

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia

**INQUIRY INTO
THE PROVISIONS OF THE
FAIR PRICES AND BETTER ACCESS FOR ALL
(PETROLEUM) BILL 1999
AND
THE PRACTICE OF MULTI-SITE FRANCHISING
BY OIL COMPANIES**

**INTERIM REPORT
OF THE
SENATE ECONOMICS REFERENCES COMMITTEE**

June 2000

© Commonwealth of Australia 2000

ISBN 0 642 71087 2

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Core Members

Senator S Murphy (Chair)	(Tasmania, ALP)
Senator B Gibson (Deputy Chair)	(Tasmania, LP)
Senator G Chapman	(South Australia, LP)
Senator S Conroy	(Victoria, ALP)
Senator P Cook	(Western Australia, ALP)
Senator A Ridgeway	(New South Wales, AD)

Substitute Members

Senator Crane to replace Senator Gibson for the Committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Fair Prices and Better Access for All (Petroleum) Bill 1999 and the practice of multi-site franchising by oil companies

Senator Schacht to replace Senator Cook for the Committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Fair Prices and Better Access for All (Petroleum) Bill 1999 and the practice of multi-site franchising by oil companies

Senator Greig to substitute for Senator Ridgeway for resources issues

Participating Members

Senator E Abetz	(Tasmania, LP)
Senator R Boswell	(Queensland, NP)
Senator B Brown	(Tasmania, AG)
Senator P Calvert	(Tasmania, LP)
Senator G Campbell	(New South Wales, ALP)
Senator H Coonan	(New South Wales, LP)
Senator A Eggleston	(Western Australian, LP)
Senator J Faulkner	(New South Wales, ALP)
Senator A Ferguson	(South Australia, LP)
Senator J Ferris	(South Australia, LP)
Senator B Harradine	(Tasmania, Ind)
Senator S Knowles	(Western Australia, LP)
Senator R Lightfoot	(Western Australia, LP)
Senator B Mason	(Queensland, LP)
Senator J McGauran	(Victoria, NPA)
Senator A Murray	(Western Australia, AD)
Senator M Payne	(New South Wales, LP)
Senator J Quirke	(South Australia, ALP)
Senator T Tchen	(Victoria, LP)
Senator J Tierney	(New South Wales, LP)
Senator J Watson	(Tasmania, LP)

Secretariat

Peter Hallahan, Secretary
Jacquie Hawkins, Senior Research Officer
Angela Lancsar, Executive Assistant

SG.64
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Tel: 02 6277 3540
Fax: 02 6277 5719
E-mail: economics.sen@aph.gov.au

CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE	iii
INTERIM REPORT	
Terms of reference	1
The Inquiry	1
The Bill	2
Reactions to the Bill	2
The Oilcode	4
The practice of multi-site franchising	5
Introduction	5
The Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980	6
What is multi-site franchising?	6
Rationale for multi-site franchising	7
Conclusions	9
APPENDIX 1	
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	11
APPENDIX 2	
PUBLIC HEARINGS AND WITNESSES	13
APPENDIX 3	
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM HEARINGS INTO PETROL PRICING AND MULTI-SITE FRANCHISING INQUIRY	17

INTERIM REPORT

Terms of reference

1.1 On 12 October 1999, the Senate referred the following matter to the Senate Economics References Committee for inquiry and report by 24 November 1999:

- a) the provisions of the Fair Prices and Better Access for All (Petroleum) Bill 1999; and
- b) the practice of multi-site franchising by oil companies and, in particular:
 - i) whether this practice allows oil companies to avoid restrictions placed on them by the *Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980*, and
 - ii) whether the Act should be strengthened.¹

1.2 The Committee sought from the Senate extensions to the reporting date which is now 29 June 2000.

1.3 The Committee notes that the bill was discharged from the House of Representatives *Notice Paper* on 3 April 2000.

1.4 The Committee also notes that it is awaiting the provision of responses to questions taken on notice by a number of witnesses during the course of the public hearings. A list of these questions on notice is at Appendix 3.

1.5 Therefore, the Committee has decided to table an interim report on the reference at this time to enable it to look in greater detail at what is a complex issue. It proposes to table a final report early in the next sittings of Parliament.

The Inquiry

1.6 The Committee advertised its terms of reference and approached a number of interested parties, calling for submissions to be lodged by 30 November 1999. It has received 61 submissions from a range of individuals and organisations. These are listed at Appendix 1.

