

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 01

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Staff attendance at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference

Hansard Page: 45 (08/02/10)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—To follow up from Senator Nash's questions about attendance at the Copenhagen conference, judging by the questions you have already answered, the two officers attended for the first week. Is that correct?

Mr Gibbs—I do not have the exact dates, but it was approximately for the first week of the two weeks.

Senator COLBECK—Would you confirm the dates of their travel and what events they attended while they were at the conference?

Mr Gibbs—Yes.

Answer:

Mr French arrived in Copenhagen on Sunday 6 December 2009 and departed Copenhagen for Canberra on Friday 11 December 2009. Mr Ruscoe also arrived in Copenhagen on Sunday 6 December 2009 and attended the first six days of the conference. Mr Ruscoe departed Copenhagen in Sunday 13 December 2009.

Refer to response to CC 18.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 02

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Staff attendance at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference

Hansard Page: 46 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Thanks. And were there any events or meetings that they attended on their way to or from the conference? Have any feedback or reports been provided by the representatives on their return?

Mr Gibbs—As I explained to Senator Nash, I have had some briefings with the officers involved, verbal and written.

Senator COLBECK—There is nothing that you can provide to the committee from that process?

Mr Gibbs—I think I would have to take that on notice.

Mr Talbot—I would have to take that on notice too.

Answer:

Mr French travelled directly between Canberra and Copenhagen for the sole purpose of attending the UNFCCC conference.

In addition to attending the first six days of the UNFCCC conference, on Sunday 13 December 2009 Mr Ruscoe attended the third *Centre for International Forestry Research* Forestry Day in Copenhagen. This was a conference and workshop discussing the global agenda for forests and climate change. Later this day Mr Ruscoe travelled to Jonköping, Sweden.

On 14 and 15 December 2009 Mr Ruscoe met with representatives of the Swedish Forest Agency to discuss forest management, including similarities and differences in strategies for forest adaptation to climate change. On 15 December 2009 Mr Ruscoe travelled to Stockholm. On 16 December 2009 Mr Ruscoe met with a representative of the state owned company Sveaskog, Sweden's largest forest owner, to discuss their understanding and preparedness for forest management under a changing climate. Mr Ruscoe departed for Canberra on 16 December 2009.

Briefing material was provided to the DAFF senior executive through the Australian delegation in Copenhagen. DAFF officers provided verbal briefings on their return.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 03

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Outcomes from the Copenhagen Conference on carbon stored in wood products

Hansard Page: 46 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—But what about outcomes of particular programs? If I go to forestry in particular, what is the situation with respect to carbon stored in solid timber products, for example?

Dr O'Connell—There is certainly—

Senator COLBECK—There are a range of things that I would have expected must have been progressed. Where we at with those particularly vital things?

Dr O'Connell—We can certainly provide that in consultation with the climate change department. I think we are talking more about the specific issues relating to a report by those two officers back to their branch heads, which may go more towards the nature of negotiations.

Answer:

Carbon stored in harvested wood products is not currently recognised under the international accounting rules for the Kyoto Protocol.

Two proposals for including the carbon stored in harvested wood products were being negotiated in the international negotiations leading up to the Copenhagen conference but no agreement on this issue was reached at Copenhagen. It is expected that this issue will continue to be negotiated during the meetings in 2010, prior to the next United Nations Convention on Climate Change Conference in Mexico at the end of 2010.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 04

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Staff attendance at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference

Hansard Page: 47 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Just in respect of the actual costs for the representatives, could you give us—and I understand this will have to be taken on notice—

Dr O’Connell—Certainly.

Senator COLBECK—the cost for the delegation broken down by hotel accommodation, airfares, events, food, alcohol and miscellaneous? I suppose that covers off on that.

Answer:

Name	Airfare	Accommodation	Travel allowance*	Total
Simon French	\$6,829	\$2,500 (estimate)	\$1,321	\$10,650
Ian Ruscoe	\$10,039	\$3,500 (estimate)	\$1,502	\$15,041

* Travel allowance includes meal allowances and incidental expenses. Officers do not get an alcohol allowance. Travel allowance is calculated by the department’s overseas travel area based on rates for each country.

The accommodation costs are listed as estimates as the Department of Climate Change has not yet invoiced DAFF for these costs.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 05

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Staff attendance at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference

Hansard Page: 47 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator NASH—All right. Thanks. One flew business and one did not. Just within the department in general, Dr O'Connell, could you give us some guidance as to what the protocols are around the level of flying?

Dr O'Connell—Normally, on a long-haul flight of that nature, it would be business class, yes.

Senator NASH—So why did one fly economy? Do we know?

Dr O'Connell—I suspect it was very crowded going to—

Senator NASH—No room at the inn.

Dr O'Connell—Availability.

Senator NASH—Okay. If you could take that on notice and come back, that would be good. Did they toss a coin? Sorry. Could you just come back and take that on notice as to the protocols around it and the reasons why. Thank you. Sorry, Senator Colbeck.

Answer:

Both DAFF officials travelled Business class to and from the Copenhagen conference in line with departmental policy governing long distance international travel and as documented in Chief Executive's Instructions (CEI) No.1b.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC06

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Soil Carbon Research Program

Hansard Page: 52-53 (08/02/2010)

Senator Milne asked:

Senator MILNE—How many samples have been taken to date across the country?

