

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2009-10 —May 2009**Questions on Notice (QON) index—Department of Climate Change**

Answers to QON taken during the Additional Estimates hearings, or written QON submitted thereafter, are due on 10 July 2009.

QON No.	Department / agency	Senator	Hansard Reference	Question	Comments/answer received
CC1	DCC	ABETZ	29/5/09 p5	Senator ABETZ—Thank you. Who determined what the prizes would be for this competition? Dr Parkinson—The department. Senator ABETZ—What is the value of the prizes? Could you take that on notice, and could you allocate out the value of each prize?	
CC2	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p11	Senator ABETZ—The answers that I was provided with on notice came in after 4 May, didn't they? Why was this information not provided in the written answers? Please take that on notice because, quite frankly, I think that things could have been done a lot better.	
CC3a	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p13	Senator ABETZ—All right. How many days did the call centre operate last year? ... Senator ABETZ—If it did not operate on the weekends and public holidays, it may have only operated for 74 working days. Senator Wong—Senator, I am very pleased to concede your arithmetic, but I am not sure what the point is. If you want to know if it operated on the weekends, we will take that question on notice.	
CC3b	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p14	Senator ABETZ—Yes, thank you. That would have done. How much does that make the cost per call, given that we were told that the cost was \$83,000 to run the centre? Dr Parkinson—We will do the mathematics for you, Senator. Senator ABETZ—Thank you for that. And if you could tell us what hours the call centre was open and what actual days and also the hours worked per person that would be very helpful.	
CC4	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p14	Senator ABETZ—... In relation to the \$149,000 spent on market research, can you tell us who carried out the research, how were they selected and what did they conclude? Dr Parkinson—I am happy to take the question on notice.	21/09/09
CC5	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p15	Senator ABETZ—Can I also be told how many consultants overall the department has engaged in relation to its activities—be it with the school competition, for example, with its advertising campaign, with its call centre or any other activities?	19/10/09

				Could you let us know about the consultants, the costs of each and the basis on which they were engaged? If you can take that on notice, that would be very helpful. Dr Parkinson—They are in the annual report. Senator ABETZ—In the annual report we were told, if I am correct, that in 2007-08 there was \$2.4 million spent on consultants but in 2008-09 it was estimated to be \$7.39 million. That seems a substantial increase and hence my interest as to what the basis is for that increase. Dr Parkinson—We would be happy to provide that.	
CC6	DCC	BROWN (B)	29/5 p17	Senator BOB BROWN—When did you realise that mistake had been made? Senator Wong—I understand my office has been aware of it. I do not know the precise date. Senator BOB BROWN—Could you find out the precise date for the committee? Senator Wong—I will take that question on notice. But I say, again: there was no intention to create any false impression here—nor has it been an issue that has been raised publicly with me. We were clear about a 450 ppm stabilisation goal. If you look back over the government statements on this issue—as I said—the Prime Minister’s speech to the National Press Club the white paper all articulated the goal of 450 ppm as the stabilisation goal. You will see also that there is reference to this in the explanatory memorandum.	
CC7	DCC	BROWN (B)	29/5 p19	Senator BOB BROWN—My question, though, has been predicated on the Prime Minister’s statement that the global conditionality was based on CO2 equivalent levels of 450 parts per million or lower by mid-century. I just ask the minister this question on this: when was the Prime Minister informed of this mistake? Senator Wong—I will take that question on notice. Senator BOB BROWN—Has the Prime Minister been informed of this mistake? Senator Wong—I said I would take that question on notice.	
CC8	DCC	BROWN (B)	29/5 p20	Senator BOB BROWN—Have any business or environment groups been informed that the three words ‘by mid-century’ were an error? Have any business or environment groups that have welcomed the announcement come back to you and informed you of the error? Senator Wong—No stakeholder has raised this with me. It may be that this has been discussed with members of the department, and I will take that question on notice to determine if that is the case.	
CC9	DCC	CAMERON	29/5 p22	Senator CAMERON—Thanks, Mr Comley. Could you provide the committee with a comparison [Of support for EITEI under the CPRS vs Waxman-Markey bill] like you have just gone through so we can understand it in more detail. Mr Comley—Certainly.	
CC10a	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p22	Senator ABETZ—Could I ask a follow-up question on notice. Could you provide a similar comparison of the Waxman and the CPRS in relation to how it will deal with	

				the electricity sector and electricity generators. Mr Comley —Yes, we can do that.	
CC10b	DCC	FIELDING	29/5 p47	Senator FIELDING —You mentioned before that you were coming back to the committee about comparisons with the proposed bill from the US. What about comparison with the European model? I ask so you can come back at the same time rather than coming back with pieces— Mr Sterland —Particularly on the generators? Senator FIELDING —Yes. Mr Sterland —We would be happy to do that.	
CC11	DCC	CAMERON	29/5 p23-24	Senator CAMERON —I would like to move on to an opinion piece in the <i>Australian</i> by the Chief Executive of the Minerals Council of Australia, Mitch Hooke, on 22 May 2009. That article is headed ‘Carbon plan will cause jobs carnage’ and states: The CPRS scheme will shed 23,510 jobs in the minerals sector by 2020 and more than 66,000 by 2030. Arising from that article and a Concept Economics report, a number of articles appeared in regional press around the country with various headings, such as ‘Report claims scheme to slash jobs’, ‘Carbon trading costly for Central Queensland’ and ‘ETS will cost 23,500 jobs’. The last was a Western Australian report. Could you explain to me how many jobs will be lost in the minerals industry by 2030 relative to today? ... Senator CAMERON —Could I ask you to take that on notice and give me some further analysis on these issues that I have raised. ... Senator CAMERON —Could the department provide on notice a detailed analysis of the Concept Economics modelling and the arguments and outcomes in that modelling so that I can understand it better?	
CC12	DCC	BOSWELL	29/5 p26	Senator BOSWELL —Has the EU bill carved out mining? Mr Comley —It is important to put this in context. It is clear in the European case because they have ratified Kyoto. Fugitive emissions from coalmines are included in the calculation of the emissions for the European Union’s international obligations under Kyoto, so they are recorded and counted, and that impacts on their capacity to meet the cap. Fugitive emissions from coalmines are not included within the European emissions trading scheme, but that is not to say that there are not measures related to methane emissions in those sectors. I am happy to take on notice to see whether there are other measures that seek to mitigate methane from those mines. It is quite important to understand that the European system covers broadly 40 per cent of emissions through their emissions trading scheme. They use a range of other regulatory mechanisms. We would have to have a look to see whether there is a regulatory mechanism that applies.	