1.7 The Committee held three public hearings and a round table forum of representatives from the petroleum industry and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and officers from the Department of Industry Science and Resources. Details of dates of the public hearings and the public forum, and witnesses called, are listed in Appendix 2.

1 *Journal of the Senate*, No. 77—12 October 1999, p. 1835.

The Bill

1.8 The Explanatory Memorandum states that the object of the bill is to:

... secure improved competition in the wholesale sector of the petroleum market and to help create an environment of fairer pricing and better access in the supply of petroleum products by ensuring that franchisees in the petroleum sector are able to purchase fuels for re-sale from a variety of sources.²

1.9 During his First Reading Speech, Mr Fitzgibbon stated that the purpose of the bill was to 'bring prices down and reduce the outrageous gap separating city and country fuel prices ... by giving service station operators the opportunity to shop around for their fuel'. He noted that:

With the arrival of Woolworths and other independents, we have now seen the benefits of new competition at the retail level. It is now time to introduce that same level of competition at the wholesale level.³

Reactions to the Bill

1.10 The Committee received a number of submissions and heard evidence that covered a diverse range of views on the Bill. Views extended from complete support for the bill with calls for the Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act (the Sites Act) to be strengthened, to strong opposition with suggestions that the Act be repealed and the Government's proposed Oilcode introduced.

1.11 The Motor Trades Association of Australia (MTAA) urged the Committee to support the proposed bill. It stated that it believed that the bill would introduce wholesale price competition by allowing dealers to negotiate and access fairer prices for their fuel supplies, with the expectation these benefits would be passed on to the consumer.⁴ While noting that franchisees may not actually choose to use the provisions, the bill would provide them with a form of leverage when dealing with suppliers and their own franchisors.⁵

1.12 However, the Australian Institute of Petroleum (AIP) and the oil majors all expressed opposition to the bill, indicating that, in their view, the bill is 'flawed ... inequitable and unworkable.'⁶ Each of the oil majors in evidence to the Committee,

2 Explanatory Memorandum, p. 2.

3 House of Representatives *Hansard*, 30 August 1999, p. 9333.

4 MTAA, Submission No. 30, p. 43.

5 MTAA, Submission No. 30, p. 42.

6 AIP, Submission No. 41, p. 2. See also Submissions No. 38, BP; No. 44, Caltex; No. 10, Mobil and No. 45, Shell.

indicated that they preferred the current regulatory framework to the provisions of the proposed bill.⁷

1.13 Particular issues of concern raised in submissions and in evidence to the Committee related to:

- the level of competition in the industry;
- the practice of 'passing off';
- homogenous product versus product differentiation;
- fuel standards;
- the effect on the franchising system;
- the pricing structure of petrol;
- the role of independents in the industry.

1.14 Professor Fels, Chairman of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, told the Committee that the bill 'certainly has some merits'.⁸ He noted that the commission had been concerned for quite some time about tied supply arrangements in the retail oil industry. However, while the partial breaking of tied supply arrangements under the provisions the Fitzgibbon bill could increase competition in the wholesale fuel market, he said that this impact may be limited.

This is because the branded franchisees of the refiner marketers account for only around 30 per cent of all retail service station sites in Australia. This impact could also be further diminished in the case of low volume service station sites which are more prevalent in country areas. Low volume service stations usually require higher retail margins to remain viable. It is difficult to envisage that the ability of a low volume branded franchisee to resource some part of its supply requirement from lower cost suppliers will lead to substantial reductions in retail prices.⁹

1.15 The Committee sought the Department of Industry, Science and Resources' views on the Fitzgibbon bill. The officers confirmed the government's continued commitment to its reform package¹⁰ and advised the Committee that the government does not support the Fair Prices and Better Access for All (Petroleum) Bill 1999. They noted that while the government supports measures to encourage competition in the petroleum market, it does not accept that this bill achieves that aim.¹¹

7 See Evidence, p. E124; p. E143; p. E155 and p. E166.

8 Evidence, p. E175.

9 Evidence, p. E195.

10 Petroleum Retail Legislation Repeal Bill 1998 and Draft Oilcode introduced by government in 1998.

11 Evidence, p. E192.

1.16 The Committee is also aware of a dispute about the validity of the bill and is awaiting comprehensive advice about this issue.

The Oilcode

1.17 In 1998, the Government announced a package of measures designed to develop a more competitive petrol market. These measures included the Petroleum Retail Legislation Repeal Bill 1998 and a Draft Oilcode.

