TREASURY PORTFOLIO
Additional Estimates 2006-07

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
TREASURY (INCLUDING ATO) – WRITTEN QUESTIONS ON NOTICE								
AET-1	Conroy	ACCC	Written	***Telstra Fibre to the Node Talks*** 1. Does the Commission support the concept of an explicit surcharge on wholesale prices to recover that part of the net non-commercial USO costs incurred by Telstra that are not funded by the current level of the USO? Please answer YES or NO. a. Why? b. Please detail exactly what the position of the ACCC was to this proposition when it was discussed with Telstra in the FTTN talks. 2. Does the ACCC believe that the USO subsidy covers the entire amount of the funding shortfall that arises as a result of the imposition of de-averaged wholesale prices by the ACCC and averaged retail prices by the government? 3. How does the ACCC either go about or would propose to go about assessing whether there is any shortfall in uso funding and how large such a shortfall is? 4. The ACCC's answer 6 to SBT 109 from the Supplementary Budget Estimates states that the ACCC is not able to assess the accuracy of Telstra's claim that it must provide additional internal cross-subsidies to meet its universal service and price control obligations over and above explicit universal service funding without public scrutiny and testing. Does the ACCC believe the validity of this claim is relevant to its decision to de-average ULL pricing? a. If not, why not? b. If so, why hasn't the ACCC tested the validity of this claim in the public inquiries associated with the ACCC's decision to de-average ULL prices?	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				5. Please explain how the government's Broadband Connect program could be relevant to reducing the need for Telstra to use internal cross-subsidies (over and above explicit universal service funding) to meet its universal service obligations (as implied in the ACCC's Answer 6 to SBT 109 from the Supplementary Budget Estimates)? a. Does the ACCC concede that the Broadband Connect program could actually exacerbate the ability for existing levels of universal service funding to cover the cost of Telstra's universal service obligation by creating competing infrastructure that may reduce Telstra's returns in USO areas (by taking customers of Telstra infrastructure) without reducing its net non-commercial USO costs (as Telstra would still be required to maintain this infrastructure)?				
AET-2	Conroy	ACCC	Written	***Special Access Undertakings*** 1. Is the ACCC aware that the communications sector has had the worst investment record of any sector of the Australian economy according to the Bureau of Statistics in the three years to 2004-05 (ABS Cat No. 5204, Australian System of National Accounts, 2004-05, Table 64)? a. What is the ACCC's explanation for this situation? b. Does the ACCC believe that the current telecommunications regulatory environment has contributed to this situation? 2. Does the Commission accept any responsibility for the fact that no Special Access Undertakings have ever been accepted? a. It has now been 5 years since the SAU regime was changed with the intent of being more investor friendly, doesn't the fact that despite this change there has still been no SAU's accepted imply that the Commission is not assisting investment to occur?	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-3	Conroy	ACCC	Written	***ULL Averaging*** 1. Which other OECD countries have de-averaged wholesale prices imposed by regulators? 2. Which other OECD countries have mandatory de-averaged wholesale prices as well as mandatory averaged retail prices? 3. In your answers to Questions on Notice you say that Telstra asserts that the Band 4 figure from the Commission is $149 but that is not the Commission's figure. What is the Commission's figure? 4. Does the ACCC accept that the ACCC's view of this figure is essential for public debate on the issue of ULL deaveraging? 5. What is the ACCC's explanation for failing to publicise this figure to date? 6. Telstra claims that the $149 figure was derived from the figures the ACCC published concerning Network Costs and ULLS Specific Costs. These costs were stated as the only costs that would be acceptable to the Commission and specific figures were included in both the Draft and Final Determinations. Why does the ACCC disagree with this $149 figure?	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	
AET-4	Conroy	ACCC	Written	***Resourcing of the Telecommunications Area and the Content Regulation Branch of the ACCC*** 1. What is the level of resourcing in the telecommunications area of the ACCC? 2. What has been the increase over the past five years? 3. How many staff work there now? How many worked there five years ago?	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				4. What is the content regulation branch doing?				
AET-5	Murray	ACCC	Written	***Anti-Cartel Behaviour*** I noticed in a recent email WebAlert the ACCC reissued the ICN anti-cartel enforcement template originally published in December 2005 – could you please explain why? If there was an increase in requests, is there any indication of what type of behaviour people were interested in finding out concerning anti-cartel behaviour? Are there positive indications on this front?	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	
AET-6	Sherry	ASIC	Written	***Ponzi Scam*** Senator Sherry has received a letter from a victim of the Ponzi scam and this victim is seeking answers to the following questions: In late 2003, the constituent went to FICS after determining which company his investment cheque was deposited with – CPT Securities Pty Ltd. FICS considered the complaint and after 18 months of deliberation disallowed the complaint. He is seeking answers to the operations of FICS: 1. If FICS' wages are paid by the AFSL holders, could this result in a conflict of interest. What actions are taken by government to ensure unbiased resolution by FICS and why has ASIC not appointed a delegate to the FICS board to ensure adequate oversight of the resolution service? 2. In the case of the constituent he paid $60,000 to a Mr George Markos of High Wealth Securities P/L this money was placed into CPT Securities Pty Ltd Equipoise Toowoomba Trust Account with the NAB. Reportedly, FICS accepted CPT's claim that they were *not* trustee despite owning the account and co-signing every dollar out, which resulted in FICS disallowing his	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				claim. In light of this and after complaints from investors is ASIC planning on taking any action or further investigation against CPT Securities or High Wealth Securities? 3. Does ASIC require all investment schemes to be registered with them, irrespective of number of investors and amounts raised, so ASIC double checks if the investment Offer is properly licensed and insured? If not why not? In this case the constituent actually checked ASIC's database before investing and found no black marks or warnings against any of these people/companies, does ASIC feel investors are sufficiently warned of investments by visiting their website and if not what other avenues are available for investors to check on investments? 4. Why aren't the NAB required to ensure that there is a trustee / trust deed in place when an FSL company opens a trust account with them? 5. Why is there no government agency to give me redress and compensation?				
AET-7	Sherry	ASIC	Written	***Pistachio Growers (further to SBT-6)*** 1. In ASIC answer 1a) ASIC stated "In its earlier investigations, ASIC formed the view that the Peebinga Pistachio Plantation Scheme (PPP) was illegal. However, those investigations also revealed that the scheme was not originally set up by Mr and Mrs Fleming." Does this mean those who originally set up PPP set up an illegal scheme that led to the severe financial loss of the growers should be acted against? 2. Further in answer 1a) ASIC stated "In December 2004, PPA proposed to ASIC that it would make a cash offer to all growers and then wind up the scheme. This proposal was accepted by ASIC on the basis that the cash offer was likely to exceed the amount growers would receive if PPP were wound up".	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Did ASIC consult with growers before accepting this offer? If not in hindsight do you think you should of, so you could at least explain the dire circumstances they were in? 3. In answer 1b) ASIC states "On 5 November 2005, ASIC received advice from a grower who stated he had accepted PPA's offer, but had not been paid". What action did ASIC take after receiving this complaint? Would the failure of PPA to comply with the proposal agreed to between ASIC and PPA be a breach of the law and in turn require ASIC action against PPA? 4. In response to question 2 ASIC states "ASIC has requested, and is awaiting receipt of, a supplementary report from the liquidator of PPA and will assess that report to determine what action, if any, is warranted". What date did ASIC make this request to the liquidator of PPA and has ASIC set a date for the maximum time allowed to respond to this request, when does ASIC think they will receive the supplementary report? 5. If the supplementary report from the liquidator indicates that monies from the sale of Pistachio nuts was used to pay for the cash offer to a lucky few growers instead of the agreed funding from Elan Trading Corporation would this be considered by ASIC as a breach of the act and in turn require action against PPA. QUESTIONS and ANSWERS FROM LAST ESTIMATES Senate Economics Legislation Committee ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE Treasury Portfolio Supplementary Budget Estimates 1 - 2 November 2006				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Question: sbt 6 (ASIC) Topic: Pistachio Investors Hansard Page: Written Senator SHERRY asked: Question 1 (a) Why has ASIC not acted against Donald Brownlie Fleming and Dee Dee Fleming over their misconduct as directors of Perpetual Plantations Of Australia (ACN 008 013 447) in the matter of the Peebinga Pistachio Plantation Scheme? In December 2004 PPA gave ASIC an undertaking that it would make a cash offer to all growers to acquire all their respective interests and entitlements in the Scheme. PPA advised ASIC (on Dec 13 2004) the offer will be funded by Elan Trading Corporation (another of Donald Flemings companies) and that the proposal was not contingent on funding being made available to PPA. Payment to growers who accepted the offer was to be made by 30th April 2005 but many growers did not receive payment. Question 1 (b) As ASIC vowed to monitor the progress of PPA's proposal (letter dated 15 December 2004) please advise the date when ASIC first became aware that growers were not receiving payment? Question 1 (c) What correspondence, if any, did ASIC have with PPA regarding the progress of these payments in the period following the expiration of the April 30 payment deadline - until the time that PPA and Elan Trading were placed in liquidation (November 2005)? Question 2 Is ASIC aware that $835,000 being the net return from the sale of nuts from the 2005 pistachio harvest (belonging to growers who did not accept the PPA offer) has been misappropriated by the directors				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				of PPA. Question 3 Is ASIC aware that prior to making the offer to growers, PPA had acted illegally in order to obtain a benefit for another Fleming company (not PPA) by giving a Guarantee to a third party, which was secured by a Mortgage and a Charge over the assets of the plantation. If the answer to that question is 'no' - are we to believe that ASIC did not actually review PPA's corporate details when deciding the issue of how to act in relation to the non complying plantation Scheme? Answers: Question 1(a) In its earlier investigations, ASIC formed the view that the Peebinga Pistachio Plantation Scheme (PPP) was illegal. However, those investigations also revealed that the scheme was not originally set up by Mr and Mrs Fleming. ASIC has not acted against Mr or Mrs Fleming as, based on the investigation that it undertook, it did not find that they had engaged in conduct that warranted enforcement action other than to remedy the breach of Chapter 5C of the Corporations Law by Perpetual Plantations of Australia Pty Limited (PPA). In December 2004, PPA proposed to ASIC that it would make a cash offer to all growers and then wind up the scheme. This proposal was accepted by ASIC on the basis that the cash offer was likely to exceed the amount growers would receive if PPP were wound up. On 11 November 2005, receivers and managers were appointed to PPA. On 17 November 2005, voluntary administrators (who later became liquidators) were appointed to PPA and external administrators were appointed to Elan Trading Corporation Pty Limited.				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				On 23 November 2006, ASIC received a confidential preliminary report pursuant to section 533 of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) in respect of PPA. ASIC has requested a supplementary report from the liquidator and will assess that report to determine what action, if any, is warranted. Question 1(b) On 5 November 2005, ASIC received advice from a grower who stated he had accepted PPA's offer, but had not been paid. Question 1(c) From 30 April 2005 to November 2005, ASIC exchanged correspondence and telephone calls with the lawyers acting for PPA on at least six occasions. Question 2 No. As at 12 December 2006, it does not appear that ASIC has received any complaints concerning the return from the 2005 pistachio harvest, nor has it received any correspondence from the liquidators of PPP or PPA about this issue. ASIC has requested, and is awaiting receipt of, a supplementary report from the liquidator of PPA and will assess that report to determine what action, if any, is warranted. Question 3 It is not clear what is meant by this question. Cross guarantees and indemnities between associated companies are not of themselves illegal. It is important to note that the assets of PPA, which gave the guarantee, are separate from the assets of PPP.				
AET-8	Webber	ATO	Written	***Full Time Employees of Benale Pty Ltd, trading as Fletcher International WA, Paid Tax*** Can the ATO confirm how many full time employees Benale Pty Ltd	Written	3/04/2007	4/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				trading as Fletcher International WA paid tax on behalf of for the 2005/06 financial year?				