Mr Gibbs—I do not have the exact figure with me now, but if you would like I could come back to you on that question.

Senator MILNE—I would like to know how many samples have been taken and the breakdown of those states in which they have been taken. If that is the first lot of samples that comes in by the middle of this year that will have been analysed, presumably that will be your baseline? What will be the parameters of the research framework? How many samples need to be taken before you determine what will be your baseline, and where do we go from here with it?

Answer:

1. Breakdown of samples by state, to date:

	Sites numbers	Sample numbers
Tasmania	8	24
New South Wales	87	261
Victoria	16	48
South Australia	60	180
Western Australia	100	300
Queensland	40	120
Total	211	933

Typically, soil samples are taken to three depths (10cm, 20cm and 30 cm) resulting in three 'samples' sent from each site for analysis in the CSIRO laboratories.

In addition to this, samples have been taken from 300 points in two different perennial pasture systems in WA at the three depths (1800 samples). Analysis of 750 samples from Gippsland, VIC., collected by a Caring for our Country project, has also commenced.

Total samples currently available for analysis = 3,483.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC06 (continued)

2. The program is assessing soil carbon values under defined management practices. Samples collected will be used to provide soil carbon baseline data against farm management practice on a regional basis. Regions are sampled based on the availability of sites with a detailed history of land management practice. All samples from a given region will be collected and analysed together.

The data produced by the Soil Carbon Research Program will address the following:

- soil carbon stocks by region
- which farm management practices lead to improved soil carbon.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 07

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Climate Change Research Program

Hansard Page: 57 (08/02/2010)

Senator Milne asked:

Senator MILNE—That is fine. In terms of the large-scale research projects with cross-sectoral application, there were meant to be a minimum of 12 projects this year. Can you please tell me what those projects are?

Mr Mortimer—Are you talking about the Climate Change Research Program here?

Senator MILNE—Yes.

Mr Gibbs—We have exceeded that number. For example, under the livestock program there are at least 18 projects. I can get a final number for you of the number of projects across the whole program, if you like.

Senator MILNE—I would like to know the number of projects that you are funding under the Climate Change Research Program and what they are actually for. Are they all in livestock?

Answer:

The Climate Change Research Program has funded 47 projects. The projects have been funded across five program areas: the Reducing Emissions from Livestock Research Program; Nitrous Oxide Research Program; Adaptation Research Program; Soil Carbon Research Program; and the Biochar Research Program.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 07 (continued)

Breakdown of projects under the Climate Change Research Program (CCRP)

Research Program	Projects
Reducing Emission From Livestock Research Program (13 projects)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National strategies and coordination 2. Genetic improvement of beef cattle for greenhouse gas outcomes 3. Breeding low methane emitting sheep and elucidating the underlying biology 4. Archaeophage therapy to control rumen methanogens 5. Novel strategies for enteric methane abatement 6. Use of peptide-phage display libraries to discover peptides that are bioactive against rumen methanogens 7. Understanding the mechanisms behind the anti-methanogenic bioactivity of Australian plants targeted for grazing systems 8. Reducing methane emissions by supplementing feed with dietary lipids 9. Manure management to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cattle feedlots 10. Mitigation of methane emissions from the northern Australian beef herd 11. Enteric methane abatement strategies for ruminant production systems in SE Australia 12. Demonstration projects for on-farm practical methane management strategies 13. Information integration and delivery.
Soil Carbon Research Program (9 projects)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soil carbon research program overarching project 2. South eastern SA cereals, sheep and beef systems and Australia wide perennial sheep pastures 3. South west Western Australia: Cereal, sheep and beef systems 4. Victorian dairy, sheep, cereal and beef systems 5. Northern rangelands beef systems 6. Queensland cereals and sugar 7. New South Wales cereals, cotton, sheep and beef systems 8. New South Wales cereals and beef 9. Tasmanian vegetables and dairy systems
Nitrous Oxide Research Program (9 projects)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nitrous oxide research program coordination 2. Integrated data and synthesis framework for reducing nitrous oxide emissions from Australian agricultural soils 3. Reducing nitrous oxide emissions from sugarcane lands 4. Decreasing nitrous oxide emissions in high rainfall legume/wheat cropping systems 5. Fertiliser management strategies for decreasing on-farm greenhouse gas emissions 6. The potential of inhibitors for the mitigation of nitrous oxide emissions from animal production systems, in south-eastern Australia

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Enhanced efficiency fertilisers as mitigation tools for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from intensive agricultural systems in Australia 8. Irrigated cotton and grain cropping systems 9. Mitigating nitrous oxide emissions from soils using pulses and improved nitrogen management.
<p>Biochar Research Program (5 projects)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyses of stocks of source material, the effect of production techniques and production conditions on properties of the resultant biochar and production of bioenergy and potential toxic substances 2. Carbon sequestration potential of biochar in different soils 3. Life cycle assessment of greenhouse gas mitigation benefits of biochar 4. Assessing impacts of biochar on greenhouse gas flux from agricultural soils 5. Risk assessment: biochar toxicity, biochar application rates and reduced efficacy of pesticide application to soils.
<p>Adaptation Research Program (11 projects)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A national research program for climate-ready cereals 2. Adaptation of a range of wheat types to elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration 3. Developing climate change resilient cropping and mixed cropping/grazing businesses in Australia 4. Relocation of intensive crop production systems to northern Australia: Costs and opportunities 5. Agriculture transforming to adapt to climate change: The peanut industry expansion in the NT as a blueprint 6. Development of effective management strategies to adapt production to mitigate climate change challenges in the wine industry 7. Developing improved on-ground practices and industry strategies for adapting to climate change within beef production enterprises across northern Australia 8. Climate change adaptation in the southern Australian livestock industries 9. Reducing the impact of heat stress on animal performance and welfare in southern Australia dairy, beef and sheep industries 10. Adaptation of fishing and aquaculture sectors and fisheries management to climate change in south eastern Australia—a national case study 11. Consistent climate scenarios
<p>Total number of projects funded by CCRP</p>	<p>47</p>

