

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 2

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division

Topic: Social media policy

Proof Hansard page: 8/9

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: Going back to the additional estimates in February, there has been no progress on that at all? You said in answer to question 234 that additional staff members at ABARES's Corporate Communications Branch have been given access to support the outlook conference in March. Have there been any further changes to that protocol?

Ms Freeman: I beg your pardon, Senator. I did not quite understand your question.

Senator COLBECK: I am going to the question on notice No. 234, which deals with access to social online media. Question 2 of that question asks, 'Have there been any changes to the staff who are permitted access to social media?' Your answer to that, at that stage, was, 'Yes'. That related to some people from ABARES and Corporate Communications Branch to support the outlook conference. I am just asking: have there been any further changes to access?

Ms Freeman: I would have to refer to my IT colleagues on the specifics of access for individual staff members, but, as was answered in question 234, the use of social media for those specific things—for example, the ABARES outlook conference and the Plague Locust Commission—was there and active. But I will hand over to my colleague Mr Gathercole.

Mr Gathercole: Access to social media is permitted within the department upon request. When an executive manager requests access for their staff it is given.

Senator COLBECK: How does that comply with the draft social media policy?

Mr Gathercole: I believe it complies with it.

Senator COLBECK: What is the time line for finalising that? It is obviously not an urgent issue.

Ms Freeman: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The department expects to have its social media policy finalised this calendar year.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 7

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division

Topic: Hospitality

Proof Hansard page: 16

Senator MACDONALD asked:

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Again on notice, can I get an update on the hospitality spend of the minister's and parliamentary secretary's offices and any departmental hospitality related to the minister or the parliamentary secretary.

Dr O'Connell: I think we can do that now, if you like.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Perhaps you can answer all of these questions at once. Was there a hospitality spend in relation to the New Zealand apple import protocols and the impact risk analysis? I understand that you hosted New Zealanders or spent some time in New Zealand. I am particularly interested in what hospitality went into the decisions in relation to that.

Ms Freeman: I can comment in relation to hospitality spend for the minister and parliamentary secretary. In relation to that specific event, I might have to take that on notice.

Dr O'Connell: Our understanding, and we can confirm it, is that there was not any hospitality spend on that.

Answer:

From the Budget Estimates hearing on 23-24 May 2011 to 30 September 2011 the hospitality spend for the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Senator the Hon. Joe Ludwig is \$1225.00. There has been no hospitality spend incurred for the Parliamentary Secretary for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, the Hon. Dr Mike Kelly AM MP. The hospitality spend by the department does not include hospitality for the minister or parliamentary secretary.

The department has no record of hospitality spend by the minister, parliamentary secretary or the department in relation to New Zealand apple import protocols and the import risk analysis.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 16

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division
Topic: Freedom of Information – live animal exports
Proof Hansard page: 22

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: Let's go to something specific within the documents. We are talking about document 05806, minister's comments. That is a document whose critical date was 6 June. It was signed by the minister on 10 June. The minister's comments are redacted and, according to the documents here, are not relevant. How are the minister's comments in relation to this matter not relevant?

Senator HEFFERNAN: He didn't want to get the sack.

Mr Withers: They were not relevant as in they were not relevant to the scope of the request.

Senator ABETZ: Minister, are you able to tell us what was part of that which was obliterated, given that there is no legal reason why it cannot be made available?

Senator Ludwig: I will take that on notice and have a look at what I said.

Answer:

The 'minister's comments' in the minute (MNMT2011-05806) were redacted under s22 of the FOI Act because they were outside the scope of the request.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 143

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division

Topic: Communication programs

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. Two communications programs undertaken by the department were the Australia's Farming Future (AFF), which incorporates the Carbon Farming Initiative (CFI) and the Western Australian Drought Program (QON 188 May 2011). Provide details of the spend for these communications programs by electorate.
2. How was this break up of expenditure determined?
3. The reason for the underspend of \$7.6 million in the Australia's Farming Future – Climate Change area (QON 176 May 2011) is stated as "demand driven program dependant on uptake". Specifically how was this component of the AFF program communicated to producers?
4. Where were advertisements placed, how frequently and over what time frame?
5. What assessment has been undertaken into the efficacy of communication with producers?
6. What analysis has been undertaken to determine why demand for funding through the Climate Change program did not meet budget allocations?
7. With regard to promoting Biosecurity Quarantine Operation through *Shipping News*, how does the \$33,481 paid for 4 pages of advertising and a presence on a "subscribers only" website equate in terms of value for money compared with other advertising and promotions options?
8. How was *Shipping News* selected as the most appropriate publication for the Biosecurity Quarantine Operation?
9. What is the policy for deciding where to place advertisements and how is the value proposition assessed?