CC13	DCC	BOSWELL	29/5 p27	Mr Comley —There will have to be 45 million certificates that are acquitted—that is, surrendered by liable parties. It may not be precisely that amount of renewable generation in that year because there may have been earlier generation that would be banked. In fact, the modelling that has been prepared for us indicates that there will be some banking of renewable energy certificates through the earlier period. In the renewable energy market at the moment there are currently a stock of banked certificates. My recollection is that there is about 8,000 gigawatt hours of banked certificates at the moment but I can check that.	
CC14	DCC	BOSWELL	29/5 p27	Senator BOSWELL —Okay. What would your best estimates of renewable energy certificates be from, say, 2010 to 2020? You have obviously modelled those. Mr Comley —Yes. The modelling report has been released earlier this year. It is available on the department's website. Senator BOSWELL —I could not find it, so I will look again. Mr Comley —We are happy to provide that on notice.	Answered at hearing (tabled document)
CC15	DCC	CASH	29/5 p32	Senator CASH —Thank you for that. I would like to turn now to an area which affects my home state of Western Australia: Griffin Energy. Have members of your department, or have you yourself, Minister, met with Griffin Energy in relation to the CPRS? Mr Sterland —Yes. Senator CASH —You have? And on how many occasions do you believe you have met with them? Mr Sterland —I would have to take that on notice. It has been one of my staff who has been primarily involved with the energy sector and who may have met them in both bilateral meetings or in industry meetings at times, so it would be better to be accurate on that. But it would be, I think, a number of times.	
CC16	DCC	BROWN	29/5 p42-43	Senator BOB BROWN —How do you know the total if you do not know the component? Let me put this question specifically to you. It is established by other observers, presumably, that in Tasmania, for example, regeneration forest burns produce more greenhouse gases than the rest of the Tasmanian economy put together, including its transport system. Are you aware of those figures? If you are not, how do you measure the volume of greenhouse gases coming out of deforestation if you do not know what the figure is for deforestation followed by replantation or regrowth? ... Senator BOB BROWN —I put it on notice that you provide the committee with the work and the information that you do have on that.	
CC17	DCC	FIELDING	29/5 p48	Senator FIELDING —I wonder what, as a general principle, the department believes regarding what percentages of global carbon emissions are man-made, animal-made or made from natural sources. That would not leave out submerged volcanoes. We had Senator Brown in here before saying there were forests burning, and there is some	

				move globally to count even bushfires in the emissions scheme. Does the department have a very firm view of the global proportions? You probably have it somewhere, but you probably do not have it top of mind. Could you table that for us at some stage? Senator Wong—We can provide that. I do not know if this is helpful to you, but there are some quite good visual graphs which track a range of climate models against temperature and which, I think, really demonstrate how— Senator FIELDING—I am not interested in that. I am interested in the carbon emissions very specifically	
CC18	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p49	Senator ABETZ—It is still underway. That is the main thing. Thank you very much. Minister, I have two questions for you to finish off with, if I may. The <i>Australian</i> on 25 March 2009 suggested that Project Better Place, which is a business which Evan Thornley is associated with, had a meeting with you, or there had been discussions with you, regarding a launch of Better Place in Australia. Senator Wong—I will have to take that on notice. I have to say it is not ringing any very loud bells. Senator ABETZ—All right. It is on page 7 of the <i>Australian</i>, 25 March 2009: The meeting, attended by Better Place and government officials, noted “there have been discussions with Parliamentary Secretary Evan Thorney (sic), the Federal Minister for Climate Change, Minister Wong; regarding a launch(s) in Australia”. I want to know whether such a meeting took place and, if so, was Mr Thornley involved in that meeting et cetera? If it does not ring any bells, by all means take it on notice.	19/10/09
CC19	DCC	ABETZ	29/5 p49	Senator ABETZ—Minister, there is a website called 1millionwomen, in relation to climate change and carbon reduction. I understand the Australian government is a sponsor of it. Is that correct? Are you aware of the website? Senator Wong—I am aware of the website. I am aware of the project. I believe I have been told that there is some government sponsorship. I am not sure whether that is our department or others, but we can take that notice. Senator ABETZ—That is what I was going to ask. If it is not your department, would you, through departmental officers, be as kind as to tell us which department it is and how much the sponsorship is for?	
CC20a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	9/09/09
CC20b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	9/09/09
CC21a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC21b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC21c	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC21d	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC21e	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	