AET-9	Webber	APRA	Written	***Reward Insurance Ltd*** 1. Can APRA advise of the reasons and background as to why APRA served Reward Insurance a Notice to Show Cause in early July 2001? 2. "Reward Insurance commenced underwriting License Builder Warranty Insurance from 01/05/1196 and continued to 30/06/1999. From 01/07/1999 any business obtained by Australian Home Warranty was placed with HIH. "Reward Insurance again commenced to underwrite Licensed Builder Home Warranty Insurance in May 2001 to mid June 2001 at which time it ceased at the request of APRA. Over this period approximately 700 policies were written with no reinsurance program in place". - Actuary report by William Szuch dated 30/06/2001. Can APRA confirm the above chain of events and its response to Reward Insurance Ltd's writing insurance policies without an APRA approved reinsurance program? 3. Can APRA confirm that Reward Insurance did in fact put in place an APRA approved reinsurance program to cover the 700 policies? If so, when? 4. Can APRA confirm that Reward's reinsurance arrangements by providing a copy of the 401 and 402 forms for the period from January to December 2001?	Written	25/05/2007	25/05/2007	
AET-10	Boswell	Treasury	Written	***Biodiesel and Fuel Rebate*** Q1. How much Bio-diesel was sold in each month in the year of 2006? ie amount for Jan 06, Feb 06 for each month through to Dec	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				06 Q2. In relation to Bio-diesel, can you provide the monthly totals for each month in 2006, of the volume and $ amount sold to each of the 4 major oil companies plus the total figure to independents? Q3. Could you provide a monthly breakdown of the $ amounts of the Diesel Fuel rebate (off road use) - once again for each month in 2006?				
AET-11	Sherry	Treasury	Written	***Official Development Assistance*** Please provide full details of the Official Development Assistance (ODA) eligible expenditure and activities undertaken by Department since 2000-2001 to date.	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-12	Wong	ABS	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (ABS)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written	19/04/2007	19/04/2007	
AET-13	Wong	ACCC	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (ACCC)***	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-14	Wong	AOFM	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (AOFM)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	
AET-15	Wong	APRA	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (APRA)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-16	Wong	ASIC	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (ASIC)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written			
AET-17	Wong	ATO	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (ATO)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	14/05/2007	14/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-18	Wong	CAMAC	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (CAMAC)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-19	Wong	I-GT	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (I-GT)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-20	Wong	NCC	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (NCC)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-21	Wong	PC	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (PC)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-22	Wong	RAM	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (RAM)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?	Written	2/05/2007	2/05/2007	
AET-23	Wong	Treasury	Written	***Recruitment Agency Spending (Treasury)*** (1) What sum was spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which are used by the department and agencies in the Minister's	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				portfolio? (3) What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact on departmental outcomes from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/ or on utilising on line recruitment portals?				
AET-24	Wong	ABS	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (ABS)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-25	Wong	ACCC	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (ACCC)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?				
AET-26	Wong	AOFM	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (AOFM)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-27	Wong	APRA	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (APRA)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?				
AET-28	Wong	ASIC	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (ASIC)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-29	Wong	ATO	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (ATO)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess	Written	28/05/2007	28/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?				
AET-30	Wong	CAMAC	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (CAMAC)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-31	Wong	I-GT	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (I-GT)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-32	Wong	NCC	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (NCC)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-33	Wong	PC	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (PC)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-34	Wong	RAM	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (RAM)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?				
AET-35	Wong	Treasury	Written	***Opinion Polls/Market Research (Treasury)*** (1) What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups, or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio? (3) How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? (4) What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups of market research?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-36	Wong	ABS	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (ABS)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-37	Wong	ACCC	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (ACCC)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-38	Wong	AOFM	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (AOFM)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-39	Wong	APRA	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (APRA)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-40	Wong	ASIC	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (ASIC)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-41	Wong	ATO	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (ATO)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years)	Written	28/05/2007	28/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-42	Wong	CAMAC	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (CAMAC)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-43	Wong	I-GT	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (I-GT)***	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend.				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-44	Wong	NCC	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (NCC)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-45	Wong	PC	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (PC)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-46	Wong	RAM	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (RAM)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years) Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-47	Wong	Treasury	Written	***Advertising Campaigns (Treasury)*** (1) What sum was spent on each of the active advertising campaigns for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years)	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Campaign $M Smart Card 47.3 Child Support Reform 36.1 Promote Private Health Cover 52.1 Medicare direct mail 17.5 New family law arrangements 19.9 Independent contractors <15 Pensions real estate/assets test 5.9 (at least, over 2 years) Smart Traveller 13.1 Alcohol abuse 25.2 Citizenship 4 Disease risk factors Child care rebate Family Law arrangements Illicit drugs and mental illness Living in Harmony Initiative For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) planning progress for campaigns; (b) likely start dates; and (c) media spend. ATTACHMENT A: http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fapa_ctte/estimates/sup_0607/pmc/campaign_activity.pdf				
AET-48	Wong	ABS	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (ABS)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?				
AET-49	Wong	ACCC	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (ACCC)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	
AET-50	Wong	AOFM	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (AOFM)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio,	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?				
AET-51	Wong	APRA	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (APRA)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-52	Wong	ASIC	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (ASIC)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-53	Wong	ATO	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (ATO)***	Written	11/04/2007	12/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?				
AET-54	Wong	CAMAC	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (CAMAC)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-55	Wong	I-GT	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (I-GT)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?				
AET-56	Wong	NCC	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (NCC)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-57	Wong	PC	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (PC)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(4) For each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?				
AET-58	Wong	RAM	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (RAM)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-59	Wong	Treasury	Written	***Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies (Treasury)*** (1) Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (2) Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio? (3) What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? (4) For each department and agency in the Minister’s portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-60	Wong	ABS	Written	***Employment and Reporting of Interviewers*** (1) Every year in the ABS annual report, the ABS provides details of staff employed under the Public Service Act, including tables and graphs. Why does the ABS not include the details of the 652 interviewers who constitute nearly 20% of the ABS staff and are employed under the Australian Bureau of Statistics Act? (2) Can the Minister provide reasons why the ABS not employ the 652 interviewers under the Public Service Act? (3) How long has the ABS been employing interviewer under the ABS Act? (4) Are there any legal reasons that disallow the interviewers from being employed under the Public Service Act? (5) Who else, apart from the interviewers, are on-going employee and employed under the ABS Act?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-61	Fielding	ACCC	Written	***Anti-Competitive Behaviour*** 1. The Australian newspaper on 2 February 2007 noted that the ACCC is auditing the liquor division of Woolworths to ensure it no longer acts in an anti-competitive manner. When is that audit due for completion? Please provide a copy of the final report of the audit. 2. Is the Commission aware of the case of Graham and Kris Downing who have a small general store in Palmers Island, NSW? It is reported (Grafton Daily Examiner, 12 March 2005) that the Downings have been victims of anti-competitive behaviour from Woolworths, preventing them from getting a liquor licence. This reported anti-competitive behaviour was well after the 2001 behaviour the ACCC pursued and for which Woolworths was fined $7 million last year. What does the Commission propose to do about	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				this case? 3. The Australian (2 Feb 2007) also reported the ACCC had also brought court proceedings against Coles's Liquorland division. Will an audit also be undertaken of Coles's Liquorland division? If not, why not? If an audit is to be undertaken, please provide a copy of the final report.				
AET-62	Ludwig	ABS	Written	***Government Grants (ABS)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-63	Ludwig	ACCC	Written	***Government Grants (ACCC)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-64	Ludwig	AOFM	Written	***Government Grants (AOFM)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	11/05/2007	14/05/2007	
AET-65	Ludwig	APRA	Written	***Government Grants (APRA)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	25/05/2007	25/05/2007	
AET-66	Ludwig	ASIC	Written	***Government Grants (ASIC)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available)	Written	2/05/2007	2/05/2007	Interim answer

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient				
AET-67	Ludwig	ATO	Written	***Government Grants (ATO)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	
AET-68	Ludwig	CAMAC	Written	***Government Grants (CAMAC)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-69	Ludwig	I-GT	Written	***Government Grants (I-GT)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient				
AET-70	Ludwig	NCC	Written	***Government Grants (NCC)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-71	Ludwig	PC	Written	***Government Grants (PC)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				g. The postcode of the grant recipient				
AET-72	Ludwig	RAM	Written	***Government Grants (RAM)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-73	Ludwig	Treasury	Written	***Government Grants (Treasury)*** With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided: a. The name of the grant program b. The name of the grant recipient c. The ABN of the grant recipient (where available) d. The amount awarded e. The date the grant was awarded f. The state of the grant recipient g. The postcode of the grant recipient	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-74	Murray	ASIC	Written	***Television Advertising*** Several investors in Westpoint and in other failed schemes have contacted my office and asked why ASIC does not take out TV advertisements to warn investors of such schemes, on a similar basis to government TV advertisements on other matters. Such constituents	Written	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				seem to be of the view that electronic media has wider reach and impact than ASIC press releases. Has ASIC considered this matter, or considered requesting the Government for funds to run such information commercials in selected cases?				
AET-75	Murray	ASIC	Written	***Office of Workplace Services*** The Assetless Administration Fund appear to have been quite successful in cracking down on systematic misbehaviour by company officers who have deliberately avoided responsibilities to creditors, which includes employees who have missed out on entitlements. ASIC puts out a list of banned directors – do you also inform the Office of Workplace Services that directors have been banned because of failure to pay entitlements or other workplace obligations to employees? ASIC has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Tax Office and other Government departments – do you have one with the Office of Workplace Services so that it can follow up matters properly, by prosecuting employers for non-payment of entitlements?	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-76	Murray	ASIC	Written	***Correspondence of 21 December 2006*** In correspondence from ASIC's executive Malcolm Rodgers dated 21 December 2006, he advised me that ASIC does not record whether a registered company is for profit or not. The AASB is examining accounting standards that will be specific to the NFP sector. Is ASIC looking at reviewing its data capture fields to recognise the different nature of such entities? In that same letter, I received a response regarding enforcement against companies which fail to comply with section 319. I was advised that this is a 3 phase process. I was advised that 'This process has been completed for all 2004 non-complying companies'. If my understanding is correct, once non compliance has been established a letter is sent, to which the party must respond in 28 days, if nothing happens they are given a 14 day Notice and if they do not respond to that then court proceedings are initiated to obtain an order for them to comply. Given the initial timeframe, why does it take so long to complete the process for all non-complying companies (ie I'm being told in Dec 2006 that it has been completed for 2004 companies) – Is that due to hold-ups in the Courts, or is it because there are insufficient staff or resources in ASIC to process these matters more efficiently?	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-77	Evans	Treasury	Written	***Medicare Levy Surcharge Data*** How many people have paid the Medicare Levy Surcharge in each of the last 5 years? In each of these years, how many people have been earning below the average wage? How much revenue has the Government earned from the Medicare Levy Surcharge in each of the last 5 years? Of the number of people who have taken out PHI in the last 5 years, how many of these people would have paid the Medicare Levy	Written	25/05/2007	25/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Surcharge if they hadn't taken out PHI?				
AET-78	Wong	ABS	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (ABS)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-79	Wong	ACCC	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (ACCC)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	
AET-80	Wong	AOFM	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (AOFM)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?				
AET-81	Wong	APRA	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (APRA)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-82	Wong	ASIC	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (ASIC)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-83	Wong	ATO	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (ATO)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the:	Written	28/05/2007	28/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				(a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?				
AET-84	Wong	CAMAC	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (CAMAC)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-85	Wong	I-GT	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (I-GT)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-86	Wong	NCC	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (NCC)***	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?				