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 08

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Exceptional Circumstances

Hansard Page: 58-59 (08/02/2010)

Senator Macdonald asked:

Senator IAN MACDONALD—When did it go from your minister to the Prime Minister?

Mr Mortimer—I do not have that information with me.

Dr O'Connell—We will take that on notice.

...

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Can you tell me when he dealt with it?

Dr O'Connell—We have to take on notice any steps beyond that point, just to clarify the timings.

Answer:

The Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry announced on 10 February 2010 that EC assistance would be made available to eligible recipients in Queensland's Gulf region until 15 June 2011.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 09

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Summary of the types of projects under the Forest Industries Development Fund

Hansard Page: 61 (08/02/2010)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Senator O'BRIEN—I want to ask about the Forest Industries Development Fund and find out if any projects have been funded. Can you give us a summary of the types of projects that have been funded under that program?

Mr Talbot—There have been two rounds of the Forest Industries Development Fund. In the first round, eight projects were funded to a total of \$3.6 million. In the second round, 14 projects were short-listed and contracts are being negotiated at the moment. Due to the Christmas-New Year break—they were approved just before Christmas—the potential applicants have been given until mid-February to decide whether they take up the projects.

Senator O'BRIEN—So there are 14 contracts out there waiting to be signed, there?

Mr Talbot—That is correct, Senator.

Senator O'BRIEN—And of the projects approved, how would you describe them?

Mr Talbot—Senator, there was a broad range of projects. It is probably better if I take that on notice and try to put it in writing to you because they were quite broad in terms of their outlook.

Answer:

Projects supported by the Forest Industries Development Fund seek to improve international competitiveness, and lead to employment growth and retention to ensure the long-term economic viability of the industry through increased investment in measures designed to add value to the forest resource. Wood products processing companies have been targeted in the design of the program.

The attached table contains names of successful grantees from round one and round two with executed deeds as of 1 March 2010, as well as company locations and the purpose and amount of the grant.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 09 (continued)

Recipient	Grant Funding Location	Purpose	Value (GST inclusive)
Big River Group Pty Ltd	Grafton NSW 2460	Ausply Upgrade	\$550 000
Kempsey Timbers (Sawmilling) Pty Ltd	West Kempsey NSW 2440	New Timber Processing Facility	\$316 800
Allied Timber Products Pty Ltd	Burpengary QLD 4505	Bathurst Development - Stage 3	\$504 900
Associated Kiln Driers Pty Ltd	Colac VIC 3250	Optimisation of lower grade radiata pine using x-ray scanning in conjunction with acoustic measuring in a high speed commercial application	\$550 000
Forest Enterprises Australia Ltd	Bell Bay Tas 7253	Purchase and install a new hardwood and softwood grading system to increase timber recovery and optimise the return of high value timber products	\$550 000
Colonial Timber Products Pty. Ltd.	Brendale QLD 4500	Component Prefabrication Wall Frame Manufacturing Line	\$283,499.70
Carter Holt Harvey Woodproducts Australia	Chatswood NSW 2067	Affordable indigenous housing - building affordable homes with wood	\$146 703
Forrest Timber Products Pty Ltd	Birregurra Victoria 3245	New Value Adding Timber Processing System	\$550 000
de Bruin Group	Mount Gambier SA 5290	Wood Biomass Baler	\$465 300
Itreat Timber Pty Ltd	Narangba Qld 4504	Highly Specialised Timber Treatment Plant Installation	\$495 000
Colenden Pty Ltd t/as Pilks Pine	Lowanna NSW 2450	Value Adding Upgrade	\$330 000

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Recipient	Grant Funding Location	Purpose	Value (GST inclusive)
Kempsey Timbers (Sawmilling) Pty Ltd incorporating Kempsey Timbers t/as Australian Solar Timbers	Kempsey NSW 2440	New End-Matching System for Strip Flooring Line	\$198 000
Wespine Industries Pty Ltd	Dardanup WA 6236	Application of Advanced Automated Grading Technology to Sawn Structural Softwood	\$269 500
Port Lincoln Aboriginal Community Council Inc.	Port Lincoln SA 5606	Vanilla Forest Development Project	\$110 000
PACPine Pty Ltd	Burruga NSW 2795	Steam Piston Generator	\$33 000
Kempsey Timbers (Sawmilling) Pty Ltd incorporating Kempsey Timbers t/as Australian Solar Timbers	Kempsey NSW 2440	New 3D Scanning System for Strip Flooring Line	\$412 500
Associated Kiln Driers Ltd t/as AKD Softwoods	Colac Victoria 3250	Log Sorting by Juvenile Wood Identification	\$550 000
Carter Holt Harvey Woodproducts Australia Pty Ltd	Myrtleford Victoria 3737	Myrtleford Plywood Mill Redevelopment including Staff Development and Installation Training	\$1 100 000
Ecofriendly Solutions Pty Ltd	Manjimup WA 6258	Biofuels Plant Expansion	\$124 740
Hurford Hardwood Pty Ltd	Tuncester NSW 2480	Thermally Modified Plantation and Highland Species Flooring	\$181 500