CC22a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	9/09/09
CC22b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	9/09/09
CC22c	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	9/09/09
CC23a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC23b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC23c	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC23d	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC24a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC24b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC25a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC25b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC26a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26c	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26d	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26e	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26f	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26g	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26h	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC26i	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC27a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC27b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC28a	ORER	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC28b	ORER	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC28c	ORER	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC28d	ORER	BIRMINGHAM	Written	See attached below	
CC29a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC29b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC29c	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC30a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC30b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC31a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC31b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	

CC32a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC32b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC32c	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC32d	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC33	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC34a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC34b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC35a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC35b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC35c	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC36	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC37a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC37b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC37c	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC38a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC38b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC39	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	
CC40a	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC40b	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC40c	DCC	BOSWELL	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC41a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41k	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41l	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41m	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	

CC41n	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41o	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC41p	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC42j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC43a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	21/09/09
CC43b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	21/09/09
CC43c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	21/09/09
CC44a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC44b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC44c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC44d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC45a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC45b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC45c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC45d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC46a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET

CC46j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46k	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46l	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46m	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46n	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC46o	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	Tfr to DRET
CC47a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC47b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC48a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC48b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC49g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC50a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC50b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC50c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC50d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC50e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC51a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC51b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC51c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC52	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC53a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC53b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	

CC53h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC53k	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54k	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54l	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54m	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54n	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54o	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54p	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54q	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54r	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54s	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54t	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC54u	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55h	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	

CC55i	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55j	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55k	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55l	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55m	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC55n	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC56a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56f	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC56g	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC57a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC57b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC57c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC57d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC57e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	19/10/09
CC58a	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC58b	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC58c	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC58d	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC58e	DCC	JOHNSTON	Written	See attached below	
CC59	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60a	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60b	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60c	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60d	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60e	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC60f	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC61	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC62	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC63	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	

CC64	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC65a	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC65b	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC65c	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC65d	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC65e	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66a	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66b	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66c	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66d	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66e	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66f	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66g	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC66h	DCC	CASH	Written	See attached below	
CC67a	DCC	BOYCE	Written	See attached below	
CC67b	DCC	BOYCE	Written	See attached below	
CC67c	DCC	BOYCE	Written	See attached below	
CC68	DCC	WILLIAMS	Tfr. from DAFF	What is being done to fully integrate fire into assessments of global climate change? Are there any global models?	
CC69	DCC	LUDLAM	Tfr. from DRET	Regarding the government's commitment to a 20% renewable energy target, a. What is the target of 20% benchmarked against? b. What is the most recent projection for how much electricity will be supplied in 2020? c. Will the target be automatically adjusted to match 20% of projected demand?	
CC70a	DCC	WILLIAMS	Tfr. from DEWHA	Will Australia continue to pursue an Emissions Trading Scheme if other major emitters do not agree to participate?	
CC70b	DCC	WILLIAMS	Tfr. from DEWHA	Does the Government believe the economic loss and job losses that will follow the introduction of the CPRS is worth the environmental benefit of the scheme?	
CC70c	DCC	WILLIAMS	Tfr. from DEWHA	What modelling shows this?	
CC71	DCC	WILLIAMS	Tfr. from DIISR	What assistance is being given to local government to prepare for climate change, particularly relating to their responsibilities and roles?	

CC72a	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Tfr. from DEWHA	Has a decision been made about who is to receive the Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) – i.e. will the value of these go to the school or to the State Government?	Tfr. back to DEWHA
CC72b	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Tfr. from DEWHA	What is the total value of these RECs, broken down by state?	Tfr. back to DEWHA
CC72c	DCC	BIRMINGHAM	Tfr. from DEWHA	What has been the attitude of the State Government authorities to the RECs? Have they been part of the bargaining process? Does this continue to be a source of dispute?	Tfr. back to DEWHA

Written Questions on Notice

CC20(a-b) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) What programs have been cut in this latest budget?
- b) Please provide a detailed list of the specific programs which have:
 - Been axed
 - Had their funding reduced by more than 10 per cent.

CC21(a-e) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) Please provide the names, salaries, titles and responsibilities of all staff in the Ministers' offices.
- b) Please indicate what their salaries were in October 2007 (or when they started) and what their salaries are now.
- c) Please identify which staff have government cars as part of their package. What model vehicles do they drive? What is the cost of the vehicle packages?
- d) Which staff are entitled to fly business class?
- e) What is the home base for each of the staff? If they are not located in the home base of the employing Minister/Parliamentary Secretary or Canberra, what is the reason?

CC22(a-c) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) In relation to both Departmental and Ministerial staff, please provide details of staff training activities undertaken by the Department of Climate Change this financial year, and planned for next financial year.
- b) Please provide a breakdown of costs, the nature of the training programs run, numbers of staff involved by level of employment and any instances of external consultants being engaged.
- c) Where external consultants were engaged, please detail their expertise and the specific deliverables of the program.

CC23(a-d) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) How many teleconferences have been held by the Ministers(/Parliamentary Secretary) with overseas events or conferences over the last year?
- b) What funding has been provided for such teleconferences?
- c) What plans does the government have to commence or increase the use of teleconferences by the Ministers?
- d) How much has been spent on teleconferences over the last year? How much is planned to be spent over the coming year?

CC24(a-b) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) Is the department cutting back on its graduate intake? If so, by how much and when, and how many graduate places are being cut? To what areas in the department would these positions have gone?
- b) Has a date been set for when the program will be re-established?

CC25(a-b) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) What is the Department's hospitality spend for 2008/09? Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
- b) For each Minister's office, please detail total hospitality spend for 2008-09. Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.