AET-87	Wong	PC	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (PC)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-88	Wong	RAM	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (RAM)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-89	Wong	Treasury	Written	***Campaign Advertising – cost, frequency and type (Treasury)*** For Campaign Advertising in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: (a) cost; (b) frequency; and (c) type/medium (e.g. print, television, radio) of campaign advertising for this financial year? Can this information be provided on a monthly basis for the financial year?	Written	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-90	Ludwig	Treasury	Written	***Accredited Client Program – further to SBT-45*** With reference to the Treasury's response to question BET45 (taken on notice at the 2006-07 Supplementary Budget Hearings) which stated: "the Government does not generally provide the details of the costings of proposals that are not Government policy and which may or may not have been considered in the policy development process." 1. Is the Treasury aware that the Customs Legislation Amendment Act (No. 2) 1999 contained provisions to enable the deferral of customs duty? As mentioned on page 153 of the Australian National Audit Office's report on Customs' Cargo Management Re-engineering Project which states: "Custom's Accredited Client Program is intended to streamline clearance processes. The program was initially part of the CMR business model. The Customs Legislation Amendment Act (No. 2) 1999 contained provisions to enable the deferral of customs duty." 2. Is the Treasury also aware that the Revised Explanatory Memorandum for the Customs Legislation Amendment and Repeal (International Trade Modernisation) Bill 2001 which was passed in 2001, states:	Written	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				"it is intended that accredited clients will be people who are allowed to defer the payment of goods and services tax and duty. To facilitate this proposal, it intended that regulations will be made under section 132AA of the Customs Act, which will allow people who can defer goods and services tax to also defer the payment of duty." 3. In light of duty deferral being in legislation at the time of the 2004 Budget process, will the Treasury revise its previous position not to release the details of the costings and provide those costings to the committee? If not: a. How can Treasury maintain its position not to provide the details of the costings given duty deferral was in legislation at the time the costings occurred and that therefore the costings formed an integral part of the government's reasoning in changing its policy to favour the revised Accredited Client Program? 4. With regard to (I) the Customs Legislation Amendment Act (No. 2) 1999 and (II) the Customs Legislation Amendment and Repeal (International Trade Modernisation) Bill 2001 and (III) the Customs Legislation Amendment (Border Compliance and Other Measures) Bill 2006: a. Is the Treasury generally required to prepare costings for such legislation where they potentially impact on Commonwealth revenue: i. If so, why? ii. If not, why not? When is Treasury usually required to prepare costings in relation proposed legislation that impacts upon Commonwealth revenue and how does this legislation differ from those circumstances? b. Did the Treasury prepare a costing of duty deferral, as it impacts upon Commonwealth revenue, in relation to this legislation? i. If not, why not? ii. If so, what date was the costing finalized? Could the Treasury provide the details of that costing? c. Did the Treasury prepare a costing of any provisions of this legislation other than those relating to duty deferral, as they impact upon Commonwealth revenue?				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				i. If not, why not? ii. If so, what date was the costing finalized? Could the Treasury provide the details of that costing d. Would Customs generally be required to notify the Treasury or refer to it any provisions contained within this legislation? i. If not, why not? ii. If so, did Customs meet this requirement and on what date? e. Was the 2004 Budget process the first time that Treasury conducted any costing in relation to Accredited Client Program? i. If so, could the Treasury explain why there was a long delay between the introduction of the legislation (in this case just items I and II) and when they were finally costed? 5. In the 2006-07 Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing Mr Nigel Ray, General Manager, Tax Analysis Division, stated in relation to the costings of the Accredited Clien Program that occurred in the 2004 Budget process: "Treasury would have costed a number of options around that." a. Could the Treasury provide a brief description of the number of options that it costed? i. If not (e.g. because it would go to the details of advice given to government) could the Treasury at least provide the number of options that were costed as referred to by Mr Ray? With reference to the evidence given by Mr Jeff Buckpitt, National Compliance Manager the Australian Customs Service, at the 27 April 2006 hearing of the Senate Inquiry into the Customs Legislation Amendment (Border Compliance and Other Measures) Bill 2006: 6. Can the Treasury indicate whether it agrees with the following statement made by Mr Buckpitt, and if not detail how it disagrees: "Treasury costed that as potentially being $89 million over a four-year period" 7. Can the Treasury indicate whether it agrees with the following statement made by Mr Buckpitt, and if not detail how it disagrees:				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				"the decision was that the government had concerns about the financial impact of the accredited client program, and the minister was tasked with consulting industry further to develop a proposal which would be acceptable to government and industry—that is, one that did not have the same financial implications for the budget" With reference to the evidence given by Mr Jeff Buckpitt, National Compliance Manager the Australian Customs Service, at the 25 May 2006 hearing of the Senate Budget Estimates: 8. Can the Treasury indicate whether it agrees with the following statement made by Mr Buckpitt, and if not detail how it disagrees: "Under the original model with the accredited client program, duty would be payable on the seventh day of the following month. So, in the case of an accredited client, the duty in respect of their cargo for the month of June would not be paid until 7 July. So, in effect, the impact for the budget is all of the duty for the month of June for all of the accredited clients." 9. Can the Treasury indicate whether it agrees with the following statement made by Mr Buckpitt, and if not detail how it disagrees: "it was roughly $20 million per year that was being pushed from June to July, and when you total that you end up with the $89 million figure." With reference to accounting conventions used by the Treasury in preparation of the budget and costing policy proposals: 10. Can the Treasury explain how it would cost a proposal that involved deferring the collection of $22.25million in Commonwealth Revenue from one financial year to the next on an ongoing basis? In its response can the Treasury: a. Provide a total estimated cost to the Budget for such a proposal over the first four years of operation? b. Provide the estimated cost to each individual budget inside the first four years of operation? With reference to the Accredited Client Program approved as part of				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				the 2005-06 Budget: 11. Can the Treasury confirm whether it performed a costing of the Alternative Cost Recovery System (ACRS) contained within the revised Accredited Client Program as an alternative to the import processing charge for accredited clients? c. If not, why not? i. Isn't Treasury required to examine all policies which impact on Commonwealth Revenue (for example Treasury's response to question BET82 from 2006-07 Budget estimates indicated that the revenue implications from the Australian Government's decision to increase import processing charges were reported in the 2006-07 Budget") ? If so, why did the Treasury decide not to cost this change? ii. Will Treasury now perform a costing to estimate what the impact of the decision will be? d. If so – i. How much was the ACRS estimated to cost the Commonwealth over the first four years of operation? ii. Could the Treasury provide the detail of the costings? If not why not? e. If the Treasury cannot confirm whether a costing was performed - given the Treasury has previously reported the impact of increasing import processing charges as per part (a)(i), why doesn't the Treasury follow the same approach in this instance?				
AET-91	Sherry	ATO	Written	***Mr Anthony Potts*** A Mr Anthony Potts contacted my office in regards to the superannuation proposals put forward by the government. He had a particular situation that was not made clear by the government when it announced it's proposed tax treatment of a "taxed" defined benefit scheme. I subsequently wrote a letter to The Treasurer, the hon. Peter Costello, to gain clarification to the proposals in Mr Potts case, the letter is attached below.	Written	7/06/2007	7/06/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				I have received an email from Mr Potts stating that he has received a letter from the ATO with forms for a private ruling. Mr Potts is not seeking a private ruling he and I are seeking clarification from the government on the tax treatment of his GSO defined benefit scheme. If he retires at 55 but only claims his super at 60, the GSO fund will place his super into a holding account for the interim period between 55 and 60. They will continue to pay his pension into this holding account for this 5 year period, what taxes will he be liable for with this holding account? He is not accessing his super until he is over 60 so will he benefit from the government announced tax free status on the exit tax and what notional earnings tax will he be charged during this period?				
TREASURY – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE								
AET-92	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Trade and Export Items*** **Senator JOYCE**—We have a terms of trade shock—that is interesting. Currently in our terms of trade, what are the major export items? Give me the top five. **Dr Kennedy**—I can do the broad shares and then go within the shares. Non-rural commodities are about 40 per cent of our exports—the mining stuff. **Senator JOYCE**—What is the biggest of the non-rural commodities? **Dr Kennedy**—Coal and iron ore are the largest single shares, I think. **Senator JOYCE**—How much is coal at the market? **Dr Kennedy**—I do not know, off the top of my head. We will take the question on notice, if you like.	E22	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AT-93	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Competitive Advantage in Extraction of Coal*** **Senator JOYCE**—What is the window for coal exports into the	E23	16/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				future at our current rate of production? How long into the future can we continue to export coal? **Mr Parker**—A couple of hundred years. **Senator JOYCE**—A couple of hundred years sustaining the proportion of the economy that it sustains at the moment? **Mr Parker**—This goes to the issue of what the reserves are and the level of economically extractable reserves. It is not just a question of how much coal or whatever there is absolutely in the ground; it is a question of whether it is economic to extract it. As the price goes up it becomes economic to extract more. **Senator JOYCE**—Do we have a competitive advantage in our extraction of coal? Is ours like a far more affordable product to extract than, say, our major competitors in the coalmining industry? Do we have an avenue of basically less overburden and coal close to the surface that gives us a huge competitive advantage in our extraction of coal? **Mr Parker**—I am not sure of the details. **Senator JOYCE**—Can you take that on notice? **Mr Parker**—Yes.				
AT-94	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Importation of Liquid Fuel*** **Senator JOYCE**—We have coal and iron ore exports, but what portion of our exports at the moment is manufacturing? **Dr Kennedy**—Elaborately transformed manufactures, or manufactures more broadly, are a little under 20 per cent by share of manufactures. **Senator JOYCE**—Manufacturing is 20 per cent of our total export income—is that right? **Dr Kennedy**—I will take it on notice and check, but that is the broad rule of thumb. Basically, about 40 per cent is non-rural commodity exports and the rest is split between agriculture, services and manufacturing, in broadly equal shares. **Senator JOYCE**—In layman's terms, 40 per cent is mining and then the rest is— **Dr Kennedy**—services, manufacturing and agriculture. **Senator JOYCE**—What portion of the trade account deficit is due to	E24	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				the importation of fuel? **Dr Kennedy**—That is a question I can take on notice. We are a net importer of liquid fuel. We import more than we export. **Senator JOYCE**—What is the largest item on our trade account deficit? What is the largest item of import into Australia? **Dr Kennedy**—In terms of types of goods, it probably is manufactures—capital equipment—and also consumer items. I do not have the shares to hand, but it would be a split between those two. **Mr Parker**—We can give you a split—that is not a problem. **Senator JOYCE**—I would like you to take on notice what the portion of fuel is in our trade account. We might have it here, I will just check. **Dr Kennedy**—In terms of the share of imports, if we split it this way, we have goods and services. Goods imports are about five times the size of services imports. **Senator JOYCE**—What are the main goods imports? **Dr Kennedy**—We could split the goods imports three ways into consumption goods, capital goods and intermediate and other goods. Intermediate and other goods would be things like fuel or other things that are going to be used as— **Senator JOYCE**—What are consumption goods? **Dr Kennedy**—Of total goods debits of a little over $15 billion, in December consumption goods were about $4½ billion; capital goods were about $3½ billion and intermediate and other goods were about $7 billion. **Senator JOYCE**—I am curious because there is a continual argument put up about how much of our trade account deficit is due to the importation of fuel. I want you to take that on notice to stop conjecture on it. **Dr Kennedy**—Sure. **Mr Parker**—We export and import liquid fuels. **Senator JOYCE**—What is the threat from the importation of fuel and how does it relate to our capacity and competitiveness in the exportation of mining products, which are highly reliant on fuel? What contingency plans, in your threat analysis, do you have to deal with that issue? **Mr Parker**—We will take that on notice.				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-95	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Productivity and Compositional Changes*** **Senator SHERRY**—Again, we have touched on this to some extent, but what about the estimated productivity in the aggregate market sector excluding mining? **Mr Davis**—I do not have the precise numbers with me. **Dr Kennedy**—If you look at the detail of labour productivity in the market sector, excluding mining in 2005-06, it is about 2.7 per cent **Senator SHERRY**—What about long term, long run? **Dr Kennedy**—The long-run averages for the market sector are about 2.2 per cent. **Senator SHERRY**—What about the trend average since the late 1990s, the last seven years—I am forgetting it is 2007. **Dr Kennedy**—Now you have stumped me. I do not have that number to hand, but we could certainly calculate it for you. **Senator SHERRY**—Thank you. Just coming back to those compositional changes, can you outline with greater precision the decline in productivity in the mining sector being offset by the shift away from lower productivity sectors in the economy, and we touched on agriculture earlier. Are you able to do that with any greater precision? **Mr Parker**—We could do the analysis for you and take that on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Earlier, Dr Kennedy, when we discussed this compositional change, you referred to it not fully offsetting. I am just wondering to what extent it has offset. **Dr Kennedy**—The compositional effect is a substantial effect. I believe the Reserve Bank, in their November monetary policy statement, published the composition effects around productivity when they were looking at this issue of slow output and employment. I do not have the numbers to hand, but my understanding of our own preliminary analysis was that, as I said before, the fall in productivity within the mining sector more than offset the positive effect that labour going to mining makes to productivity. I do not have a number to hand; I can take the question on notice.	E29-E30	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-96	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Impact of Drought*** **Senator SHERRY**—What about the impact of drought on, for example, short-term fruit and vegetable prices, bread and dairy commodities—milk and cheese? Every time I have been into the supermarket in the last year, prices in the food sector seem to be increasing in comparison to other areas **Dr Kennedy**—Certainly food prices have been growing more rapidly than other prices, but that has not all been drought related. There has been frost related activity and other climate events that have driven some of those food price increases. **Senator SHERRY**—But the principal climatic impact would be drought, would it not? **Dr Kennedy**—The most recent movements around fruit and vegetables—and I will confirm this for you later—I think were more due to frost related activity, and obviously there were the cyclones around the well-known banana effect. But certainly there will be drought effects. **Senator SHERRY**—So you have that issue under close examination? There are significant parts of Australia that are drought stricken and I would have thought it reasonable— **Dr Kennedy**—It is the major reason for us revising our growth down from 3¼ per cent to 2½ per cent in 2006-07.	E34-E35	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-97	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***CPI and Housing Rents*** **Senator SHERRY**—What about the potential impact of housing rents flowing through to inflation; has that been given any recent examination? Today there is a superannuation link story, but there has been more regular commentary about the increase in housing rents, the increase in returns. Does Treasury have any observations to make about what are apparently increasing housing rents? **Dr Kennedy**—Housing rents, in the CPI, have been growing, I think, at around 3.7 per cent through the year—once again, it is a number I will get checked in a moment. But it is also the case that the whole stock of rents take a fair bit of time to change, to turn over, and there has clearly been evidence of acceleration in housing rents. So it is an	E35-E36	19/04/2007	19/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				issue that we have been thinking about and the extent to which it might feed into prices. **Senator SHERRY**—Has the growth figure been higher than that 3.7 per cent in the immediate past? **Dr Kennedy**—I will take that on notice. I think there has been somewhat of an acceleration of rents in that CPI number. There is certainly evidence coming to bear that the new rents that are being settled, if you like, have been increasing. But, as I said, that takes some way to work its way through. A measure of rent is based on the whole stock of rents. The increase in rents would have been an acceleration, certainly since its longer run growth was reasonably modest for some time. **Senator SHERRY**—So it is a recent trend for it to edge up, if you like, or move up? **Dr Kennedy**—I believe so. I will confirm that for you. **Senator SHERRY**—Why would that be the case? Why would housing rents increase? What has happened that has led to that? **Dr Kennedy**—Basically, more demand, presumably, for those rental properties than there has been supply would see rents start to increase, and that is likely to be what we are seeing. Activity around the housing market has been quite modest for a couple of years, and the population has continued to grow reasonably strongly. It would be mixed, but I am certainly aware that rental vacancy rates are low in most cities—in fact, all cities, I think, around two per cent or lower. **Senator SHERRY**—What proportion of the CPI are housing rents? Is it reasonably significant? I am not looking for the exact figure. **Dr Kennedy**—What do you mean by 'is it significant'? **Senator SHERRY**—The weighting by level compared to other components would be a better way of putting it, I think. **Dr Kennedy**—I think it is low single digits, but I can get someone to find that out for you while you're asking questions, if you like. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, sure. I don't think we'll finish before the lunchbreak at 12.30—I am sure we won't—but perhaps if you can get some information on that for when we resume after lunch. **Dr Kennedy**—We think it is about four per cent of the basket, but we will check that for you.				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-98	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***First Home Buyer Affordability Index*** **Senator SHERRY**—I have some issues relating to housing affordability. What is the current level of housing affordability in Australia? **Dr Kennedy**—According to measures such as the HIA's First Home Buyer Affordability Index, housing affordability is at quite low levels at the moment. **Senator SHERRY**—Do you have a figure? **Dr Kennedy**—The First Home Buyer Affordability Index was at an all-time low in the December 2006 quarter, indicating that first home buyers would need to spend 30.7 per cent of average household income on mortgage repayments. **Senator SHERRY**—When you say an all-time low, how far does 'all time' go back? **Dr Kennedy**—The history of that series? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. **Dr Kennedy**—I do not know off the top of my head. It would go back at least 15 years. **Senator SHERRY**—Perhaps you could just confirm that detail on notice. **Dr Kennedy**—Yes. **Senator SHERRY**—What is the level of debt servicing burden at the present time in Australia? **Dr Kennedy**—It is around 11.2 per cent of gross household disposable income, but I will confirm those numbers for you.	E39	19/04/2007	19/04/2007	
AET-99	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Household Debt*** **Senator SHERRY**—At the same time as we have had a significant increase in household debt, is it the case that household assets have increased faster than that debt? **Dr Kennedy**—I think the household asset-to-debt ratio has been broadly stable at around 16 per cent to 17 per cent. They have increased broadly in line with each other. **Senator SHERRY**—What are the major areas of growth in household assets by sector?	E41	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Dr Kennedy—The major asset they hold is housing. The growth rates might be something that I need take on notice. I do not have that to hand.				