1.18 The purpose of the Bill was to repeal the *Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980* and the *Petroleum Retail Marketing Franchise Act 1980* to enable deregulation of the petroleum products industry. The draft Oilcode, developed through extensive consultation involving representatives from all sections of the industry, would apply to a considerably broader range of operations than the present legislative regime.

1.19 The Committee notes that the provisions of the Petroleum Retail Legislation Repeal Bill 1998 were referred to the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee for examination and report. That Committee tabled a comprehensive report on the bill in June 1999.

1.20 However, on 23 September 1999, the Minister for Industry, Science and Resources announced that the government would withdraw the Petroleum Retail Legislation Repeal Bill and not proceed with the implementation of a new Oilcode. The press release noted that this decision was in line the Government's commitment that it would not proceed with its petrol reform package if there was not agreement between all industry participants. The Minister stated that 'it has proved impossible to get all the parties to agree to all elements of the reform package'.¹²

1.21 While there is still not agreement between the MTAA and the oil companies on the Oilcode, the MTAA indicated that it would be willing to swap an agreed and mandated Oilcode for the Franchise Act but it cannot yet agree to the repeal of the Sites Act. MTAA stated that it believes that it is possible to reach a compromise on the future of the Sites Act with the oil majors, government and the other interested parties.¹³

1.22 Mr Starkey, AIP, noted that through negotiation and 'all sorts of concessions on the way through', the parties had largely agreed on the reform package. He thought that if MTAA's concerns about undertakings given by the oil companies could be addressed, 'the way is clear to progress and ... develop a more robust and efficient marketing industry'.¹⁴

12 Media Release, Senator Nick Minchin, 99/309, 23 September 1999.

13 Evidence, p. E2.

14 Evidence, pp. E222-223.

1.23 However, Mr Starkey told the Committee that the 'AIP and its member companies have always argued that the repeal of the Sites Act is essential for the companies to be able to be more competitive in country areas'.¹⁵

1.24 When asked by the Committee about ACCC's view of future reform of the industry, Professor Fels responded that ACCC had recommended repeal of the Sites Act and repeal of the Retail Marketing Franchise Act subject to the satisfactory modification in a new Oilcode and self-regulatory code of conduct with some transitional arrangement in relation to the repeal of the Sites Act.¹⁶

1.25 Professor Fels stated that ACCC did not think the Sites Act was particularly effective in reducing vertical integration by the oil majors, given that franchisees are tied 100 per cent, for product, to their franchisor. He also thought that the Sites Act may have created some distortions and inefficiencies and reduced the flexibility of the oil majors to respond to changing market conditions while not impinging either on wholesalers or importers.¹⁷

1.26 He advised that ACCC recommended repeal of the Franchise Act because there seemed to be more efficient and effective ways of addressing the problems the act was originally designed to address. He concluded:

We believe that a revised Oilcode and self-regulatory code of conduct would be far more effective at addressing the imbalances in bargaining power between franchisor and franchisees.¹⁸

1.27 At the conclusion of the round table forum, the Committee proposed that if the parties were interested, it would be happy to facilitate any process that would 'progress matters further' in negotiations about the reform package.¹⁹

The practice of multi-site franchising

Introduction

1.28 The second part of the Committee's terms of reference require it to consider the practice of multi-site franchising by oil companies and, in particular, whether this practice allows oil companies to avoid restrictions placed on them by the *Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980* (the Sites Act) and whether the Act should be strengthened.

1.29 The issue of multi-site franchising attracted considerable comment during the inquiry. A range of submissions and witnesses expressed strong opposition to the

15 Evidence, p. E200.

16 Evidence, p. E226.

17 Evidence, p. E226.

18 Evidence, p. E226.

19 Evidence, pp. E229-230.

concept. The Motor Trades Association of Australia for example expressed concern about potential anti competitive effects of large scale multi-site franchising, as pricing decisions are concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of operators.²⁰ Other submitters expressed similar concerns and sought a limit on the number of sites that may fall under an individual franchisee's control.

1.30 Unsurprisingly, the oil companies and the Australian Institute of Petroleum disagree, maintaining that multi-site franchising does not constitute direct retailing by the oil companies and does not permit them to evade the Sites Act or exert undue influence over petrol prices. All supporters of multi-site franchising highlighted its advantages for companies, operators and consumers. The AIP was strongly of the view that single and multi-site franchises should be subject to the same regulatory regime and that no change to current arrangements is warranted.

The Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980

1.31 The *Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980* (the Sites Act) is one of two Acts²¹ introduced to regulate aspects of fuel retailing following a report by the Royal Commission on Petroleum²².