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 10

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Forest Industries Development Fund Round 2 Applications

Hansard Page: 61/62 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Why is it that, particularly under round 2, applicants were given five weeks to make their application. As I understand it, that was before projects were announced for round 1, so applicants for round 1 were not aware of the results of the first round. Applicants for round 2 would not have been aware of the outcome of the first round because it had not been formally announced. Yet it has taken 4½ months to get to the stage of announcing this process. There seems to be a fair variance. Applicants are given five weeks to make applications, yet it takes over 4½ months to assess the outcomes.

Mr Talbot—Once these projects are approved one of the delays relates to the applicants taking up the offer. I do not have all the details in front of me but I am quite happy to provide them to you. One of our challenges in processing these applications relates to the fact that once we have approved and notified the applicants it is for them to decide whether they will take up the project.

Answer:

The first round of grant applications opened on 12 January 2009 and closed on Friday 6 February 2009. Proponents from round one whose EOIs were not shortlisted were advised by letter on 4 March 2009. Four shortlisted proposals that were not successful in the final assessment were advised on 5 May 2009.

Round two of the Forest Industries Development Fund opened on 4 August 2010. The closing date was 17 September 2009.

The announcement of successful round one projects was not made until funding agreements had been finalised with proponents.

Unsuccessful applicants from round one were advised at least three months before round two opened.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 11

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Money given to the Australian Forestry Standard

Hansard Page: 64 (08/02/2010)

Senator Brown asked:

Senator BOB BROWN—How much money has been given to the Australian Forestry Standard?

Mr Talbot—I would have to take that question on notice, Senator.

Senator BOB BROWN—Would you do so?

Mr Talbot—Yes. I do not know off the top of my head, but I will take that question on notice, Senator.

Answer:

The government has contributed \$415,416 to the Australian Forestry Standard since June 2000.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 12

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Australian Forestry Standard Funding

Hansard Page: 65 (08/02/2010)

Senator Brown asked:

Senator BOB BROWN—Can you tell the committee what the previous government's reasons were for funding the Australian Forestry Standard but not the Forest Stewardship Council?

Senator Sherry—He cannot, and nor can I because it was a decision that was made by the previous government. Senator Colbeck might have an idea, but I do not know. I can take on notice the current government's attitude.

Senator BOB BROWN—Would you, please?

Senator Sherry—I will take on notice the previous government's attitude, but I am pretty confident that I know what the response will be. That was advice to the previous government and we cannot disclose that—we do not have access to it, actually.

Answer:

The decision to develop the Australian Forestry Standard was made by the Ministerial Council on Forestry, Fisheries and Aquaculture at its meeting in July 1999. The Council comprised ministers from the Commonwealth, states, territories and New Zealand.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 13

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Failure to Fund the Forest Stewardship Council

Hansard Page: 65/66 (08/02/2010)

Senator Brown asked:

Senator BOB BROWN—I ask you, Minister: will you now look at the failure of the current government to fund the Forest Stewardship Council, given the evidence we have just heard that the Japanese purchasers of wood products from Australia are interested in—if not insisting upon—the Forest Stewardship Council? You may be aware that Gunns Limited in Tasmania is now saying it would support such a standard and, indeed, so is the Tasmanian government, but we do not have one.

Senator Sherry—I will take it on notice.

Senator BOB BROWN—Can you see that this would be an obstruction to further progress for some pretty important investment decisions in Tasmania—regardless of which side of the fence we might be on—about, for example, Gunns pulp mill?

Senator Sherry—That is something that Minister Tony Burke will express a view on, not me, so I will take that on notice.

Senator BOB BROWN—Would you please let the committee know—and you can take this question on notice—about approaches from the Forest Stewardship Council for funding and assistance? When were they made? What response is the government making to them? When will it make those responses?

Senator Sherry—We will that on notice.

Answer:

FSC Australia wrote to the Prime Minister in October 2008 and April 2009 and to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry in December 2007 and March 2009. FSC Australia suggested that the Australian Government should provide a similar level of funding to that provided to develop the Australian Forestry Standard.

The Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry wrote to FSC Australia on 5 February 2008 and 12 February 2009. FSC Australia has been advised that the Australian Government does not have budgeted additional funding support to develop a second forest management standard for Australia.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 14

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Forest Stewardship Council certification

Hansard Page: 66 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Mr Talbot, would you be aware whether or not a Forest Stewardship Council standard in Australia prevents Australian companies from achieving FSC certification?

Mr Talbot—I will have to take that one on notice. The reason for that is that I know there is an international standard that a number of Australian companies have used.

Answer:

Provided a company meets the requirements of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), there is nothing to stop it receiving FSC certification. The FSC Certificate Database lists seven companies in Australia which hold combined forest management/chain-of-custody certificates, and 195 companies which hold chain-of-custody certificates (<http://info.fsc.org/PublicCertificateSearch>).