AET-100	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Corporate Sector Debt*** **Senator JOYCE**—One of the issues that you brought up is that you said that the corporate sector now has strong control of debt. Would it be a fair proposition to say that that is by reason of an accelerating share price more than a retirement of debt? **Mr Parker**—I would have to take that on notice and go back and look at it. **Senator JOYCE**—The proposition is that, if you are in an environment where interest rates are rising—and they rise by reason of what is happening overseas, macro-economic effects throughout the world—the only thing you should really talk about when you refer to a government is the differential between its interest rates and the United States interests rates, or another benchmark, rather than saying its interest rates are lower, its interest rates are high. If you talked about interest rates in a period when there is a trend up throughout the world, and we had a position where stock prices stagnated, then a company that had a high leverage would be in a completely different position now from, say, 10 years ago when obviously there would have been a trend of interest rates going down or a propensity for greater exposure.	E49	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-101	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Companies on the ASX during an Equity Buyout*** **Senator JOYCE**—I have one final question on debt. How many companies could go off the Australian stock market if there was an equity buyout before it started affecting them? Take that on notice. **CHAIR**—That is an interesting question for Mr Parker, but I do not think that we expect a response.	E49	25/05/2007	25/05/2007	
AET-102	Joyce	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Entity Structures***	E59	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Mr Callaghan—What I was saying previously is that, if they had a company structure and they were selling the company that held the assets here, we would not get the money now. A fact of life is that this was happening quite a bit in terms of the way people could get around the CGT liability. **Senator JOYCE**—Couldn't we have changed the interposed entity structure without having to give an exemption to foreigners? **Mr Callaghan**—As this was debated, we moved ourselves into line with the OECD model. We moved ourselves into line, which was the outcome of many of our treaty negotiations in terms of the rationale—improving the attractiveness of Australia as an investment location—and we tightened up on the interposed entity on the land-rich aspect. **Senator JOYCE**—The OECD: England is one that is called to mind. Does America have a similar arrangement? **Mr Callaghan**—I would have to check. **Senator JOYCE**—Do you know of any country apart from England that has it? **Mr Callaghan**—I think the US has it. The majority of OECD countries have it. I do not have a list of those who do or do not. I would have to take that on notice.				
AET-103	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Revenue from Non-Forestry Managed Investments Scheme*** **Senator SHERRY**—Perhaps Mr Callaghan can help us? **Mr Callaghan**—I was just trying to understand your question. If I understand what has happened, the ATO had an interpretation of what the current law was, so in one sense there is no cost to revenue because taxpayers were operating under the ATO's interpretation of what the law was. The ATO have indicated that they have reconsidered their view of what the current law is. In a sense changing that, looking forward, would have implications for revenue going forward, but it is not a cost of the current arrangements. **Senator SHERRY**—What is the implication to revenue going forward, then, that has been estimated? **Mr Callaghan**—I do not have that estimate with me. We have seen published numbers about what the size of the investment is in the	E68-E69	25/05/2007	25/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				industry. Most of those would be deductions. It would have to be netted out, but that gives you an order of magnitude of the nature of deductions that would not be allowed. But there would be offsetting elements in there. I would not have the total cost available. I would have to take it on notice. Sorry, it is not a cost; it is what would be the gain in the non-forestry side?				
AET-104	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Review of Forestry*** **Senator SHERRY**—What are the observations about that review in respect of forestry? **Mr Callaghan**—The review was undertaken, the information gathered and the government made a decision, made an announcement— **Senator SHERRY**—There has presumably been a document put together as a consequence of that consultation? **Mr Callaghan**—There was ongoing advice provided to the government coming from that consultation, as there always would be. **CHAIR**—We are getting very close to commentary on policy, which the officer is not obligated to do. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, I understand that. Is the documentation on the review publicly available? **Mr Callaghan**—The submissions, where those lodging the submissions indicated they would be public, were made public. There was not a report from the department at all that was made public. **Senator SHERRY**—So the outcome, conclusions and analysis are not publicly available? **Mr Callaghan**—That is right. **Senator SHERRY**—Can you take on notice to make it publicly available? **Mr Callaghan**—Certainly. **Senator SHERRY**—Thank you. Turning to the non-forestry management investment schemes, what has been the process here? **Mr Callaghan**—I do not have the dates in front of me, but when there was an announcement in 2006, shortly after the budget, with the indication of the possible outline of a new regime for the forestry sector, it indicated that there would be ongoing review of the	E70	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				application to the non-forestry sector. When the announcement was made in December about the forestry sector, the government indicated that they would shortly be announcing their position on the non-forestry. An announcement was made on I think 9 February regarding the non-forestry. **Senator SHERRY**—Was that review-analysis part of the same process as for forestry? **Mr Callaghan**—There was a continuation of the discussions that went forward. In many respects, many of the major players in the forestry are also the major players in the non-forestry. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, the same. **Mr Callaghan**—So there is a continuation of it. **Senator SHERRY**—Are the analysis and conclusions in respect of the non-forest management investment schemes part and parcel of that analysis in respect of forestry investment schemes? **Mr Callaghan**—In the sense that, if you start from the basic principle of what the ATO was reconsidering in terms of the carrying on of the business which is the basis of the deduction, that is the starting point, and it is common. Then in terms of the two ultimate areas of where the investment is going, one into forestry, one into non-forestry, there are clear differences, as was indicated in the government's announcement of this. **Senator SHERRY**—I understand there are differences, but in terms of the documentation are they one and the same documents? **Mr Callaghan**—No, I do not think you could look at it like that. It is not saying that there is just a single document. There is a series of consultations, advices and considerations. There are different considerations dealing with the forestry sector, and then with the non-forestry sector, in the policy sense. **Senator SHERRY**—Again, I just wanted to be clear about the documentation and whether it is effectively the same documentation covering both but related issues. But, in any event, can you take on notice to make public the documentation in respect of the non-forest managed investment schemes? **Mr Callaghan**—Yes.				
AET-105	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Tax Deductibility of Political Donations (relates to BET-31)***	E77	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator SHERRY—Thank you for that, Mr Gallagher. As part of your analysis, what was the cost of the tax deductibility of political donations under the old regime? Do you have that information? **Mr Gallagher**—No, we did not assess the base; we assessed the change. I do not have that information with me. **Senator SHERRY**—Did you examine it? **Mr Gallagher**—It may have been a by-product of the costing process. I would have to take the question on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Presumably you would have examined it in calculating the increase in the tax deductibility? **CHAIR**—I think the witness said he wants to take this on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, but I think it is reasonable to keep asking aspects of the question. I do not think I am being unreasonable with the witness. He would have had to examine both sets of costs to identify the difference. **Mr Gallagher**—We had to look at what donations were over the threshold, the extent to which donations were over the threshold, and where there are multiple donations from essentially the same person/company we attempted to put them together so we could assess the application of the threshold. **Senator SHERRY**—Was there any assumption made about behavioural effect and change as a consequence of the deductibility rules? **Mr Gallagher**—I think there were behavioural assumptions in the costings. The costings were some time ago now. I cannot remember exactly what they were. But there were assumptions about behaviour.				
