

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TRAINING

SENATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 2003-2004 ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES HEARING

Outcome: CSIRO
Output Group: - CSIRO

DEST Question No. E982_04

Senator Carr provided in writing

Question:

In a media release from CSIRO on 12 December 2003, entitled “Queensland forestry gets a boost”, it was claimed: *“With \$5m in R&D funding provided by the QDSD, CFFP will add to this commitment and will undertake a suite of research projects to support investment in new plantation and processing industries.”*

- a) As of 17th February 2004, has the QDSD money yet been allocated, and what proportion has been committed to CSIRO?
- b) Does the CSIRO consider the statement to be an accurate and fair reflection of the situation at the time of its release?
- c) Could CSIRO provide documentation to demonstrate QDSD’s commitment of this \$5m to CSIRO Forestry at the time of the press release?

Answer:

CSIRO has provided the following response.

Forestry and Forest Products

- a) Under the Queensland State Budget, \$5 million has been allocated to the Queensland Department of State Development (QDSD). As of 17 February 2004, subsequent allocation of these funds has not yet occurred.
- b) Whilst the statement is accurate, CSIRO acknowledges that the statement may be misinterpreted as stating that the full \$5m was destined for CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products. This is incorrect and was not CSIRO’s intended interpretation.

The intention of the statement quoted above and the media release as a whole was to communicate the enthusiasm of CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products towards “supporting long-term collaborative research efforts designed to substantially lift hardwood production in the south east of the state”. Building on our existing work in this area, CSIRO will leverage any funds allocated to it via the QDSD to “undertake a suite of research projects to support investment in new plantation and processing industries”.

- c) The interpretation of the above statement to mean that CSIRO is the direct beneficiary of the full \$5m is erroneous, as pointed out in reply (b) above.