CC26(a-i) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) Have the Ministers(/Parliamentary Secretary) travelled overseas on official business in 2008-09?
- b) If so, where was the travel, what was the purpose and what was the duration?
- c) What was the total cost of:
 - a. travel
 - b. accommodation, and
 - c. any other expenses?
- d) How many Ministerial staff or family accompanied the Ministers(/Parliamentary Secretary)?
- e) For these staff (please outline their position)/family what was the cost of:
 - a. travel
 - b. accommodation, and
 - c. any other expenses?
- f) How many officers from the Department accompanied the Ministers(/Parliamentary Secretary)?
- g) In relation to these Departmental officers (please outline their position), what was the total cost of:
 - a. travel
 - b. accommodation, and
 - c. any other expenses?
- h) Were any costs or expenses, as covered above, met by private companies, unions or other organisations? If so, please provide details.
- i) Please detail total travel expenses met by the Department. In relation to all departmental travel expenses, please provide estimated resulting carbon emissions. Were any offsets purchased? If so, how many and at what cost?

CC27(a-b) (BIRMINGHAM)-DCC

- a) How have portfolio responsibilities been apportioned between the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary/Minister Assisting?
- b) What additional Departmental or MoPS Act staff have been provided to the Parliamentary Secretary/Minister Assisting? What are their salaries? What other costs are associated both with the appointment of the Parliamentary Secretary and with his subsequent appointment as Minister Assisting?

CC28(a-d) (BIRMINGHAM)-ORER

- a) What is the current market price for renewable energy certificates? If a person bought a solar PV system under the new Solar Credits program, would they receive that amount in pocket?
- b) What is the difference between the price paid to the solar supplier and what the householder gets in their pocket?
- c) Which figure did the Government use when it said that people buying a PV system would gain \$7,500? Is it misleading to use the figure paid to solar companies and not what the householder would actually receive in his or her pocket?
- d) When will the first application for, or granting of, Renewable Energy Certificates under the new household solar PV incentive system be accepted or made?

CC29(a-c) (BOSWELL)-DCC

On 8 May the Australian Coal Association released a report by ACIL Tasman showing that 16 coal mines will close and 10,000 coal jobs will be lost in the first 10 years of the ETS. On 22 May the Minerals Council released a report by Concept Economics showing twenty-three and a half thousand mining jobs will be lost by 2020 and sixty-six thousand by 2030 as a result of the ETS. Queensland workers will be the hardest hit with more than half of the job losses occurring in Queensland. The CFMEU and ACTU have sold out on their membership under the extremely

veiled claim that the jobs destroying ETS will deliver green jobs aplenty for Australian working families.

- a) Can the Minister please point me to evidence that shows retrenched mining workers in the regional mining areas of Queensland will be taken up in 'green jobs'?
- b) Can the Minister please explain to me what is a 'green job' and will these 'green jobs' pay equivalent wages to the mining jobs currently available in regional Queensland?
- c) Can the Minister guarantee that for every job sent offshore by the ETS a 'green job' will be created in its place?

CC30(a-b) (BOSWELL)-DCC

I refer to the Government's repeated claims that it has secured support for the passage of its CPRS legislation from industry, quoting specifically the AiGroup and the BCA.

- a) Last week, the Australian newspaper published an opinion article by Greg Gailey, President of the BCA, arguing that "*the [CPRS] legislation should not be approved until the scheme's design is resolved*", citing a significant number of outstanding issues and unresolved conflicts with the legislation. How can the Government stand before the Australian public declaring industry support for the passage of its flawed legislation, when one of the associations specifically mentioned clearly does not support it in its current form?
- b) Last week in a Senate Climate Policy Committee hearing I questioned a very reluctant Peter Burn from the AiGroup regarding his organisations support for the CPRS. I proposed to Mr Burn that the AiGroup position was that the CPRS legislation should go ahead as it is with Coalition support. He objected vehemently saying this was not his organisations position. I will read you an extract from that committee:

Senator BOSWELL—*The scheme is on the table. We are in the Senate; the scheme as it is now comes up and we are called to vote. The bells are ringing and all those who are for it go to one side and all those who are against it go to the other. Which side does the Ai Group want us to go—the ayes or the noes?*

Mr Burn—*The Ai Group will continue to talk to all members of parliament about developing improvements to the scheme. And just to answer your question: it would be foolish for us to reveal our bargaining position at this point publicly when we are in the process of ongoing discussions.*

I will read you another extract from that committee promulgated by your very own Senator Cameron:

Senator CAMERON—*Before I go to that, can I first of all turn to the Australian Industry Group and to Mr Burn. In your recent press release you said: "Ai Group supports the passage of the CPRS legislation this year including the elements of the package announced today." Is that still your position?*

Mr Burn—*That is part of the position, Senator. The other part that is relevant and I raise it because I raised it also in speaking to another question is that we will continue to seek changes on behalf of members.*

Has the Government received advice from the AiGroup that they support the passage of the CPRS legislation in its current form? And I ask again, how can the Government stand before the Australian public declaring industry support for the passage of its flawed legislation, when both of the associations specifically mentioned clearly do not support your scheme in its current form?

CC31(a-b) (BOSWELL)-DCC

I refer to the Government's propaganda document titled "*The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme and You*".

- a) On page 20 of the document you state "*that climate change may affect life in regional Australia more than in our cities*". Is the Government aware that the CPRS will affect life in regional areas more than in our cities?

- b) Also on page 20 of the document you state that “*following extensive consultation with industry, agriculture will enter the scheme in 2015 at the earliest*”. How can you say agriculture will not be included until 2015 when dairy and livestock farmers will face immediate income losses as a result of the inclusion of agricultural processing facilities from the schemes commencement?