AET-106	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Calculation of Revenue Figures*** **Senator SHERRY**—Thanks for that. Given that we have just had a very helpful breakdown of some of the disaggregated costs that have not been published—the media, for example—I want to go to a couple of issues relating to the calculation of the components of the revenue figures that are contained on the back of the Treasurer's press release of 7 December. Perhaps I can start with some issues on which I started to pose some questions to Mr Gallagher at the hearing on the	E93-E95	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				bills a couple of weeks ago. Ms Vivian, you were there, too. I posed a question about the estimated revenue to be gathered from the estimated number of persons for whom tax file numbers would not be received. That is in the figure. Can you give me that figure today, please? **Mr Ray**—We took that question on notice and we have provided an answer to the committee. **Senator SHERRY**—Can you just refresh my memory? What was the answer? I did not see anything. **Mr Ray**—We did not provide the number. The information has not been published. **Senator SHERRY**—Why is it not being published? **Mr Ray**—Because the government has not published it. **Senator SHERRY**—I have just been given an example—and we have just talked it through—of the government not publishing the advertising media as a separate category, yet I have just been given that by the ATO, broken down and disaggregated. **Senator MURRAY**—Quite properly. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, quite properly, and I appreciate the tax office's cooperation. Why can I not get the figure that I have asked for on the non-provision of tax file numbers? **CHAIR**—If this is a policy matter, this officer cannot respond to that question. **Senator SHERRY**—I would beg to differ. If we go back to your opening statement, I think it is a perfectly reasonable question. When we have received the disaggregated figure—and we know that Ms Vivian has outlined it as an estimate—I do not see why we cannot reasonably receive a figure for this particular item. It has been costed, it has been published, it is on the public record—the revenue item—so why can we not receive an admitted estimate of the revenues that have been calculated? **Mr Ray**—You did not ask us that question in the last hearings. You asked us for, I think, the estimated number of people— **Senator SHERRY**—I think I asked for both. But I will ask for both now and I am happy to receive both the figures. **Mr Ray**—We are happy to take that on notice again. **Senator SHERRY**—Frankly, Mr Ray, I think you are just being				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				smart. I put the question on notice and I did indicate that I would be seeking that information here. Frankly, I expected to get it at the hearing on the bills, but it has not been provided. Because I am not going to get the information in this area, I ask: are you able to provide any other information that has been calculated on the revenue components? **Mr Ray**—It would depend on your question. **Senator SHERRY**—The estimated loss to revenue in that measure from, for example, the exit tax removal? **Mr Ray**—If your question goes to whether we can break down the net impact on revenue of various elements of the package, we would need to take it on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Why? **Mr Ray**—Because, as we have been through many times, the government has not published that information. **Senator SHERRY**—I know they have not published it, but the ATO have just given me a breakdown of the expense item administration costs when I asked for it. **Mr Ray**—I am aware of that. **Senator SHERRY**—And you are aware that on previous occasions—or at least on some occasions—when I have asked for a breakdown of the revenue calculation I have received it? **Mr Ray**—I did not say you would not receive it. I said I would take it on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, but you have taken at least one question on notice—actually, I think it is two—and apparently you have said no. I have not checked the answer. You have just referred to it. **Senator Coonan**—He said he would take it on notice and that he would look at the breakdown. He did not say anything other than that. Did you? **Mr Ray**—No. **Senator SHERRY**—Let us be frank. I am not going to get it, am I, Mr Ray? **CHAIR**—I do not think that is a reasonable question. You have asked a question. The officer has said he does not have that information and will take it on notice. What the outcome of that might be, I do not think should be a matter of conjecture tonight.				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator SHERRY—I think it should be. You were not at the bills hearing, Mr Chair. That is being denied in a response. I did indicate that I would be pressing the issue here tonight. I think it is in breach of the opening statement that you read out. I am not going to press the issue any further because it is probably futile to do so tonight, but I will take it up at a meeting of the committee because, frankly, I think it is unreasonable. Just so that we are clear on what I would like on notice, in terms of the revenue components we are obviously dealing with the revenue loss as a result of the non-provision of a tax file number. Is the abolition of what is known as the exit tax a component? I just want to deal with the components. **Mr Ray**—The revenue loss because of the non-provision of the tax file number? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. Sorry, that is a gain. There is a loss because you gain the revenue and then it is paid out—or at least largely paid out. I would like the estimate of both of those figures for each year. Then there is the loss to revenue. There may be other gains to revenue. Are you able to identify any other gains to revenue from this measure? **Mr Ray**—As we discussed a couple of weeks ago, the package has some pluses and minuses in it. One of the things that you would expect to happen is that there would be a shift from, say, employment income that is taxed at marginal rates to a super fund— **Senator SHERRY**—That is, as a consequence of behavioural change— **Mr Ray**—That is correct. **Senator SHERRY**—as distinct from loss resulting from the removal of taxes up to ETP, the exit tax, and the income tax free treatment? They are basically the categories of revenue we are dealing with, are they not? Are there any other categories? **Mr Ray**—You would expect there would be a shift from other individuals to superannuation as well. **Senator SHERRY**—The bottom line is: could I have the details, a list, of each item of revenue gain or loss within the category of revenue? **Mr Ray**—What you are asking for is a head of revenue split of each element of the package?				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator SHERRY—Yes, for each of the four years—obviously it is disaggregated—in the forward estimates. Having made no progress on the revenue side, the issue I did raise—				
AET-107	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Longer Term Impact to Revenue Measures*** **Senator SHERRY**—On the same issue, has Treasury carried out any work on the longer-term impact to revenue of the measures beyond the year 2009-10? **Mr Ray**—I think we have answered that question before in that we have definitely done some thinking about what the longer-term implications of the package would be. **Senator SHERRY**—The thinking is even harder to get than the figures that I have been trying to get, which I know are on paper. **Mr Ray**—Again, what we have said in the past is that we have not done definitive long-term quantitative work. **Senator SHERRY**—Has there been any attempt to put this thinking down on paper to date? **Mr Ray**—Not in a publishable form. **Senator SHERRY**—No, that is not what I asked. I will get to whether you are going to give it to me and publish it. There has been some attempt to calculate impact on revenue beyond 2009-10 and it is on paper or in a computer somewhere? **Mr Ray**—There has been some thinking that has been on paper, yes. **Senator SHERRY**—Thank you. That is great. Could I put this on notice: can I have that, please? **Mr Ray**—You can put that on notice.	E95-E96	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	
AET-108	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***CDE Program*** **Senator SHERRY**—I have another superannuation issue that someone in revenue may be able to help me with. It concerns Indigenous workers on what is known as the CDE program for remote Aboriginal communities. It is a form of payment that they receive. My understanding is—and I would be interesting to know whether this is correct—that this form of payment is not for the	E99	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				purposes of the nine per cent superannuation guarantee. Can anyone confirm that? **Mr Lonsdale**—I would have to take that on notice.				
AET-109	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Length of Time Taken for Examination of Foreign Acquisition Requests*** **Senator SHERRY**—Where there has been an examination previously by the Foreign Investment Review Board with respect to foreign acquisitions, do you have any details as to the length of time taken? **Mr Colmer**—I do have some figures on that. If you will just bear with me for a minute. **CHAIR**—If you do not have those figures you can take that on notice. **Mr Colmer**—I will get that information for you on notice.	E111	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-110	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Impact of US, Thailand and Singapore Free Trade Agreements*** **Senator SHERRY**—Has there been any recent analysis of the impact of the US free trade agreement, the Thailand free trade agreement and the Singapore free trade agreement? **Mr Murphy**—I cannot point to any reports or formal analysis that has been done. There may have been. I would have to check. I am not aware of any. **Senator SHERRY**—So no analysis on any of those three agreements to date? **Mr Murphy**—No. Question about free trade agreements would be better directed to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, but we can check on that for you.	E111	19/04/2007	19/04/2007	
AET-111	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Differences Emerging in Legislation Between the States*** **Senator SHERRY**—I did refer at the previous estimates that there were some differences emerging in the legislation that had been developed between the states. Do you have any information you can	E113	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				provide on them? **Ms Smith**—No, I have not. Could I take it on notice? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes.				
AET-112	Sherry	Treasury	14/02/2007	***Financial Advice – Issuing of Communiqués, Agreements or Understandings*** **Senator SHERRY**—For example, if a real estate agent is recommending the sale of a property and points out the virtues of the garden and other aspects of the house, that is property advice. But if they say, 'Invest in this property for your retirement'—which is a fairly common line—that would be financial advice? **Mr Murphy**—No. I am talking about the Corporations Act financial services. It would have to be actually a financial service. **Senator SHERRY**—Okay. Has this been the subject of some sort of memorandum communiqué? **Mr Murphy**—It has been discussed a number of times and it is discussed in other forums. It could be discussed in the Commonwealth-state consumer forum. Mr French might be able to help there. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. **Mr French**—This matter has been discussed in the context of the Ministerial Council on Consumer Affairs. **Senator SHERRY**—Has there been a conclusion reached? **Mr French**—No. There has been work examining the options. Ruth Smith would know more about the ins and outs of the current state of that. Some of the issues you have been raising are the root of the difficulty in working out what to do in this area, because you have got states regulating in the area of real estate and the Commonwealth in the area of financial services. The difficulty is coming to an option which appropriately covers these issues; it would be quite difficult to come to grips with. **Mr Murphy**—As a practical matter what you would find is the real estate agent may refer a person to a financial planner—they may even have them in the premises—and those people become clients, if you like, of the financial planner.	E114-E115	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator SHERRY—Also, presumably they could refer them to a mortgage broker or another financial institution? **Mr Murphy**—Yes. **Senator SHERRY**—Just to make sure I understand, there has been no formal agreement on division of responsibilities, if you like, at this stage? **Mr Murphy**—The states are fully aware of the Commonwealth's position that, if they wish to seek to further regulate people who are not caught under Commonwealth legislation—the Corporations Act—as providing a financial service, it is a matter for them. **Mr French**—There has been a working party of the Standing Committee of Officials on Consumer Affairs which has been looking at the issue, and work has been undertaken on regulatory impact assessment. **Senator SHERRY**—I understand that. Take this question on notice, because I have to finish: has there been the issuing of any sort of formal communiqués, agreements or understandings in this area to date? **Mr French**—There have been. We can take that on notice, but there have been a number of statements by the ministerial council as it relates to the progress of that work. **Senator SHERRY**—Thank you.				
AET-113	Conroy	ACCC	15/02/2007	***Meetings with the G9*** **Senator CONROY**—How many meetings have you had with the G9? **Mr Dimasi**—We have had several. Off the top of my head, I could not tell you exactly the number, but we have had several. **Senator CONROY**—I am happy for you to take this on notice: could you indicate how many there have been, who attended them, and the dates. **Mr Dimasi**—We will take that on notice. **Mr Cosgrave**—We are happy to do that. The G9 being a collective of individuals, that will reflect that there have been a number of discussions with individual members who have carriage of various issues. So there will be a large number.	E15-E16	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-114	Conroy	ACCC	15/02/2007	***Implications for the Telecommunications Access Regime*** **Senator CONROY**—What would be the implications for the telecommunications access regime if Telstra's litigation was successful? **Mr Samuel**—I do not think it is appropriate to comment on that, given that this is before the High Court at the moment. I think we need to await the adjudication of the High Court before we deal with that. As I indicated in my opening statement, we treat the current legislation as being valid. We will operate under the current legislation as if it is valid. If it is termed to be invalid then we will deal with that at the time, as no doubt will parliament. **Senator CONROY**—You must have a general view about how it would impact on the access regime. Telstra are obviously saying it has got to throw it out. What impact would that have on the regulatory regime? **Mr Samuel**—We will have to take that on notice. I do not think we have given it much consideration, which is not to say that we are treating the High Court case lightly, but I think we have more significant matters to deal with in the context of the administration of parts 11B and 11C than the current High Court challenge.	E22	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	
AET-115	Conroy	ACCC	15/02/2007	***Rationale and Methodology Used When Designing Markets for Ideas, Opinions and Editorials*** **Senator CONROY**—I am happy for you to take this part on notice. Can you explain the rationale and methodology you used when you designed your market for ideas, opinions and editorials? **Mr Samuel**—It would be helpful to take this on notice. You may be assisted in this when the public— **Senator CONROY**—I was happy for you to take that on notice. **Mr Samuel**—We will be issuing a public competition assessment on this in the next short while. If there are further queries, it may be then appropriate to examine that, because that will give a much more detailed analysis of the process that we undertook there and of the conclusions that we reached. It may be appropriate for you to carry	E29	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				that forward at the next Senate estimates hearing. We will give you that information on notice. **Senator CONROY**—What changed the commission's view between 8 December 2006 when the statement of issues came out and 17 January when the ACCC announced that it would not oppose the acquisition? **Mr Samuel**—What normally can occur in relation to any issue of a statement of issues. The statement of issues is designed to focus stakeholders' attention on the issues that are of potential concern to us and, indeed, on issues that may not be of concern, and to focus the market inquiries and the market response. The most information that I can give you now, because I do not have the details to hand, is that the market response and the further market inquiries conducted in that period—which was something like five weeks—led us to the conclusion that we reached. If we take those on notice then we can give you— **Senator CONROY**—You are on the record saying a couple of things, and I will quote them to you: However, following extensive market inquiries, it became apparent that a range of advertising alternatives exist for advertisers in these community newspapers, although individual advertisers may have different ranges of alternatives. Overall, the ACCC was satisfied that sufficient advertising alternatives exist in this case to provide a competitive constraint to News Ltd. What are those alternatives? **Mr Samuel**—As I said, we will take that on notice, because I do not have all of that detail to hand. **Senator CONROY**—I am sure you would not, but the man who made the call is sitting right here. What are the alternatives? **Mr Grimwade**—There were a variety of alternatives that were being put to us by the various small businesses that we spoke to. I can take that on notice and give you all the detail, but I recall that among the information that had been provided to us there were some mentioned of businesses that they were developing their own leaflets. **Senator CONROY**—Leaflet drops? **Mr Grimwade**—This is the information that we got from a variety of				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				different small businesses. Leaflet drops were an option. Some of the councillors that we spoke to considered that the barriers to entry in community newspaper delivery was low and that they could establish their own if they felt that prices would rise or if there was any need to formulate their own local community free newspaper. There were other advertising alternatives. As Mr Samuel said, we will be issuing a public competition assessment which outlines the reasons for our final decision shortly and that should provide the answers to your questions.				