Answer:

- 1-2. Details of the spend for these communications programs by electorate are not available and the communications programs were not allocated based on electorate boundaries.
3. Changes to the Climate Change Adjustment Program Advice and Training Grant and the Transitional Income Support program were communicated through:
 - letters and phone calls from Centrelink to recipients in Exceptional Circumstances declared areas that were due to expire
 - the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) and Centrelink websites
 - the Rural Financial Counselling Service's network.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 143 (continued)

4. No advertisements were placed for the Climate Change Adjustment Program or Transitional Income Support program.

A total of 101 press advertisements for the Western Australian Drought Pilot were placed between 1 July 2010 and 2 July 2011, with mixed frequencies in the following publications:

Albany & Great Southern Weekender	Donnybrook Bridgetown Mail	Mandurah Coastal Times
Augusta Margaret River Mail	Esperance Express	Manjimup Bridgetown Times
Australian	Farm Weekly	Merredin Wheat Belt Mercury
Avon Valley Advocate	Geraldton Guardian	Narrogin Observer
Broome Advertiser	Geraldton Mid West Times	North Coast Times
Bullsbrook, Bindoon & Gingin Advocate	Great Southern Herald	Northern Guardian Carnarvon
Bunbury Mail	Harvey Reporter	Pilbara News
Busselton Dunsborough Mail	Hills Gazette	Port Hedland North West Telegraph
Central Midlands & Coastal Advocate	Kalgoorlie Miner	Wagin Argus
Collie Mail	Kimberly Echo	West Australian
Countryman		

5. No assessment has been made of the communication efficacy of the Western Australian Drought Pilot. The Drought Pilot has been assessed and the results of the review have been released.

Australia's Farming Future is an ongoing program and communication continues.

6. Post-program surveys are not proposed for these measures.
7. The *Shipping Australia* magazine is the publication of the peak industry body Shipping Australia. Its members are key stakeholders in the shipping industry and so the magazine provides a unique channel to communicate with a significant proportion of the target audience.
8. The *Shipping Australia* magazine was selected as providing the best value for money in communicating with key stakeholders in the shipping industry.
9. Placements are determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the objective of the communication and the target audience.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 144

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division

Topic: Board appointments

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. What strategies are in place to increase the proportion of women on Government appointed Boards and Councils, particularly Boards such as FRDC, Recreational Fishing Advisory Council, Forest Industries Development Fund Advisory Committee, Wine Australia Corporation Selection Committee and Grains Research and Development Corporation Selection Committee?
2. What are the selection criteria for Government appointed Boards and Councils?
3. What consideration has there been of the principles for sound and effective Board performance as outlined by the Australian Institute of Company Directors and the *ASXCGC Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations*

Answer:

1. The department considers the government's 40 per cent gender balance target when facilitating appointments to portfolio bodies, including boards and councils. This includes the Boards mentioned.
2. The government-appointed bodies are skills-based. The requirements vary depending on the legislation under which the appointment is made.
3. Portfolio government bodies are governed by enabling legislation, relevant subordinate legislation and the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997* (CAC Act). Individual boards, within these constraints are able to adopt management practises that reflect external advice on board performance.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2011
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 145

Division/Agency: CPD – Corporate Policy Division

Topic: Release of additional estimates briefing

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

In response to QON 200, May 2011, the government advised it took 708.25 hours to create a redacted version of the Incoming Government Brief. The request to provide a redacted version of the briefing material provided for the Minister for Additional Estimates was estimated to take 200 hours and was rejected as an unreasonable diversion of resources for the department.

1. Please provide details of how such requests are assessed and how 200 hours is considered unreasonable while 708.25 hours is not.

Answer:

1. The time taken to provide redacted estimates briefs would vary for each estimates depending on the number of briefs prepared. For example it is estimated that it would take 294.81 hours to redact the briefs for Supplementary Budget Estimates. This is considered an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.