CC32(a-d) (BOSWELL)-DCC

I refer to Part 8 of the *Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme Bill 2009* regarding the emissions-intensive, trade-exposed program. The stated aims and objects of the package are to “*recognise issues relating to the impact of the carbon pollution reduction scheme on the international competitiveness of activities that are identified as emissions-intensive trade-exposed activities*” and “*to reduce the incentives for such an activity to be located in, or re-located to, foreign countries*”.

- a) Can you please explain how the aims and objects of the bill fulfil Mr Rudd’s election promise to “ensure that Australia’s international competitiveness is not compromised by the introduction of emissions trading”? It seems to me that there is a fundamental distinction between ensuring something does not occur and reducing the incentives for something not to occur.
- b) A second plank of Mr Rudd’s election promise to trade exposed industry is that they would be consulted to ensure they are not disadvantaged. The CPRS bill is now before Parliament. Is the Government satisfied that consultation with industry has lead to the conclusion that their operations will not be disadvantaged? I refer to such trade exposed industries as coal, cement, aluminium, livestock, steel, LNG, dairy, paper, plastics and chemicals.
- c) The crucial details of the EITE program, including the list of eligible EITE activities, have been referred to regulations. The regulations have not been tabled. The Government claims the CPRS will bring about the biggest structural reform in Australia’s history. This is a big deal. Has there ever been precedence on such a gigantic reform where the Parliament has been asked to make a decision on the basis of a substantially incomplete legislative package?
- d) Why is emission intensity being used as a proxy for trade exposure? Is a business that does not meet the emissions intensity thresholds any more or any less trade exposed than those that do? And do they or do they not have the capacity to absorb the costs any more or any less than those businesses that do meet the thresholds?

CC33 (BOSWELL)-DCC

I refer to the Government’s propaganda document titled “The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme and You”. On page 20 of the document you state that “Agriculture and fisheries industries will also benefit from the new Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme Fuel Credit Payment for the first three years of the scheme. The amount of the Fuel Credit Payment will be equal to the fuel tax cuts provided to motorists.” Why has forestry been excluded from the Fuel Credit Payment given this industry, like agriculture and fishing, also support jobs in regional economies?

CC34(a-b) (BOSWELL)-DCC

What in your best estimate will be the price of renewable energy certificates for every year from 2010 to 2020?

- a) If you multiply the estimated price of the certificates by the annual target does this give you the total annual cost to the economy of subsidising renewable energy generation?
- b) What does this cost come to each year from 2010 to 2020?

CC35(a-c) (BOSWELL)-DCC

What kind of additions to Australia’s electricity distribution infrastructure will be needed to support the entry of large amounts of intermittent renewable energy to Australia’s electricity grids?

- a) What is the total estimated cost of this infrastructure?

- b) How are these additional infrastructure costs recovered?
- c) What is the estimated unit cost of this infrastructure in terms of a megawatt hour each year from 2010 to 2020?

CC36 (BOSWELL)-DCC

How many people will be required in the bureaucracy to administer the renewable energy target and other renewable energy policies?

CC37(a-c) (BOSWELL)-DCC

- a) What is the market failure that the 20 per cent renewable energy target seeks to address?
- b) Does the renewable energy target undermine the cost-effectiveness of the ETS in reducing greenhouse gas emissions?
- c) Has the cost effectiveness of the renewable energy target been investigated against its objectives through a regulatory impact statement?

CC38(a-b) (BOSWELL)-DCC

- a) Is it a true or is it a false claim that one megawatt hour of renewable energy generated from an intermittent source of renewable energy such as wind or solar will displace one megawatt hour of base load energy generated from coal or gas?
- b) Can you simply turn coal- or gas-fired generation up and down to compensate for changes in the wind?

CC39 (BOSWELL)-DCC

The Government has stated that electricity-intensive, trade exposed industries will be excluded from the renewable energy target. Does this mean that electricity consumed by these industries will be excised from the scheme or will other industries and households have to pick up the slack in paying for subsidised energy?

CC40(a-c) (BOSWELL)-DCC

- a) Has the Department had discussions with state government authorities regarding the pass-through of renewable energy generation and infrastructure costs to retail price tariffs?
- b) What will be the impact on wholesale and retail prices of the renewable energy target, including both the subsidised costs of generation and additional network infrastructure each year from 2010 to 2020?
- c) Can you please break these costs down for me as far as they go?

CC41(a-p) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

I refer to the climate change advertising campaign which had a budget of \$13.95 million. In answers to the last Estimates (F&PA 127 and 129) we were told that \$5,150,440.90 remained unspent. The official we received said that media placements worth \$15,447 for last October had been cancelled and that, quote: “the campaign objectives of raising awareness of the impacts of climate change and the CPRS so Australians could ‘have their say’ were unlikely to be enhanced by further advertising at that time”

- a) What do you mean when you say the adverts “were unlikely to be enhanced by further advertising at that time”?
- b) Was that a reflection that the advertising campaign was a flop?
- c) Does the department consider the advertising campaign was a raging success?

In a recently received Estimates answer, were told that an evaluation of the campaign had not been completed.

- d) Has it been completed?
- e) What did it find?
- f) Was it successful?

- g) Did it recommend the advertising be terminated?
- h) Or has the campaign been prematurely scrapped?
- i) Will it be revived?
- j) Has there been an analysis on the effectiveness or success of this campaign?
- k) If yes, please provide details
- l) Please provide a copy.

We were told that of the \$13.95 million budgeted for this media campaign, only \$8.8 million had been spent.