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 15

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Illegal logging policy

Hansard Page: 66/67 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Has the government responded to the letter from the US members of Congress including those in the House of Representatives?

Mr Talbot—I would have to take that on notice. We have not seen the letter in this department.

Senator COLBECK—I will have a chat to you later and I will show it to you.

Dr O’Connell—We will take it on notice.

Answer:

Minister Burke responded on 10 March 2010 to the letter on illegal logging from the US members of Congress.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 16

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Exceptional Circumstances/Drought Policy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

1. How many new Exceptional Circumstances applications have been received from State Governments in the past six months?
2. Which electorates are these applications from?
3. How many have been successful? How many have been rejected? What is the status of the other applications? When will they be finalised?
4. How many regions currently are in EC areas? (Please provide an electorate breakdown)
5. When do these regions EC expire?
6. Has NRAC visited these areas?
7. When will those EC areas which expire in March be informed whether they have been rolled over or whether their EC status expires?
8. When will the Government make an official response to the three drought reviews which have been undertaken? What was the cost of those drought reviews?
9. Why has it taken so long to respond to the drought reviews? How much did the reviews cost?
10. Which organisations have been consulted about the government's new drought policy? Please provide a complete list of organisations and individuals consulted? Did the department or Minister meet with the NSW Local Government and Shires Association?
11. Isn't it a fact that the new Government Drought policy has been signed off by the Cabinet and the Prime Minister and is sitting on the Minister's desk? Why is the Government sitting on the new policy?

Answer:

1. In the six months up to 4 March 2010, Exceptional Circumstances (EC) applications have been received for four areas. This includes the Gulf region in Queensland, and the Bundarra, Dunedoo-Mudgee and Eurobodalla regions in New South Wales.
2. The Gulf region in Queensland is in the federal electorate of Kennedy. The Bundarra district in NSW is in the federal electorate of New England. The Dunedoo-Mudgee EC application area falls predominantly within the federal electorate of Calare. The Eurobodalla district in NSW encompasses parts of the federal electorates of Eden-Monaro and Gilmore.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 16 (continued)

3. The application for EC assistance in the Queensland Gulf region was successful.

An application for EC assistance in the Eurobodalla region was not successful. A revised application is currently being assessed by NRAC.

An application for EC assistance in the Bundarra region was not successful. The NSW Government is able to submit a revised application.

An application for EC assistance in the Dunedoo-Mudgee region is being assessed by NRAC.

4. As at 4 March 2010, there were 48 EC-declared areas in Australia.

Exceptional Circumstances (EC) areas by Federal Electorate		
EC area name	Expiry Date	Electorate or parts of
NSW		
Bega	30 April 2011	Eden-Monaro
Braidwood	31 March 2011	Eden-Monaro, Hume
Condobolin	31 March 2011	Calare
Condobolin-Narrandera	31 March 2011	Calare, Riverina
Cooma –Bombala–ACT	30 April 2010	Fraser, Canberra, Eden-Monaro
Dubbo Revised	31 March 2011	Calare, Parkes
Forbes	31 March 2011	Calare, Riverina
Goulburn-Yass	31 March 2011	Hume, Eden-Monaro
Gundagai	31 March 2011	Eden-Monaro, Riverina
Hay	31 March 2011	Farrer, Riverina, Calare
Hume	31 March 2010	Farrer, Riverina, Eden-Monaro
Majority Western Division	31 March 2011	Farrer, Calare
Molong Revised	31 March 2011	Calare
Nyngan Revised	31 March 2011	Calare
Riverina	31 March 2011	Farrer, Riverina
South West Slopes and Plains	31 March 2011	Farrer, Riverina
Young	31 March 2011	Hume, Calare, Riverina

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 16 (continued)

VICTORIA		
Central and East Gippsland Revised	30 April 2010	Gippsland
Central Victoria North Revised	31 March 2011	Murray, Bendigo, McEwen
Central Victoria South Revised	31 March 2011	McEwen, Ballarat, Calwell, Gorton, Lalor, Bendigo, Corio, Corangamite, Scullin
Mallee – Northern Wimmera Revised	31 March 2011	Mallee, Wannon
North East Victoria	31 March 2011	Indi, McEwen, Gippsland
Northern Victoria Revised	31 March 2011	Indi, Murray, Mallee
South and West Gippsland	30 April 2010	McMillan, Flinders, McEwen, Casey, Isaacs, La Trobe,
South Western Victoria	31 March 2010	Mallee, Wannon, Ballarat, Corangamite
SOUTH AUSTRALIA		
Central and Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges	31 March 2010	Mayo, Barker
Central Eyre Peninsula	31 March 2010	Grey
Central North East including Annex	15 June 2010	Grey, Barker
Clare, Light and Barossa	31 March 2010	Barker, Mayo, Wakefield
Fleurieu Peninsula	31 March 2010	Mayo
Kangaroo Island	31 March 2010	Mayo
Lower Eyre Peninsula	31 March 2010	Grey
Mid North	31 March 2010	Grey, Barker, Wakefield
Murray Mallee	31 March 2011	Barker
North West Rangelands	15 June 2010	Grey
River Murray and Lower Lakes Corridor	31 March 2011	Barker, Mayo
Upper North Cropping	31 March 2010	Grey
Upper South East	31 March 2010	Barker
Western Eyre Peninsula	31 March 2010	Grey
Yorke Peninsula	31 March 2010	Grey
TASMANIA		
Central Midlands	30 April 2010	Lyons
Flinders Island	30 April 2010	Bass