1.32 The Fraser Government introduced the Sites Act in order to limit the extent to which the major oil companies could influence fuel retail prices. The Act prohibits the companies from owning and directly operating more than 5% of retail sites.

1.33 The effectiveness of the Act has been questioned during this and previous inquiries. The advent of multi-site franchising in particular has been identified as one method by which the companies have allegedly circumvented the Sites Act. Other alleged methods of exerting influence include conditional price support, 100 per cent tie arrangements and the use of fuel cards.

What is multi-site franchising?

1.34 Franchising is a common method of operating fuel retail outlets. Under franchising arrangements, the parent oil company generally retains ownership of the site and equipment but leases the site to individual franchisees, surrendering operation of the site to the lessee. However a number of other commercial arrangements also exist within franchises. Essentially, a franchisee who purchases a franchise buys goodwill, the right to operate a site (including any associated retail premises) selling a recognised brand of fuel under a tied arrangement.

1.35 Franchisees may also receive price support where the retail price falls below wholesale price and, in some circumstances, profit support where the site operates at

20 Evidence, p. E2.

21 The other being the *Petroleum Retail Marketing Franchise Act 1980*.

22 Royal Commission on Petroleum 1976, *The Marketing and Pricing of Petroleum Products in Australia*, Fourth Report, AGPS, Canberra.

an overall loss. These arrangements vary widely between the different companies. The *Petroleum Retail Marketing Franchise Act 1980* regulates the operation of petroleum franchising.

1.36 Multi-site franchising (MSF) is essentially an extension of franchising, where a single operator controls the operations of several sites.

1.37 Three of the four major oil companies either use or are establishing forms of multi-site franchising, although the model varies considerably between companies. BP Amoco is in establishment phase. Mobil operates a system known as Retail Area Franchise (RAF). The average number of sites per RAF cluster is 5.

1.38 Caltex does not have MSFs because of the constraints placed on it by the ACCC when it merged with Ampol. Representatives from Caltex informed the Committee that it did not intend to go down the MSF path when the restrictions are lifted.²³

1.39 Shell has been a leading exponent of the practice and correspondingly, has attracted the most controversy in respect of its preference for this mode of operation. The company currently has six individual franchisees operating over 370 sites between them, as follows:

Franchise	Number of Sites	Number of Staff
Brumar VIC	59	400
Brumar SA	34	300
CARE Vic	54	500
Colchester NSW	59	720
Mistearl (Northshore) NSW	57	750
Novak WA	46	Not provided
Mistearl QLD	64	Not provided

Rationale for multi-site franchising

1.40 The oil companies and the Australian Institute of Petroleum argue that they introduced multi-site franchising to improve efficiencies and reduce operation costs.

1.41 The Committee received evidence from a number of multi-site operators who also identified a number of advantages for them and their staff resulting from multi-site franchising, particularly in the area of training, and career opportunities.

23 Evidence, p. E138.

1.42 It is difficult to dispute assertions that MSFs offer a number of operational efficiencies. It was argued that there are economies of scale to be achieved, for example in the area of purchasing. However, the Committee also received evidence arguing that multi-site franchising provides the oil companies with a method of bypassing the Sites Act. Previous inquiries have reached similar conclusions.

1.43 In its report of June 1999, the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs Legislation Committee (RRAT) was unequivocal in its assessment:

Through multi-site franchising, a company can avoid the operation and intent of the *Sites Act* and effectively control the retail price in an area.²⁴

1.44 The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) in its 1996 report also concluded that it was doubtful whether the Sites Act constrained the oil majors from greater involvement in the retail sector. The Commission identified multi-site franchising as one of several methods through which the companies exert influence.

1.45 However, the assessment of the RRAT Committee and others was and is that technically, multi-site franchising is not inconsistent with the Acts. This is apparently because franchisees have agreements in accordance with the Franchise Act and the sites are operated by the franchisee and not the supplier company.

1.46 The apparent ineffectiveness of the Sites Act gives rise to questions about whether it should be strengthened and the Committee has been asked to make an assessment of this proposal. This assessment hinges on a number of considerations including whether the considerations that underlay the original introduction of the Act still hold, and whether there would be any tangible benefit for consumers or the economy in making changes.