- m) What has happened to the rest of the money

In the same Estimates answers I referred to earlier, they revealed for the first time that the government had spent the following:

Costs incurred as of 31 March 2009 total \$8,800,559.13 (excluding GST), consisting of:

- a. Market research – \$148,935.00
- b. Creative agency fees and advertising production costs – \$476,144.59
- c. Website development costs – \$13,050.00
- d. Media buy – \$8,079,429.54
- e. Call Centre – \$83,000.00
- n) Have any of these figures changed since then?
- o) If so, why?
- p) Please provide full details

CC42(a-j) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

In relation to the \$83,000, referred to above (CC40, Additional Estimates 2008-09), for the call centre, we were told in the answers to the last Estimates which we recently received, that the call centre ran from 21 July to 31 October last year.

- a) Exactly how many days did the call centre operate last year?
- b) I am told that the call centre took 1616 calls. Do you know what the cost was per call? I am told that if you divide the \$83,000 by the 1616 calls received over that period, the cost is just over \$51 per call.
- c) How many people worked in the call centre?
- d) What hours was it open?
- e) Do you know how many calls the call centre took per hour?
- f) I am told that if you divide the 1616 calls by about 74 working days, that makes less than 22 calls a day. If they worked an eight hour day, that would make it less than one call every 20 minutes for the entire call centre, would it not?
- g) Has that total cost of the call centre changed?
- h) How does the department rate the success of this call centre?
- i) What assessment has been carried out in the effectiveness or otherwise of the call centre?
- j) Is the call centre being revised?

CC43(a-c) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

In relation to the \$149,000 spent on market research

- a) Who carried out the research?
- b) How were they selected?
- c) What did they conclude?

CC44(a-d) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

In relation to the \$8 million cost of placing the adverts,

- a) Please provide a breakdown on how this advertising was allocated
- b) How got the money and how much?
- c) How were the individual contracts determined?
- d) Were these contracts put out to tender?

CC45(a-d) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) What is the current market price for renewable energy certificates?
- b) If a person bought a solar PV system, would they receive that amount in pocket?
- c) What is the difference between the price paid to the solar supplier and what the householder gets in his pocket? In rough terms?
- d) Which figure did the Government use when it said that people buying a PV system would gain \$7,500? \$50 or the figure that consumers would receive?

CC46(a-o) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) I refer to the Budget announcement that it will build four new solar power stations.
- b) What do we know about where these will be built?
- c) When will they be built by?
- d) When must construction start?
- e) What tender process will be undertaken?
- f) Have any guidelines been prepared about where the stations must be built or who they should be built by?
- g) Will there be any restrictions on who can build these plants?
- h) Will they have to be Australian companies?
- i) If they are to be joint ventures, is there a maximum cap on the overseas investment?
- j) Will these be a Public Private Partnership?
- k) How much private money could be invested?
- l) Could these plants have private managers?
- m) Will only union-staff be allowed on site?
- n) Is there any contingency on the maximum cost?
- o) Ie – what if the Budget blows out to more than \$1.365 billion?

CC47(a-b) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) How many sitting days has the Minister missed from Parliament since coming to office because she was overseas at the time?
- b) Can you please detail how many days and where she was?

CC48(a-b) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) Now that the Garnaut process has been completed, can you please advise what the total cost of the Review was.
- b) Please provide a final break down of Professor Garnaut's salary, administration and associated costs.

CC49(a-g) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

You will recall that the Government spent \$18,000 to print the Garnaut Report on Italian paper. In a recent answer to an Estimates question (see answer CC21) we were told that another publication, the CPRS Green Paper was also printed on this special Italian recycled paper.

- a) How much did the government spend on that publication using this special Italian paper?
- b) How many copies were printed?
- c) Did you use the same paper for the CPRS White Paper?
- d) If not, why not?
- e) If yes, how many copies were printed?
- f) What was the cost?
- g) What other publications has the department had printed on this special Italian paper?

CC50(a-e) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) Has the department had cause to pulp any publications in the term of this government?

- b) If yes, what.
- c) Why?
- d) What was the cost?
- e) What was the cost of reprinting them?

CC51(a-c) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

In the answers to the last Estimates questions, numbers CC12 a-b and CC13 a-b we were advised that the total cost of consultants used by the department in 2007-08 was \$2.4 million – but in 2008-09 it was estimated to blow out three-fold to \$7.39 million.

- a) Do you stand by these figures?
- b) Why has this figure jumped so alarmingly?
- c) What is the extra money being spent on?

CC52 (JOHNSTON)-DCC

Please provide details of the Minister's travels during 2008-09, including:

- Purpose of the trip
- Which staff attended – and their position
- How many nights away
- Cost of the travel – broken down by
- Air fares
- Accommodation
- Other expenses.
- Were any costs by private companies, unions or other organisations?
- If so, please provide details

CC53(a-k) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) What hotel did the Minister stay at while in Paris?
- b) How many nights?
- c) What was the nightly rate?
- d) How many people joined her on this trip?
 - a. Please provide details
- e) Please provide total cost of the journey
- f) Did you offset the carbon emissions of this flight?
- g) If not, why not
- h) If yes, what was the cost?
- i) Have the Minister offset the carbon emissions of any of your flights?
- j) If so, please provide details of the costs and how much emissions were offset.
- k) If not, why not – please list all overseas flights plus approximate emissions assigned to your seat on the basis of the Dept Climate Change calculator.

CC54(a-u) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) Why does the legislation fail to take account of the use of natural carbon abatement measures such as soil carbon and biochar?
- b) What was that decision based on?
- c) If you are so convinced that we should be 'leading the world' on your emissions trading scheme, why not lead on the issue of soil carbon and biochar?