AET-116	Joyce	ACCC	15/02/2007	***Predatory Pricing Under Section 46*** **Senator JOYCE**—Are any cases currently being brought before the ACCC on predatory pricing under section 46? **Mr Cassidy**—We have 10 section 46 matters under investigation. I may end up taking that one on notice because I do not have the information to tell you whether any of those relate to predatory pricing. Can I take that on notice? **Senator JOYCE**—Yes. I would appreciate that.	E31	15/05/2007	15/05/2007	
AET-117	Sherry	APRA	15/02/2007	***Wind up of Superannuation Funds*** **Senator SHERRY**—It is always fascinating; I totally concur. I have a couple of preliminary matters. Could someone give me an outline of the ongoing wind-up of superannuation funds—a status report—that did not meet or, alternatively, did not seek licensing? **Mr Jones**—The process was designed to be finished by 31 December. Some of those funds that decided to wind up but were not completed by 30 June—that is, those that did not apply for a licence—entered into enforceable undertakings whereby we gave them up to four or five months. The exact numbers as at 30 December I would have to take on notice and give to you. Effectively, almost all of the money has been rolled out. So effectively what we are dealing with now is just wind-ups, and much of it is administrative, in terms of getting closure on the remainder of the funds. There are some funds that we have not ever been able to communicate with—that is, all that we have ever had is a registered address and that address turns	E37	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				out to be inappropriate. We have not been able to contact those. So there is a process that we will probably have to go through to wind them up. I can supply the exact numbers. We are confident enough to have disbanded our superannuation licensing team at 31 December. **Senator SHERRY**—I would appreciate if you could take that information on notice.				
AET-118	Sherry	APRA	15/02/2007	***Defined Benefit Funds*** **Senator SHERRY**—I noticed in the UK recently that there is a growing trend for the effective buyout of a DB fund—the purchase of the asset/liabilities by a financial institution unrelated to the trust structure and, in many cases, a closure of the trust structure. The buyer effectively undertakes to maintain the promise and holds the assets. Has that occurred at all in Australia? It seems to be quite widespread now in the United Kingdom. **Mr Jones**—I am not aware of examples. I can check for you. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes.	E38	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-119	Murray	APRA	15/02/2007	***Press Releases from APRA*** **Senator MURRAY**—Dr Laker, I would like to ask you some questions relative to a joint press release that you put out with ASIC and APRA on 5 February 2007. Before I do, I would like to suggest something to you. I am a member of the committees that are interested in ASIC, particularly the Corporation for Financial Services, but also the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit, the Senate finance and, of course, this Senate Economics Committee, all of which have an interest in ASIC, and I am on their press release list. I find their press releases terrific in terms of keeping up with their work from a professional point of view. Sometimes it gets a bit much because I might have three or four in a day, but that is just showing that they are busy. I have tried to encourage other regulators to think of the same system for parliamentarians on those committees or with those portfolios which intersect with APRA. I do not recall receiving press releases from APRA, in my function but I presume you send	E41-E42	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				them out. **Dr Laker**—I will clarify that. **Senator MURRAY**—I would not suggest it for all members and senators, because I doubt that they are all interested. But for those members and senators who have either a portfolio interest, which I do, or a committee interest, which I do, then it is worth while. **Dr Laker**—I note your comments.				
AET-120	Murray	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Liabilities Relating to Directors' Duties*** **Senator MURRAY**—Is there any consequent potential legal liability later on if, for example, this high debt exposure and an exogenous shock coincided to cause bankruptcy? Could shareholders who lost their money sue both the directors and ASIC for not attending to the directors' duties as understood under the law? Is there any contingent liability that might extend to ASIC? **Mr D'Aloisio**—I would have to take that on notice. I do not think there would be. There is not an obligation on ASIC to ensure that companies are not negligent in the way that they run their affairs. I am a new commissioner, but that would be quite a concept. I want to take that on notice and have a look at, because— **Senator SHERRY**—It might cause you concern to have become a commissioner if that happened. **Mr D'Aloisio**—Company directors do carry that obligation in relation to their directors' duties—due diligence and so on. They definitely carry it. I was not seeking to shirk it in that sense. But coming back to the question: is there a possibility that the directors in this case may be in breach of their duties looked at in hindsight in two or three years time? There must be, but that is a matter for the shareholders at the time. That is a matter for the company and ASIC at that point in time. It is not an issue on which we would act today.	E60	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-121	Watson	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Primary Healthcare*** **Senator WATSON**—I now move to another question, and that concerns the publicly listed company called Primary Health Care. Does ASIC intend to take action against Primary Health Care's sell-	E64	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				down of its investment in the pharmaceutical company Symbion at a time when the market and the shareholders were of the view that Primary Health Care was bringing the two companies together? I think there is a clear breach there. **Mr Cooper**—We will have to take that question on notice. This is a current transaction that is on foot at the moment. It is not something on which either myself or Mr D'Aloisio is specifically briefed, so we will just have to take that on notice. **Senator WATSON**—But would you not agree that there is a clear breach there, if that is the case? **Mr Cooper**—I really cannot speculate on live matters where we do not have a specific knowledge, so we really have to take that one on notice. **Senator WATSON**—Obviously, as I perceive it, there is a breach there, and I would hope that ASIC is going to take pretty quick action. **Mr Cooper**—We will look into it. **Senator WATSON**—Thank you. **CHAIR**—Senator, I am not uncomfortable with you making some commentary in the guise of a question, but I think I will respect Mr Cooper's view that he wants to take it on notice. **Senator WATSON**—Yes, I am quite happy for him to take it on notice. I just hope that quick action is going to be taken. **CHAIR**—It could not have been any easier, but that is all right. **Senator SHERRY**—There is always a certain degree of commentary. **CHAIR**—I was trying to do the right thing. **Mr Cooper**—That is what makes it interesting.				
AET-122	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Money Management Bulletin*** **Senator SHERRY**—It does, yes. Talking of interest, I went back from the hearings this morning to have a cup of tea and I sat down in my chair and looked at the *Money Management* special bulletin that is up on the web, which informed me that the number of cases now being checked by AMP has increased from 7,000—that was a consequence of the enforceable undertaking we have discussed on previous occasions—to 35,000. I was a little taken aback at this. There was no further detail provided, but what can you tell us of this,	E64-E65	2/05/2007	2/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Mr Cooper? Can you offer some explanation of what is occurring here? **Mr Cooper**—This is obviously very recent news. This release must have come out today, did it? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, it was this morning. I have not seen a press release from AMP. I had not checked the ASIC website to see if they had issued a press release around it, but I must say I had assumed that ASIC would have some knowledge of this. **Mr Cooper**—We did know that the 7,000 figure was to be increased as part of the work that is being done pursuant to the enforceable undertaking and the external advisers and so on. The work that AMP has done there has taken longer than was expected, and as a result of looking into exactly how many files and advices were involved, the number has gone up from 7,000. I have not read the release, but I had understood that it was in that sort of dimension. **Senator SHERRY**—Just to be clear on this, has AMP informed ASIC about this number? **Mr Cooper**—There certainly were, as you would expect, a number of discussions going back and forth between the two organisations, but I was not aware that it had been released. **Senator SHERRY**—As I say, it was in the *Money Management* special bulletin this morning—35,000. That seemed to me to be an extraordinary jump. Putting aside that figure of 35,000, which is very significant, what is the explanation for the increase in the number, whatever that is that you are finally informed about? **Mr Cooper**—I must admit that I would have to take that one on notice. It was to do with some part of the methodology; they had originally identified the number as 7,000, but it turned out to be, on a closer examination, 35,000. But I would have to take on notice precisely what was the cause of that. **Senator SHERRY**—I could understand a thousand or a couple of thousand or some reasonable variation of 7,000, but for it to suddenly go to 35,000 just seemed an extraordinary number. I think initially it represented about one per cent. It has now jumped to five per cent. **Senator WATSON**—And are there more to come? **Mr Cooper**—Of people wanting a review? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. I am not so sure it is the individuals who				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				have gone to AMP wanting a review, or whether that is the number of individuals identified as part of the enforceable undertaking process as needing now to be reviewed. Anyway, we will see what the response is. I am sure you will be issuing some press releases in the next day or two about this once you are more familiar with the information. **Senator SHERRY**—That brings me to the issue that we have discussed on previous occasions—the other activity that was being undertaken against other, as yet unidentified, firms in the financial services industry as a consequence of the shadow shopping and some of the identified misbehaviour. What point are we at with concluding those investigations and any action against other institutions? **Mr Cooper**—With all of the other things we have on the go at the moment, I must admit I am not across exactly where that work is right at the minute, so we can take that on notice and give you an update. **Senator SHERRY**—The last time I discussed this with Mr Lucy a number of firms—four or five, I think—were outstanding. To be fair to AMP, they were not the only firm with a major set of issues to deal with. From time to time I get questions and commentary, 'If it's AMP, who else is involved?' We just do not know yet whether that has all been finalised? **Mr Cooper**—Yes.				
AET-123	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Licensed Banks not Signed Up to the Banking Code of Practice*** **Senator SHERRY**—I do no think in this case the customer I have been referring to earlier particularly sees Rabobank as any different from any other bank when it comes to collecting money, et cetera, on the loan. Perhaps you could take on notice to request a list from the ABA of banks that are licensed in Australia that have not signed up to the banking code of practice; adherence is another matter.	E66	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-124	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Licensing of Actuaries*** **Senator SHERRY**—There was one other issue I raised with APRA. They had taken action against an actuary, and the nature of the	E66	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				conversation was that I thought this was relatively unusual. In terms of the role of ASIC in licensing actuaries, could you explain to me at what point that is reached? **Mr Cooper**—I must admit I do not have an immediate answer on that one. I am not aware of that having been recently discussed, so we would have to take that one on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—Are actuaries required to be licensed? **Mr Cooper**—I would not have thought as a matter of course, no. **Senator SHERRY**—Would that depend on the particular role they have in the financial services sector? **Mr Cooper**—It could, yes. **Senator SHERRY**—Could you take that on notice? That particular action of APRA had prompted me to inquire as to the status of actuaries within the licensing regime.				
AET-125	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Westpoint Staffing Allocation*** **Senator SHERRY**—In terms of resource allocation, are you able to indicate the approximate staffing allocation you have on this matter at the moment? **Mr Cooper**—I could not go into the numbers, but I can say that Westpoint has caused us to take over new premises. We took over one of Westpoint's premises in central Perth where many thousands of documents are located and a good number of our staff. The precise numbers I do not think I could give you at this stage. We could take that on notice.	E67	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	
AET-126	Wong	ASIC	15/02/2007	***James Hardie – Payment of Legal Costs*** **Senator WONG**—The fact that Hardies is a Netherlands company may mean that they can, in effect, indemnify their officers in relation to these actions? **Mr Cooper**—It may, but that is completely speculative. I do not know the answer to that. **Senator WONG**—What about the payment of legal costs associated with defending these actions? Is that prohibited? If Hardies were	E75-E76	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				registered in Australia, would this section prohibit them from paying legal costs for the defence of these actions for officers and past officers? **Mr Cooper**—I will take that one on notice. I do not believe it would prevent it, but I think we should take that one on notice. … **Senator WONG**—Senator Murray does make a good point, though. Would any current Australian law require disclosure of that fact, if the Netherlands company chose to provide such indemnity? **Mr Cooper**—Certainly Australian companies disclose in their accounts whether directors are indemnified. In relation to a Netherlands company, we would have to take that on notice. The company has already made a market disclosure relating to the various indemnity relationships. **Senator WONG**—The document you were reading off was the market disclosure? **Mr D'Aloisio**—Yes, it was. **Senator WONG**—Are you able to provide that to us? **Mr D'Aloisio**—This was taken off the ASIC website. This is James Hardie. **Senator WONG**—I would not mind having it tabled, if that is possible. **Mr Cooper**—I will just make sure I have a full copy. **Senator WONG**—Which entity made the disclosure? **Mr Cooper**—The Netherlands entity, which is the listed entity, James Hardie International NV. **Mr D'Aloisio**—It is the listed entity here, as it is a foreign company in Australia, with ASX. I think the thrust of what you are putting is something we will look at more closely. I think we understand what you want us to look at. **Senator WONG**—Thank you very much.				