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 16 (continued)

QUEENSLAND		
Central Darling Downs Revised	15 June 2010	Maranoa
Far West QLD	15 June 2010	Kennedy, Flynn
Gulf	15 June 2011	Kennedy
Northern Darling Downs Revised	15 June 2010	Maranoa
South West QLD Revised	15 June 2010	Maranoa, Flynn
Western Downs– Maranoa Revised	15 June 2010	Maranoa, Flynn

5. Please see response to answer 4.
6. Of the 34 areas that had assistance available until 31 March 2010, NRAC conducted an on-ground inspection of 33 areas.
7. On 25 February 2010 Minister Burke announced the outcome for the 34 EC areas that had assistance available until 31 March 2010.
8. The government is finalising the details of a new drought support system.

The costs of these investigations were:

BoM/CSIRO assessment	\$0.136m
Expert Social Panel assessment	\$0.973m
DAFF departmental costs (including staff costs for secretariat)	\$1.319m
Productivity Commission assessment	\$1.449m
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$3.877m</i>

9. The government is giving careful consideration to all the issues and options raised through the investigations of the assessments. The policy issues are complex.

Please see response to answer 8.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 16 (continued)

10. The expert social panel met with government officials and representatives of non-government organisations, received over 250 submissions and benefited from hearing the views from the over 1,000 people who attended 25 public forums. In its inquiry, the Productivity Commission incorporated work undertaken by the Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO and the expert social panel in their respective investigations. In addition, the Commission received over 178 submissions to its inquiry and travelled to all states to meet with farmers and other key stakeholders.

Refer to **Attachment A** for a list of organisations and individuals consulted as part of the review.

11. No. The government is finalising the details of a new drought support system.

[CC 16 – Attachment]

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 17

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Voluntary Offset Market

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Back asked:

I refer to an answer by the Minister for Agriculture to a question with out notice on the 25th of November, 2009 in which he stated: “In offsets, it is important that we continue to have a system of trading which is able to be traded internationally. That is why the government continues to argue internationally for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms. In doing so, though, there is now agreement as to what can happen in the meantime in advance of being able to have a system of international trading in particular for soil carbon. That is why there is now agreement for a voluntary market offset system through the national carbon offset standard. That will allow application for agricultural soils, both in the area of soil carbon and in the area of biochar, also for enhanced forest management and non-forest vegetation to be credited and also for mechanisms in place for credits on regrowth and soil carbon on land which was cleared legally between 1990 and 2008.”

1. What is the agreement for a voluntary market offset system through the national carbon offset standard?
2. Will this voluntary market offset system be compatible with our International Target under the Kyoto Protocol?
3. Will it be compatible with any post Kyoto protocol accounting rules to ensure it can be included in meeting our international certificates?
4. How many tonnes of carbon have been traded on the voluntary market through the National Carbon Offset Standard?

Answer:

1/4. These questions should be directed to the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 18

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Topic: Staff attendance at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Back asked:

1. Can the Department confirm whether Mr Simon French and Mr Ian Michael Ruscoe work for the Department? (note these are the names on the list of the 114 Australian Delegation)
2. Were these two men accredited to attend the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference in December? What is their role in the Department? What is their classification?
3. How many from DAFF attended the Copenhagen Conference? What was the cost of attending the Copenhagen Conference?
4. What was the purpose of DAFF sending officers to the Copenhagen Conference?
5. How many sessions and what sessions did the DAFF officers attend?
6. In relation to Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry what was achieved at Copenhagen? What was agreed to at Copenhagen?

Answer:

1. Yes.
2. Yes Msrs French and Ruscoe were accredited. Mr French works in the Climate Change Policy Branch, Mr Ruscoe works in the Forestry Branch, both of which are in the Climate Change Division. They are both Executive Level 1 officers.
3. Two (Mr French and Mr Ruscoe). The cost to the department for the two officers' attendance at Copenhagen was estimated to be \$25 691 (DAFF is awaiting final accommodation costs from the Department of Climate Change).
4. DAFF had been contributing to the negotiations leading up to Copenhagen with respect to the land use, land use change and forestry sectors (LULUCF). Given the importance of the negotiations on LULUCF to the department's interests, DAFF staff have been engaged in the relevant international discussions.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 18 (continued)

5. Both officers attended formal and informal sessions of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on negotiations for the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry Sector. Mr French also attended informal sessions of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action under the Convention on sectoral approaches for agriculture.

Mr French met with representatives from Australian farm industries, led by the National Farmers Federation, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers and the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. Mr French also met with representatives from other national governments with regard to the establishment of the Global Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Mr Ruscoe met with Australia's forestry industry peak representative bodies including the Australian Plantation Products and Paper Industry Council and the National Association of Forest Industries.

Both officers also attended Conference side events hosted by non-government organisations. Attendance at side events is an important role for delegation members to identify forums where Australian government policy may be discussed and relay relevant information to senior negotiators and other relevant delegation members.