1.47 The Committee notes that in its report of 1994, the Industry Commission concluded that vertical integration within the petroleum industry was not anti-competitive. The Commission was also of the view that the Sites Act should be repealed to secure the full benefits of vertical integration and competition in the retail sector.²⁵

1.48 Before proceeding with any proposal to strengthen the Sites Act, it is also necessary to assess whether the multi-site franchising model actually offers greater potential for influencing petrol prices than already exist under conventional franchising arrangements. Other issues to be considered also include potential benefits to the consumer resulting from this practice and its effects on small business and service levels.

24 RRAT Report, p. 21

25 Industry Commission, *Petroleum Products*, AGPS, 1994, p. 158

Conclusions

1.49 The Committee has not yet reached any definitive conclusions in respect of either the Fitzgibbon Bill or the issue of multi-site franchising. As noted previously, the Committee is awaiting the provision of key additional information from a number of sources but expects to conclude its report on these matters in the Spring sittings.

Senator Shayne Murphy
Chairman

APPENDIX 1
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Submittor	Submission No
Agostino Petroleum Pty Ltd	48
Angelis, Mr George	28
Anonymous	1
Ashlan Pty Ltd	20
Australian Competition & Consumer Commission	52
Australian Consumers Association	53
Australian Institute of Petroleum	41
Australian Institute of Petroleum	41A
Avramoski, Mr Zoran	35
Bowden, Mr Ron	57
BP Australia Limited	38
BP Kuranda	3
BP Nomah Pty Ltd	39
Brumar (Vic) Pty Ltd	4
Brumar Services Pty Ltd & Brumar (Vic) Pty Ltd	14
Brumar Services Pty Ltd	16
Caltex Australia Limited	44
CARE Retail Services Pty Ltd	12
Colchester GR Pty Ltd	32
Cross, Mr Ralph J	18
Daly, Mr Craig A	2
De Lucia, Ms Josie	15
Duggan, Mr Craig	6
F W Ash & Sons Pty Ltd	46
F W Ash & Sons Pty Ltd	46A
Ferro, Mr Gino	50
Fuazudeen, Ms Nilar	31
Hamilton, Mr Douglas S	5
Hayes, Ms Jackie	19
Hordale Pty Ltd	55
Hume, Mr Andrew	11
Jarred, Ms Jodie	17

Lansbury-Lowe, Ms Briony	7
Lee, Mr Dallas J	27
Liberty Oil Pty Ltd	29
Magnetic Witch Pty Ltd	40
Mann, Ms Louise	33
Mistearl (Northshore) Pty Ltd	25
Mistearl Pty Ltd	21
Mistearl Pty Ltd	26
Mobil Oil Australia	10
Mobil Oil Australia	10A
Motor Trade Association of Western Australia (Inc.)	37
Motor Trades Association of Australia	30
Motor Trades Association of Australia	30A
Motorcharge Limited	42
Murphy, Ms Valerie	43
National Farmers' Federation	49
Osmond, Mr Peter	8
Petrucelli, Ms Rosa	9
Service Station Association Ltd	34
Shell Australia	45
Shell Bathurst Self Serve	47
Shell Canberra Gateway	51
Shell Croydale	54
Shell Nightcliff Service Station	56
Shell Service Karratha	36
Shell Tugun Service Station	22
Tuffley, Ms Natalie	24
Walsh, Ms Mary	23
West, Ms Rachael	13

APPENDIX 2**PUBLIC HEARINGS AND WITNESSES****Wednesday, 16 February 2000, Canberra****Motor Trades Association of Australia**

Mr Michael Delaney, Executive Director

Mr Rob Harris, Chair, ASS&CSA

Mr Colin Heavyside, Immediate Past Chair, ASS&CSA

Ms Susan Scanlan, Senior Policy Officer

Australian Institute of Petroleum

Mr Jim Starkey, Executive Director

Mr Ewen Macpherson, Deputy Director

Service Station Association

Mr Keith Pynt, President

Mr Chris Hanlon, Chief Executive Officer

Tuesday, 14 March 2000, Canberra**Liberty Oil Pty Ltd**

Mr Mark Kevin

Shell Gateway (ACT)

Mr Tony Howard

Mr Ronald George**BP Kuranda, QLD (Teleconference)**

Mr Martin Hadley

Motorcharge (WA) (Teleconference)

Mr William Harry

Motor Trade Association of Western Australia (Teleconference)

Mr Garry Prendiville, President

Mr Peter Fitzpatrick, Executive Director

Mr Michael Philipoff, Chair, Service Station Division

Ms Noelle Simons, Divisional Manager

Wednesday, 15 March 2000, Canberra**Brumar (Vic) Pty Ltd & Brumar Services Pty Ltd**