We note the Minister's announcement yesterday of a \$1.5 million research project into the merits of soil carbon initiatives.

- d) Given that experts like Ross Garnaut have long been talking up the benefits of soil carbon, why has it taken until now to proceed with this research?
- e) Why are you only now launching this investigation, AFTER the legislation has been introduced into Parliament

- f) Have you done no modelling at all before now? If so, what did it say?
- g) Is it the intention of the department to use this research to press ahead to have soil carbon included in the CPRS (as the Coalition has long argued)?

\$1.5 million seems like a rather modest sum, particularly given the potential importance of this work and the billions being spent elsewhere on things like solar

- h) Why is it going to take three years?
- i) Can you outline explain details of the proposed research
- j) Does that signal that the Government won't consider incorporating soil carbon for years and years to come?
- k) Are you ruling out the Copenhagen talks adopting it this year?
- l) If so, what does this mean for your research
- m) And would you then recommend that soil carbon be incorporated into the CPRS?
- n) Does the department support the use of soil carbon being incorporated into the CPRS?
- o) Has it made urged the government to adopt this measure?
- p) Has it written to the UN or any other body supporting its adoption?
- q) If so, why wasn't it in this proposed legislation?
- r) What advice has the CSIRO provided so far on the use of soil carbon in the CPRS?
- s) Has the CSIRO supported it?
- t) Did it agree with the Department of Climate Change?
- u) If not, why not? Can you outline your differences?

CC55(a-n) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

I want to explore why the CPRS still doesn't take account of the abatement benefits of waste coal mine gas. (Background note: Questions below will refer to Qld company, Envirogen which owns four of the eight waste coal mine gas power stations currently operating in Australia.). The waste coal mine gas sector – including companies like Envirogen – are telling us that this bill unfairly penalises their industry

- a) They consider themselves a form of renewable energy – would you agree with this definition?
- b) If not, why not? What would you call them?
- c) We are told that unless this sector is able to be not penalised by the CPRS, they may simply burn, or flare, the gas. We are told this would result in some 85 million tonnes of CO2 being released into the atmosphere each year. How is that a good outcome for the environment?
- d) How many tonnes of CO2 be saved from one of the new solar stations you say you will construct?
- e) What is the point of spending billions on new solar stations if you are going to drive up 85 million tonnes of emissions elsewhere because a particular sector was left out of this proposed legislation?
- f) Before drawing up this bill, did the department meet with officials meet with officials from the Queensland based company, Envirogen?
- g) Did you hold discussions with the company's chairman and former Queensland Labor Government Treasurer, David Hamill?
- h) Did you take account his comments, such as when he said: "It would mean Australia would lose a valuable source of energy and put our industry at severe risk of an immediate shutdown."
- i) Are you not taking these warnings seriously? Are you ignoring them?
- j) Given these warnings, did the department recommend to the government that this sector not be punished by the CPRS?
- k) If so, did the Minister refuse to accept this advice?
- l) I would like to compare the situation with the government's recent back-down in relation to emissions from existing landfill sites. How is the situation different from that of the waste coal mine gas sector?

- m) If you go down the path of supporting the landfill gas sector, why won't you also support the waste coal mine gas sector?
- n) Isn't there a contradiction here?

CC56(a-g) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

- a) Does the department agree that no amount of voluntary action by people to reduce their emissions, such as through installing solar panels, which actually reduce the government's 2020 cap?
- b) While it may reduce individual emissions, won't individual actions simply free up permits for other emitters to trade or pollute?
- c) How much will the solar energy or carbon capture plants, promised in the recent Budget, actually work to bring down the 2020 cap?
- d) Will it do anything before 2020?
- e) What figure has been put on how much these plants will save, in terms of emissions?
- f) What will happen to the spare capacity in the cap, that these plants deliver?
- g) Dr Richard Dennis has been a critic of the CPRS, arguing that: "When emissions trading comes in, every tonne of carbon dioxide saved by households will simply free up a tonne that can be used by industry. Installing solar hot water systems, driving smaller cars and turning off the lights will not help the environment one bit. The only effect reductions in household energy use will have is to free up pollution permits for the big polluting industries." (Media statement 25 November 2008.) Given the flaws identified by Dr Dennis, how does voluntary action, let alone the new solar power stations, actually help to reduce Australia's 2020 cap under this proposed legislation?

CC57(a-e) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

The Finance Minister, Mr Tanner, recently talked up the government's plans to cut travel costs by carrying out more tele-conferencing.

- a) How many teleconferences have been held by the Minister with overseas events or conferences over the last year?
- b) What funding has been provided for such teleconferences?
- c) What plans does the government have to commence or increase the use of teleconferences by the Minister?
- d) What much has been spent on teleconferences over the last year?
- e) How much is planned to be spent over the coming year?

CC58(a-e) (JOHNSTON)-DCC

We've heard that the Government is axing graduate entry programs in other portfolios.

- a) Is the department cutting back on its graduate intake?
- b) If so, by how much and when?
- c) How many graduate places being cut?
- d) What areas in these department would these positions gone to?
- e) Has a date been set for when the program will be re-established?

CC59 (CASH)-DCC

Is it the case that Treasury modelling for the Government found the ETS would have only a small net effect on total employment over a decade.

On what basis was that finding made?