AET-127	Wong	Treasury	15/02/2007	***James Hardie – Government Intentions***	E80	31/05/2007	31/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator WONG—Is the government intending to ensure that James Hardie, the Dutch company, cannot provide an indemnity to the officers who are currently under ASIC proceedings? **Senator Minchin**—Mr Cooper has taken that issue on notice in relation to— **Senator WONG**—No, I am asking the minister. **Senator Minchin**—I am not the minister responsible. ASIC has taken that question on notice. I am happy to have a look at their answer and come back to you. **CHAIR**—This is a jurisdictional issue potentially as much as anything else, and I do not whether Mr Cooper can— **Senator WONG**—But that is— **Senator Minchin**—Mr Cooper took the previous question on notice about the issue of that section and its implication or otherwise to a Dutch registered company. **CHAIR**—Yes, that has been taken on notice. **Senator WONG**—I am not asking the question as to whether it is possible et cetera. I am asking whether it is the government's intention to do all that it can to ensure that the Dutch registered James Hardie corporate entity does not provide an indemnity to those persons who are the subject of these ASIC proceedings. **Senator Minchin**—I would not want to give an answer to that on the run. I am happy to get you an answer.				
AET-128	Wong	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Disqualification of Directors*** **Senator WONG**—I have a question in relation to disqualification of directors pursuant to 206D, which is the section that enables you to apply to a court in circumstances where someone has been an officer of two or more corporations that have failed. **Mr Cooper**—Yes. **Senator WONG**—Some complaints about the operation of this section and the extent to which it was effective and acted upon was an issue raised in the insolvency inquiry that the parliamentary joint committee undertook a couple of years ago. I do not want to name the particular person involved, but I have certainly been approached by some people who have identified a particular director of a cleaning	E82-E83	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				company who has been associated with two or three failed companies with a significant number of entitlements owed to employees and also to other creditors. I understand the investigation into this individual is still active within ASIC. Can you clarify for us what guidelines, procedures and protocols are associated with ASIC's investigation of the matter and its determination on whether or not it seeks to apply to disqualify under 206D(1)(a), which is the two corporations or more provision. **Mr Cooper**—That is a pretty specific and detailed question, so I will have to take that on notice. I will point out that that is not our only banning avenue. In fact, in the 2006 year we banned some 40 directors for a total of 144 years specifically in that area. I will certainly take that question on notice. **Senator WONG**—Are you able to provide us with an indication of which guidelines, policies, criteria et cetera you associate with your decision-making with your discretion under sections 206D and 206F? **Mr Cooper**—We would be delighted to cooperate as fully as we could there. I will say, though, that if that disclosure gives people who might be habitual participants in that a free kick because they know all of our procedures, what we look at and what we do not look at, then I would be not so keen on that. **Senator WONG**—There is always the option in those circumstances for you to seek to have that evidence provided in camera to the committee. **Mr Cooper**—Sure. I am not prefacing that it is necessarily— **Senator WONG**—I think that is a reasonable proposition. **Mr Cooper**—I am not saying that the guide would necessarily be like that. I am just cautioning that that could be an issue for us. I will take both limbs of that question on notice. **CHAIR**—We do not have the ability to do that in estimates, I gather. **Senator WONG**—No. We would have to do it through the statutory committee. **CHAIR**—Yes. **Senator WONG**—The chair raising a very good point, Mr Cooper, which is that, if you sought to give that evidence in camera, I would probably have to ask the question in the statutory oversight context. **Mr Cooper**—All right. Let us have a look at what materials we have				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				and we will see whether it is an issue.				
AET-129	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Surveillance and Enforcement Funding*** **Senator SHERRY**—May I just confirm a couple of budget matters. In the 2006-07 budget measure there were two separate ASIC allocations, for broadening surveillance and the enforcement funding. Can I have an approximate figure of the current uncommitted and unobligated forward estimates for each year to 2009-10? **Mr Cooper**—I would have to take that on notice. I do not have those. **Senator SHERRY**—Do you know how much has been spent in 2006-07 for each of these measures? **Mr Cooper**—Not with the data we have with us, no. **Senator SHERRY**—Would you take that on notice? **Mr Cooper**—Yes, we certainly can.	E84			
AET-130	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Affordable Cairns Pty Ltd*** **Senator SHERRY**—I raised with the tax office a superannuation guarantee enforcement issue, so obviously it is not your area. It concerned a business by the name of Affordable Cairns Pty Ltd where the company apparently has basically no assets but net debts of approximately $180,000, of which $100,000 relates to superannuation guarantee contributions. That is an issue that the tax office will pursue. It does raise the issue that I would request ASIC to examine and investigate, and that is the duties of the directors in relation to compulsory super contributions. There was the notification on pay slips that moneys were paid but actually failed to remit. I would like to know whether that constitutes a fraud and whether employees have any avenues of redress against the directors for possible breach of their duties and obligations. Prima facie at least, given the size of the debt and the withholding of the superannuation guarantee contributions over a long period of time, there is the issue of possibly trading while insolvent. There are some aspects here, I think, for ASIC to examine. **Mr Cooper**—We will take that on notice.	E84	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-131	Sherry	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Sovereign Capital*** **Senator SHERRY**—I raised some issues relating to Sovereign Capital at a previous hearing, and I got some answers back on notice with respect to that. Has ASIC continued in its oversight of Sovereign Capital? I understand from feedback I have received that, despite the company continuing to charge management fees to investors and recover expenses, Sovereign Capital does not possess an AFS licence or professional indemnity insurance. Has ASIC investigated that aspect of this matter? **Mr Cooper**—The history of Sovereign is a relatively lengthy one. We did cancel their licence and in early December we also intervened in some proceedings in the Supreme Court of Queensland where Sovereign was effectively wanting to wind itself up. Our objection was that we thought if this process was to be undertaken it should be done by an independent liquidator. The ultimate outcome was that the court ordered the fund be wound up under the supervision of a Queensland accountant who was supervising the activities. The state of play then was that the fund had about $54 million invested and 700 investors on hand. I am not aware that they are continuing to raise funds. Obviously that would be an issue, having taken away their licence. We will take that on notice and look at it.	E85	29/05/2007	29/05/2007	
AET-132	Wong	ASIC	15/02/2007	***Firepower Technology Ltd*** **Senator WONG**—Through you, Chair, I have a question as to one issue for Mr Cooper, and I am conscious that our next witness, Mr Macek, is here. There was an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 8 January regarding a company called Firepower Technology Ltd. Are you aware of that article? **Mr Cooper**—I am aware of the article and the issues. **Senator WONG**—Did that article prompt any activity by ASIC? **Mr Cooper**—Not that I am aware of, but that may not be conclusive as to whether we are doing something. Can we take that one on notice? **Senator WONG**—I am happy for you to. **Mr Cooper**—I am not briefed on it. I am not otherwise aware of it.	E86	7/05/2007	7/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator WONG—I am conscious of details of any individual companies— **Mr Cooper**—We will take that one on notice. It is certainly a colourful story, nonetheless. **Senator WONG**—Yes. Thank you, Mr Cooper.				
AET-133	Wong	FRC	15/02/2007	***Simpkins Report Update*** **Senator WONG**—Mr Macek, because of the time I will put this question on notice. I want an update on the Simpkins report on a sector-neutral approach for accounting standards for the for-profit and for the public, government not-for-profit sectors. Where are you at with that? You gave me some detail subsequent to our last hearing about that. I did ask some questions yesterday, of which you are probably aware, of the AASB on this issue. **Mr Macek**—With regard to the ongoing review of the Simpkins report— **Senator WONG**—For time purposes I was actually asking if you could take that on notice. **Mr Macek**—Right, but I could give you a 30-second update. We have a meeting of the FRC scheduled for next Monday with a special agenda, and this will be the main topic that we will be considering. **Senator WONG**—We look forward to further activity.	E86	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	
AET-134	Wong	FRC	15/02/2007	***Funding from the Non-Government Sector*** **Senator WONG**—I note here that the ASX is providing annual funding of a $100,000 for a further three years. What is your current government funding? **Mr Macek**—We have a number of sources of funding. In terms of Commonwealth government funding, some $4.8 million comes in effectively directly through the Treasury. Then there is an additional $1.6 million that comes directly from ASIC to the AASB. That is total quantum of Commonwealth government funding. There is also an additional half a million dollars per annum from the states and territories, and there are further amounts that come from the three	E87-88	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				professional accounting bodies which last year aggregated to $1.75 million, but they will be reducing in the coming years, and there is a modest amount from the ASX itself. **Senator WONG**—On notice could you give me the details over the last couple of financial years for the non-government sector? Why are they reducing over the next three years? Why is that contribution reducing? **Mr Macek**—There are two principal reasons. They both reflect the changing structure for standard setting. You may recall that prior to the establishment of the AASB and the FRC with oversight and then the subsequent changes where the FRC was given oversight of the AUASB, the accounting profession itself had responsibility for making standards. They now are taking the view that the standards are effectively law and that the making of law is the responsibility of government. Largely because of that diminution of control, they feel that the burden that they have been shouldering should be reduced. **Senator WONG**—I think you talked about the accounting bodies. Is that the only component that you anticipate reducing? **Mr Macek**—The other reason I think they gave us is that they have significant responsibilities to maintain their services to members and, like any member-based organisation, there are constraints. **Senator WONG**—Yes. You misunderstood my question. Is it only the accounting bodies' contribution which you are anticipating will reduce? **Mr Macek**—Yes, it is only the aggregate of the three professional accounting bodies. **Senator WONG**—You are aware of the extent to which it will reduce over the next financial year? **Mr Macek**—Yes. There is an agreed reduction over the next three years. **Senator WONG**—Could you provide that on notice? **Mr Macek**—Yes.				
AET-135	Wong	FRC	15/02/2007	***FRC/AASB/AUASB Budget Splits*** **Senator WONG**—Of the $4.8 million, how much is funding to the AASB? How is it divvied out between FRC and AASB? You might	E88	13/04/2007	16/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				want to take this on notice. Is this $4.8 million only for the FRC, or does it include the AASB? **Mr Macek**—No. The $4.8 million is for the FRC, the AASB and the AUASB. **Senator WONG**—Do you disaggregate that? Can you provide that on notice? **Mr Macek**—Yes. **Senator WONG**—If you could provide that on notice, I would appreciate that. **Mr Macek**—I can give you a breakdown, yes.				
ATO – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE								
AET-136	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***High Wealth Individuals Taskforce – Expenditure and Revenue*** **Senator SHERRY**—What has been the expenditure to date—or as up to date as you can give me—on the task force? **Mr Konza**—I might need to take that on notice, because I have been mainly looking at the resources, the human resources, that we have got on the task force. **Senator SHERRY**—What about the revenue raised to date as a result of the operation so far this financial year? **Mr Konza**—So far this financial year the High Wealth Individuals Taskforce is exceeding its revenue plan for the year-to-date figures. **Senator SHERRY**—Which is? **Mr Konza**—I would need to find those details.	E53	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	
AET-137	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***High Wealth Individuals Taskforce – Coverage Rate*** **Senator SHERRY**—Just going back to those numbers in the profile, I think you said you have readjusted your target of profiling to 1,100 and you have completed 160 profiles. When you say 'completed 160 profiles', does that mean that there are effectively 940 outstanding? **Mr Konza**—No. That would cause me heartburn. **Senator SHERRY**—Tell me why you have got the heartburn concern. **Mr Konza**—These figures are a little out of date from what I have	E54	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				just told you, but they will give you an idea of the dynamics. As at the end of September 2006 we had identified 1,283 high-wealth individuals in Australia. We exclude 284 of them because they were non-active cases. They may in fact have gone bankrupt after we identified them or passed away or left the country. When you take that figure off, we were left with 999 high-wealth individuals. What I was saying was that last year I told you that we had 860-odd confirmed high-wealth individuals. What I am saying is that we have identified a further 160 high-wealth individuals, and they will be added to the group of taxpayers who are monitored by the task force. **Senator SHERRY**—In terms of the 'clearance rate', individuals who have been identified, profiled and for which work is completed, how many have gone through the complete process to date? **Mr Konza**—Sorry, the complete process including an audit; is that what you are saying? **Senator SHERRY**—Effectively there is nothing more you can do. They are audited and that is it or, if the audit is completed and an assessment has been raised and the revenue has not been received, it is obviously not completed. **Mr Konza**—I would have to take that on notice, because it includes a calculation of audit coverage rates over multiple years. People may have been audited two or three years ago and they are on a watching brief now. We would count them as having been covered, so to speak.				