6. In the lead up to Copenhagen, progress was made on narrowing down options under negotiation for the LULUCF. However, no options were agreed at Copenhagen and so these will continue to be negotiated through 2010. This includes options for the accounting treatment of emissions and sequestration caused by natural disturbance and inter-annual variability in the land-use sector and for carbon stored in harvested wood products.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 19

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: International climate change accounting rules

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back/Nash asked:

1. Was there any agreement on new international accounting and measuring rules agreed to at Copenhagen to replace those currently operating under the Kyoto Protocol? When does the Department expect the new rules to be agreed to? Given the Kyoto Protocols expire in 2012 what is the time critical date for an agreement to be reached?
2. Does the Government's CPRS Legislation rely on the 'offsets' allowable under the Kyoto Protocols to meet its International targets?
3. What 'offsets' are currently available under the Kyoto Protocols for Australian businesses including farmers?
4. What are the penalties for not complying with international targets under the Kyoto Protocols?
5. Does the Government believe there needs to be changes to international accounting and measuring rules post Kyoto?

Answer:

1/5 These questions should be directed to the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 20

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: International climate change accounting rules

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

1. What did the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry mean when he stated in answer to a question in Parliament on the 25th of November, 2009 that; “In offsets, it is important that we continue to have a system of trading which is able to be traded internationally. That is why the government continues to argue internationally for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms.”
2. Please give examples of the types of ‘human activity’ the Minister is specifically talking about?
3. Please give examples of which forums the Government has argued internationally for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms?
4. Is it the Government’s position that timber products such as housing frames should be a carbon sink allowable under international accounting mechanisms?

Answer:

1. The Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry’s statement of 25 November 2009 was stating current government policy.
2. Please see response to Question 1.
3. The government has argued within the UNFCCC for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms.

In addition, the minister has raised this issue at the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

4. Yes

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 21

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Practical measures to reduce farm emissions

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

1. What practical measures are the government telling farmers can be taken by primary producers at the farm level to reduce emissions?
2. What are these measures (please provide a list, including the main benefits and/or problems surrounding implementation, the cost of successfully implementing each measure and the estimate carbon reductions that can be achieved by implementing each measure)?
3. What support/grants/funding/training is available to farmers to undertake these initiatives?
4. Is the Department concerned about any schemes being promoted to farmers to reduce their carbon footprint, provide carbon sinks or offsets?
5. How are the benefits of these measures benchmarked, i.e. how are the emissions measured and accounted for? Can they actually be accounted for?
6. How will the government work out the emissions on a livestock enterprise, a mixed farming operation or grain growing enterprise?
7. Is it not a fact that emissions released by livestock are a natural occurrence and part of a natural cycle?
8. Is it not a fact that the only industry to have reduced its emissions footprint is the red meat livestock industry, which has seen sheep and cattle numbers drop to the lowest level in also a century?
9. How big emitters are termites what measures are the government taking to reduce the emissions from termites?

Answer:

1. Previous answer given at the October 2009 Supplementary Budget Estimates, CC 45. Please see **CC 21 attachment**.
2. Previous answer given at the October 2009 Supplementary Budget Estimates, CC 46. Please see **CC 21 attachment**.
3. Previous answer given at the October 2009 Supplementary Budget Estimates, CC 47. Please see **CC 21 attachment**.
4. Previous answer given at the October 2009 Supplementary Budget Estimates, CC 48. Please see **CC 21 attachment**.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 21 (continued)

5. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.
6. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.
7. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.
8. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.
9. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.

[CC 21 attachment]

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 22

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Food processors and the CPRS

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

1. How many food processors or manufactures are consider to be large emitters and will be included in the initial CPRS scheme?
2. How many food processors or manufactures will be eligible for free credits?
3. How will Australian grown, processed or manufactured products compete with on both the international and domestic markets against produce from nations who have no emission trading scheme?
4. Has any economic modelling been done by the department on the cost to food manufacturing, processing sector of the ETS?
5. Has this economic modelling given any indication of increases in the price of food?
6. Is the Emission Trading Scheme a tax for collection purposes?

Answer:

1/6. This question should be directed to the Department of Climate change and Energy Efficiency.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 23

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Australia's Farming Future

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

How much of the Government's \$60 million Climate Change Adaptation funding for farmers promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election as part of the Australia's Farming Future policy has been granted? Please provide a breakdown of projects funded.

Answer:

The Climate Change Adaptation Partnerships program comprises FarmReady, Community Networks and Capacity Building and Information Services.

Initially \$60 million, \$31.2 million was moved to the Climate Change Research Program to increase research, development and demonstration opportunities.

An additional \$10.2 was transferred to the Adaptation Partnerships program from the Climate Change Adjustment program to consolidate funding for FarmReady, Community Networks and Capacity Building.

The **Climate Change Research Program** has funded 47 projects. The projects have been funded across five program areas: the Reducing Emissions from Livestock Research Program, Nitrous Oxide Research Program, Adaptation Research Program, Soil Carbon Research Program and the Biochar Research Program.

Projects relating to emissions reduction and biochar can be found at http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/climate-change-and-productivity-research/emissions_reduction2

Projects relating to adaptation can be found at http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/climate-change-and-productivity-research/soil_carbon

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 23 (continued)

Projects relating to soil carbon can be found at
http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/climate-change-and-productivity-research/adaptation_research_program

FarmReady

FarmReady Industry Grants

The first round of Industry Grants resulted in 47 projects totalling \$6.3 million.