CC60(a-f) (CASH)-DCC

- a) Minister are you aware of a recent study - prepared for the Minerals Council of Australia by former Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics head Mr Brian Fisher – which quantifies the Government's proposed scheme impact on the mining sector, and

- predicts the mining industry will shed 23,510 jobs by 2020 under the Government's minimum unilateral target of reducing emissions by 5 per cent of 2000 levels.
- b) Minister are you aware that the same study predicts that over the next two decades total job losses from mining would almost treble to 66,480 by 2030.
 - c) Minister are you aware that the modelling in the Fisher study broadly supports a recent ACIL Tasman study commissioned by the coal industry, which predicted 16 mine closures and 10,000 job losses by 2020?
 - d) How do you reconcile Treasury's modelling that suggests that the ETS would have only a small net effect on total employment over a decade and the findings of the study prepared by the Minerals Council of Australia.
 - e) How do you justify destroying our mining industry, which is a key generator of Australian wealth, by adding an extra \$10 billion of costs in the first five years, a cost other international competitors don't have.
 - f) Will you explain how the destruction of the Australian mining industry help Australia recover from the global recession?

CC61 (CASH)-DCC

The White Paper states that since the majority of coal mines are not emissions intensive, the Government will not provide EITE assistance to the activity of coal mining. It bases this on the assertion that the vast majority of coal production comes from mines that are significantly below the EITE eligibility threshold of 1000 tonnes CO2 equivalent per million dollars of revenue. This is at odds with the results of the ACIL Tasman report commissioned by the Australian Coal Association which says that in fact 57% of mines are above this threshold. The ACIL Tasman report is based on data from a survey covering 86% of Australian coal production. What is the Government's assessment based on? Where did this data come from?

CC62 (CASH)-DCC

The White Paper states that only a small number of coal mines are very emissions intensive and will face significant cost impact from the Scheme. The White Paper then allocates a \$500 million Coal Mining Transitional Assistance Fund to assist with transitional issues for gassy coal mines. How many mines will be sharing in this \$500 million fund? How was it calculated that this amount was adequate?

CC63 (CASH)-DCC

The Government continues to maintain that there will be employment growth in all major employment sectors in the years ahead even with the introduction of the CPRS. Both the ACIL Tasman report and the Concept Economics report commissioned by the Minerals Council of Australia concluded that introduction of the CPRS in its current form will result in 10,000 fewer people employed directly and indirectly in the coal industry in the first 10 years of the Scheme. How does the Government reconcile this huge difference in modelling outcomes?

CC64 (CASH)-DCC

The Treasury modelling lacked detail on how regional areas would be impacted by the CPRS. The Concept Economics Report however found that 1950 direct jobs would be lost by 2020 in Central Queensland alone. How does the Government expect coal miners in regional areas to fund jobs?

CC65(a-g) (CASH)-DCC

- a) What is the current status of the Greenhouse Gas Abatement Scheme (GGAS) transition process at present?
- b) How do discussions stand between the Commonwealth and the relevant states?

- c) How will any transitional issues be managed in terms of their synchronisation with the CPRS legislation that is, if there is financial support required will it be agreed before, or with the CPRS coming into effect?
- d) There is some concern that the Department of Climate Change has not adequately engaged with the waste methane sector and indeed that early movers who invested in good faith under the NSW GGAS regime will be effectively penalised by the CPRS without appropriate transition arrangements. What is the Government's response to this? Why has the Department not engaged the waste methane sector?
- e) Why is the Government not protecting and promoting the significant abatement of waste coal mine gas (WCMG), particularly when the private sector has established an industry generating hundreds of jobs in Australia and indeed offshore and delivering significant current abatement?
- f) What is the Department's attitude to the potential inclusion of WCMG in the RET as occurs in several jurisdictions overseas?
- g) What is the justification for excluding a non-emission, base load source of energy generation from the RET, particularly when countries such as Germany and France allow it under their RET equivalents? Is there not a danger that countries like China, Brazil and India will be able to include this source under RET equivalent, thereby creating tradeable credits which can be sold into Australia, but our own domestic industry won't be able to create similar credits? By definition does not this simply mean you will be exporting green jobs and investment despite the Government's claims to the contrary?

CC66(a-h) (CASH)-DCC

- a) Did Treasury modelling use the same competitive spot market assumptions made for the Eastern States Electricity Market in its assessment of the need for ESAS assistance in Western Australia.
- b) Has Griffin Energy raised with either the Minister or the Department that there is a historic price competition between gas and black coal in the Western Electricity Market and state that WA's long term security of supply will likely be compromised by the current CPRS settings?
- c) Has Griffin Energy raised with either the Minister or the Department that in the selling model the price of electricity is locked in for the length of contracts and there is no capacity in the Western Electricity Market to pass through to consumers the increasing price of carbon which the generators will bear over 15 years. By contrast in the National Electricity Market Model, based on competitive spot prices, the additional cost of carbon over 15 years will be passed through via the market clearing price.
- d) Has Griffin Energy put forward a solution to this problem?
- e) If so, what was this solution?
- f) Given the fact that the Western Electricity Market will be based increasingly on gas and renewable energy while the Eastern Market will remain coal based, what changes have been made to the proposed CPRS legislation to recognise the different circumstances apply in WA to ensure that discrimination does not occur?
- g) Does the Government have any strategy to address this issue? If so, what? If not, why not?
- h) Will the long term energy security in Western Australia be negatively impacted if the Government's legislation is passed?

CC67(a-c) (BOYCE)-DCC/ORER

- a) How many people with a disability were employed full-time and how many part-time? What classifications were these staff employed under?
- b) What percentage of staff in the Department had a disability at March 30, 2008 and March 30, 2009?

- c) What programs does the Department have to encourage the employment of people with a disability?