AET-138	Wong	ATO	14/02/2007	***MOU with Merit Protection Commission*** **Senator WONG**—As I understand it, the ATO has signed an MOU with the merit protection commission in relation to the use of independent selection advisory committees. Is that correct? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—That is correct. **Senator WONG**—I also understand that, pursuant to the Public Service Regulations, there is a mandatory requirement that an ISAC established in respect of an employment opportunity must, amongst other things, assess the relative merits of the candidate. I had a look at the memorandum of understanding and it appears that, whilst the ISAC oversees the recruitment and co-designs selection methodology and plays that scoping role, the assessment of candidates is intended	E59	23/04/2007	23/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				to be done by private sector recruitment agencies. My first question is: given the relative responsibilities that are set out for the ISAC in the MOU, can you explain to me how that complies with the Public Service Regulations to which I referred? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I do not know the detail of that. The full arrangements are done in partnership with the merit protection commission. **Senator WONG**—That is not the question. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—No, but they do have some authority and some responsibility for that legislation. **Senator WONG**—Perhaps you could take that on notice. My question relates to compliance with the process that is envisaged in the MOU and the role of the ISAC with what appears to be a mandatory requirement for assessment in the regulations. Could you also tell me if there is either a cost distribution or payment from the ATO to the MPC for ISAC services. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I am not sure about that. I will have to take that on notice. **Senator WONG**—Are you able to tell me what the contracts are with external recruitment agencies in the financial year to date pursuant to this arrangement? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—We can make that information available to you.				
AET-139	Fielding	ATO	14/02/2007	***Change Program – Insurance under Accenture Contract*** **Senator FIELDING**—I fully understand the fixed cost. The additional $5 million makes sense, with the extra work that was required. What is the insurance part again? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I think it is just underwriting hardware costs. I am not totally au fait on what that is. The way I saw it was that it was just protecting any shortfall in terms of the payment to suppliers, but I can provide a fuller explanation of that. **Senator FIELDING**—That was not covered in the original contract or— **Mr D'Ascenzo**—No, it was not. **Senator FIELDING**—I think the last time we said you were about 40 per cent through. What insurance is required after 40 per cent that	E62	30/03/2007	30/03/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				was not there at the start? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I suppose it may well have to deal with the changes to the scheduling of the program, but that is only an educated guess on my part. **Senator FIELDING**—Could you come back to us on that, on notice? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Yes.				
AET-140	Fielding	ATO	14/02/2007	***Cap Gemini Reports*** **Senator FIELDING**—You were kind enough to give me a copy of the Cap Gemini reports. Am I able to get updated copies of those? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Yes. **Senator FIELDING**—Rather than have to come back, could I just get the updated ones along the way? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I am happy to do that.	E63	29/03/2007	29/03/2007	updated reports will be provided to the committee as they become available
AET-141	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Costs of Superannuation Simplification Changes*** **Senator SHERRY**—Did I hear you say earlier that you had not finalised the costs of the super simplification changes? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—No. We still have to work that out and go to the department of finance for funding. **Senator SHERRY**—But we already have an announced cost by the Treasurer in his press release of 7 December, 'Departmental administration costs including capital', and there are figures there for the forward estimate period. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—That is right. That was the estimate. We now need to work out whether or not— **Senator SHERRY**—That is only an estimate? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—It is what we concede at that time as being the cost of the implementation. **Senator SHERRY**—So the cost may go up? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—The cost will be dependent on what we can negotiate in terms of delivery, but I am not sure how much is covered by that and what the costings might be. **Senator SHERRY**—I am more than a little concerned if you are not sure what costs are included. We have $479 million.	E65-E66	28/05/2007	28/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Mr D'Ascenzo—I understand that. I meant I am not sure off the top of my head what the break-up of the figures is. **Senator SHERRY**—So you stand by the validity of these estimates? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I am saying that they were the estimates that were made. Now I have to work through that in terms of what the requirements are of the new system. **Senator SHERRY**—The costs have already blown out by a billion dollars in terms of the total package. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Again— **Senator SHERRY**—From budget announcement to final announcement— **Mr D'Ascenzo**—This is the wider simplification feature. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. **CHAIR**—Ms Vivian, did you have something you wanted to add to this? **Ms Vivian**—The only comment I was going to make is that at the time those costings were undertaken you will understand that it was very early in the piece at the time of the discussion papers, and naturally since then, as we have been working through with industry and working through with government, we have been firming up on some of the costs, so that is what the commissioner is talking about in terms of some of the changes. **Senator SHERRY**—I understand the process between May and December last year But I had understood that we got some robust costs in December last year. **Ms Vivian**—There would have been costings there but, again, what the commissioner is referring to is that we have been working through quite a few things in terms of what this means to our Change Program. There are other issues the commissioner has alluded to, just in terms of what you were talking about—the robustness of the overall super systems, the importance of getting them in place, the impact on the Change Program and the delivery dates. I think in terms of the overall costings they are the sorts of costings the commissioner is referring to.				
AET-142	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***General Length of Product Rulings***	E71-E72	22/05/2007	22/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Senator SHERRY—What is the general length of the rulings? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Generally we give 12-month rulings, but arrangements could be such where they are for a longer period, depending on the circumstances. **Senator SHERRY**—If your ruling is in the next month, would the bulk of them conclude in the next financial year? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—It may differ. For instance, if you have an arrangement that involves an annual crop, that would be a 12-month ruling. Some of the longer ones would have a longer ruling period. **Mr Konza**—We should take that on notice if you want an accurate answer to that, because I am concerned that some of the afforestation schemes, for example, can go out a number of years and the financing and the tax treatment of the payments would be covered by those years. We may have rulings that go longer, but the principle that the commissioner explained is really the important one—that is, that those schemes that have commenced and are covered by a ruling will stay on the same footing.				
AET-143	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Tax Treatment of Redundancy Payments - ruling*** **Senator SHERRY**—I take it you have a ruling in this area? **Mr Konza**—For annual leave and sick leave? **Senator SHERRY**—No, the bona fide redundancy? **Mr Konza**—Yes, we do. **Senator SHERRY**—Has that been updated at all in recent times? **Mr Konza**—I have no knowledge of that, so I would need to check. **Senator SHERRY**—What about updating in terms of the recent industrial relations changes? Are there definitional changes within that? **Mr Konza**—I would need to check on that. I am not aware that it has been updated. **Senator SHERRY**—There may be operational reasons other than redundancy. **Mr Konza**—The test under the tax law is the redundancy of the employee. To be redundant in that sense, the work that person once did needs to be no longer done. That is the essence of our ruling. **Senator SHERRY**—You could have a circumstance where the work	E73	22/05/2007	22/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				will continue to be done but in a different way. **Mr Konza**—Our ruling goes into those sorts of circumstances. As I said, I do not have a definite knowledge of whether that ruling has been reviewed in light of new legislation and environmental developments. I would need to check on that.				
AET-144	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Range of Tax Treatments on the Closure of a Business*** **Senator SHERRY**—I would like you to take on notice what is the range of tax treatments on the close of a business. I suspect we can reasonably apply that to any circumstances, including the circumstances of the Beaconsfield mine closure. **CHAIR**—I do not think this witness can answer that. What you take out of the information that is provided will no doubt be used by you. **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, but it is quite reasonable to provide the information of tax treatment for employees' payments on the close of a business. **CHAIR**—That is a de facto way. **Senator Coonan**—That is a generic matter. **Senator SHERRY**—It is a generic matter; that is right. **CHAIR**—I do not think that you could then extend it and say that we can therefore assume that would apply to these people. **Senator SHERRY**—Well, the tax office can't. **CHAIR**—I think you will take out of it what you want.	E74	14/05/2007	14/05/2007	
AET-145	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Service Standards on Refunds – Historical Data*** **Senator SHERRY**—On the issue of refunds, apparently the ATO Tax Practitioner Forum draft minutes for November show the ATO has needed to implement procedures to speed up the processing and release of held refunds. A refund is supposed to be sent to a taxpayer within 28 days. Can you provide the committee with an update on the ATO's progress to improve the time period for the payment of refunds for taxpayers? **Ms Crawford**—Generally speaking, the issue of refunds is tracking within our service standards, at present. **Senator SHERRY**—Can you give me some more detail? What is	E74-E75	11/04/2007	12/04/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				'tracking within service standards'? **Ms Crawford**—Meeting the service standards that are set for refunds in relation to activity statements and also in relation to income tax. At present, in relation to the income tax year to date, the tax office has processed 96 per cent of original electronic lodgements within 14 days of lodgement and over 93 per cent of original paper returns within 42 days of lodgement. In relation to activity statements year to date, the tax office has processed 94 per cent within 14 days of lodgement. **Senator SHERRY**—How does that compare with previous years? **Ms Crawford**—That is fairly on par. Those service standards have not changed in my short time with the tax office. We met those service standards last financial year and we are tracking within service standard this year. **Senator SHERRY**—Can you take on notice to supply some of the historical data going back a couple of years? **Ms Crawford**—Certainly.				
AET-146	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Family Tax Benefit Part B*** **Senator SHERRY**—For the family tax benefit part B, are there figures available on the income distribution of those who claim the benefit? **Mr Konza**—I do not know. We would need to take that on notice and see whether an analysis has been done. **Senator SHERRY**—If you could do that for me, please.	E76	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	
AET-147	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Expenditure on E-Tax*** **Senator SHERRY**—What is the approximate expenditure on e-tax each year by the ATO? **Mr Konza**—We would have to take that on notice. Are you talking about the complete running costs, development costs and marketing? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. You would probably need to separate them. **CHAIR**—You mean the processing costs? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. The marketing, the establishment costs and the ongoing running costs.	E85	22/05/2007	22/05/2007	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Mr D'Ascenzo—We can provide that.				
AET-148	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Dependant Rebates and Dependant Tax Offsets Data*** **Senator SHERRY**—On the issue of dependant rebates and the dependant tax offsets that are used, how many taxpayers claim the child housekeeper, housekeeper, parent, parent-in-law and invalid relative offsets? Do you have any data on that? I assume that is the ATO. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—We do not have that specific data but we can take that on notice. **Senator SHERRY**—I would like you to take on notice the income distribution of the taxpayers claiming those offsets within those categories. Is there any detail on the total cost to revenue? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I do not have those details here. **Senator SHERRY**—I would like you to take that on notice. In terms of the completion of tax returns, have these rebates led to any issues of difficulty of completion that has been noticeable by the ATO? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Is this the childcare rebate? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes. **CHAIR**—I will just interrupt for a moment. When Senator Sherry asks you to take these matters on notice, would you please acknowledge that so that it is on the record? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—By all means. **Senator SHERRY**—The ones that I refer to are the child housekeeper, housekeeper, parent, parent-in-law and invalid relative offsets. **Mr Konza**—We have no data on that. We provide extensive help to any taxpayer through TaxPack, e-tax and the telephone help lines, but we do not have any data that says that— **Mr D'Ascenzo**—That people are having any particular difficulties. **Senator SHERRY**—Do you have any observations at all that you are able to provide to us? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—No. **Senator SHERRY**—Please take those earlier questions on notice for me. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Yes, we will.	E89	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AET-149	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Unpaid Superannuation Guarantee - Prosecutions*** **Senator SHERRY**—How many prosecutions in the last financial year has the ATO actually commenced with respect to unpaid superannuation guarantee? **Ms Vivian**—I would need to take that on notice.	E101	22/05/2007	22/05/2007	
AET-150	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***New Tax Practitioner Legislative Framework – Expenditure to Date*** **Senator SHERRY**—There has been a provision of $57.5 million over four years, including some $7.2 million capital funding for IT infrastructure, for the implementation of the new tax practitioner legislative framework. Could you indicate how much of that has been spent in 2006-07 to date against the budgeted amount for 2006-07? **Mr Konza**—I do not have a figure for that, but in general terms the answer is that not a great deal of that money would have been spent as yet. We do have project teams laying the groundwork, so to speak, for the new regime to come in, but not a great deal of work can happen until the legislation is presented. **Senator SHERRY**—The planning for the IT infrastructure, Mr D'Ascenzo, has that been affected by the issues we talked about earlier? Has there had to be any consideration of deferring the expenditure in this area? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Not in that area. **Senator SHERRY**—Could you just take on notice what has been spent to date? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—We can provide that.	E101	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	
AET-151	Sherry	ATO	14/02/2007	***Duties and Charges Regarding Importation of Oil*** **Senator SHERRY**—At a previous estimates hearing there was some discussion of a tanker carrying oil that entered Australia. Do you recall that, Mr D'Ascenzo? **Mr D'Ascenzo**—Vaguely. **Senator SHERRY**—Is there provision for the return of taxes paid in	E102	19/02/2008	19/02/2008	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				light of an importation which is deemed to be illegal? **Mr Jackson**—I recall the issue. We did look into that issue and that has been resolved. There is no need for any such action, but I would have to check on that. Did you have a particular tax, duties or charges in mind? **Senator SHERRY**—Yes, duties and charges. **Mr D'Ascenzo**—I will have to check on that. **Senator SHERRY**—So that matter has been resolved? **Mr Jackson**—I guess it is close to matters of particular business operators, and I would rather not comment on them, but I have looked into the matter.				