Details of successful applicants can be found at

[http://maff.gov.au/media/media_releases/2009/may/\\$6.3_million_from_rudd_govt_to_help_land_managers_adapt_to_climate_change](http://maff.gov.au/media/media_releases/2009/may/$6.3_million_from_rudd_govt_to_help_land_managers_adapt_to_climate_change)

The second round resulted in 20 projects up to \$3.04 million. Details of successful applicants can be found at http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/farmready/farmready_industry_grants2

FarmReady Reimbursement Grants - 7785 reimbursements have been paid totalling \$6.313 million.

Community Networks and Capacity Building comprises Next Gen Farmers and Recognising Women grants. A total of 150 projects valued at 6.35 million have been funded.

The first round of successful projects can be found at

http://www.maff.gov.au/media/media_releases/2009/june/supporting_the_next_generation_of_rural_and_regional_leaders

The second round of successful projects can be found at

http://www.daff.gov.au/climatechange/australias-farming-future/community_networks_and_capacity_building/next-gen-farmers

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 24

Division/Agency: Climate Change/Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Topic: DAFF representations for Forest Contractors in Tasmania

Hansard Page: Written (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

1. What representations has DAFF had from forest contractors in Tasmania over the past 6 months about assistance for their industry?
2. What proposals have been put to the Department?
3. What briefs have been provided to the Minister on how to assist forest contractors – short or long term?

Answer:

1. At a Community Cabinet meeting held in Hobart on 13 October 2009, the Chief Executive of the Tasmanian Forest Contractors Association (TFCA), Mr Ferdie Kroon, met with the minister and a DAFF officer to discuss issues affecting forest contractors.
2. Please see response to Question 1.
3. The minister was briefed in the context of his meeting with the TFCA.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 25

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: PIMC support the Green Building Council to accredit the Aust Forest Certification Scheme

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Colbeck asked:

1. In November last year, PIMC agreed to support a push to get the Green Building Council to accredit the Australian Forest Certification Scheme. Is the Department satisfied all Federal Government agencies - along with State Governments - have implemented procurement policies which recognise the AFCS?
2. Has the Department been in any discussions with international trading partners about forest certification? What has been the nature of those discussions?

Answer:

1. Commonwealth, State and Territory agencies are reporting to the next Primary Industries Ministerial Council meeting on what action has been taken.
2. The department has had discussions with international trading partners regarding forest certification. The discussions have addressed the following matters.

New Zealand	Support of the development and use of forest certification systems in the Asia-Pacific Region.
-------------	--

Korea	Options for development of national forest certification systems; processes for achieving mutual recognition of national schemes.
-------	---

Malaysia	Progress with the development of certification standards in each country and mutual recognition of those national standards through the Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes.
----------	--

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 25 (continued)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Indonesia | Promoting the development of systems to verify the legal origins of timber and wood products, including the use of certification systems. |
| Papua New Guinea | Establishing processes and systems to underpin future certification of forest management. Exchange of forestry professionals to include those involved in forest certification. |
| China | Exchange of views on certification and China's progress towards development of a national certification standard; sharing of information on forest certification schemes used in the Asia-Pacific region. |

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 26

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: International climate change accounting rules

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Nash asked:

Is it the Government's position that timber products such as housing frames should be a carbon sink allowable under international accounting mechanisms?

Answer:

Yes. See response to CC20 (4).

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 27

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: International climate change accounting rules

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Nash asked:

1. What did the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry mean when he stated in answer to a question in Parliament on the 25th of November, 2009 that; “In offsets, it is important that we continue to have a system of trading which is able to be traded internationally. That is why the government continues to argue internationally for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms.”
2. Please give examples of the types of ‘human activity’ the Minister is specifically talking about?

Answer:

5. See response to CC 20.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 28

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: International climate change accounting rules

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Nash asked:

Please give examples of which forums the Government has argued internationally for the need to separate human activity from natural causes in the international accounting mechanisms?

Answer:

See response to CC 20.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 29

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Rural Financial Counselling Service Program

Hansard Page: Written question

Senator Xenophon asked:

1. Given the important role the Rural Financial Counselling Service of South Australia plays in rural communities, many of which are suffering severe financial hardships caused by drought, climate change and water restrictions, what plans are in place for future funding and support?
2. If the conditions in rural areas continue to worsen, what contingency plans are in place to help the RFCSSA cope with an increase in clients?

Answer:

1. All Rural Financial Counselling Service (RFCS) program service providers, including RFCS South Australia, are currently funded under a Deed of Grant until 30 June 2011.
2. There is flexibility within the RFCS program to relocate rural financial counsellors to areas when a greater need becomes evident.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 30

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Economic modelling on coal mines

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

1. What advice has been provided to the Minister in relation to the impact on job losses?
2. For example, has there been modelling carried about on what job losses could be expected through the closure of coal mines?
3. If so, please detail – where, numbers, etc.
4. What about the impact on power stations that rely particularly on the use of brown coal?

Answer:

1. The issue raised falls within the portfolio responsibility of the Minister for Resources and Energy.
2. Please see response to Question 1.
3. Please see response to Question 1.
4. Please see response to Question 1.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: CC 31

Division/Agency: Climate Change Division

Topic: Economic modelling on coal mines

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

The impact on other sectors?

Small business

Rural sector

Answer:

5. Please see response to CC30 (1).