Mr Bruce Holland, Managing Director

Mr Craig Brown, General Manager, Brumar Services

CARE Retail Services Pty Ltd

Mr James Gardiner, Director

F W Ash & Sons Pty Ltd

Mr David Ash, Director

BP Australia Ltd

Mr David Birrell, Retail Franchise Channel Manager

Mr Bill Frilay Manager, Government Relations

Caltex Australia Ltd

Mr Richard Beattie, Manager Corporate Affairs

Mr Frank Topham, Government Affairs Manager

Mobil Oil Australia

Mr David Ball, Corporate Affairs Spokesperson

Mr Peter Buchan, Retail Sales Manager

Shell Australia

Mr Ian McKenzie, Retail Strategy and Development Coordinator

Mr Bruce Rosengarten, Managing Director, Retail Oceania

Australian Competition & Consumer Commission

Professor Allan Fels, Chairman

Mr Ross Jones, Commissioner

Mr Hank Spier, CEO

Ms Margaret Arblaster, General Manager, Transport and Prices Oversight

Wednesday, 12 April 2000, Canberra — Round Table Forum**Australian Competition & Consumer Commission**

Professor Allan Fels, Chairman (Video link)

Mr Hank Spier, Chief Executive Officer

Ms Margaret Arblaster, General Manager, Transport and Prices Oversight

Australian Institute of Petroleum

Mr Jim Starkey, Executive Director

Mr Ewen Macpherson, Deputy Director

Motor Trades Association of Australia

Mr Michael Delaney, Executive Director

Mr Rob Harris, Chair, ASS&CSA

Mr Colin Heavyside, Immediate Past Chairman, ASS&CSA

Department of Industry, Science and Resources

Ms Hellen Georgopoulos, Head of Business Competitiveness and Development
Division

Mr Antony Brugger, Manager, Business Law and Competition Reform

APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM HEARINGS INTO PETROL PRICING AND MULTI-SITE FRANCHISING INQUIRY

Date	Hansard Page	Org'n	Question on notice	Reply Rec'd
16/2	E3	MTAA	Provide breakdown of service station numbers, eg franchised, multi-franchised, independents	✓
"	E13	MTAA	Confidential information re assistance levels to MSFs	✓
"	E18	AIP	Statements of principles - have they been updated?	
"	E19	AIP	Levels of price support by four majors	
"	E19-20	AIP	Competitive access, deregulation as per Telstra model? have they looked at this option?	
"	E27	SSA	Mixing of fuel from different sources by independents - any complaints from consumers, or research?	
14/3	E39	Liberty	Can provide evidence of contract options re sale of sites in Tasmania	
"	E88	MTA (WA)	Provide copies of letters to franchisees from Caltex	✓
"	E91	MTA (WA)	Provide examples re excise increase versus real increase, and likewise with LPG prices	✓
15/3	E119	CARE	Breakdown of income - fuel/non fuel, to provide figures (confidential?)	
"	E127	BP	Affect of 50/50 on leasehold costs?	✓
"	E129	BP	May come back with more information on costs/franchise/ca after 50/50	✓
"	E132	BP	re WESCO, WA - supply of fuel	✓
"	E139	Caltex	Provide figures re impact of 50/50 on rental and costs and returns from franchise	
"	E148	Mobil	Will provide latest numbers re imported fuel component of market	

Date	Hansard Page	Org'n	Question on notice	Reply Rec'd
"	E162	Shell	Pricing arrangements in Shell submission to the ACCC inquiry - will forward pages to Econ Cttee	
"	E164	Shell	Provide market research re customer attitudes to majors	
"	E165	Shell	What concerns, if any, has Shell raised about fuel specifications?	
"	E182	ACCC	Is there scope for further price reductions through increased competition?	✓
"	E183	ACCC	If number of franchisees reduces, less competition particularly in country regions?	✓
"	E183	ACCC	In the short and long term how much would interim arrangements impact on the competition aspects	✓
"	E183	ACCC	Why should, from competitive point of view, independents stay outside the regulated ring and majors be kept inside the regulated ring?	✓
'	183	ACCC	Address independents' reaction to possible cutback or removal of franchisees from competitive point of view - anti- or pro-competitive?	✓
"	E186	ACCC	Information re ACCC support for independents and pro competitive outcomes achieved	✓
"	E187	ACCC	If in the ACCC's view there is a lack of competition or need for greater competition, does ACCC have any solutions?	✓
"	E188	ACCC	Can you express a view about MSF	✓
"	E188	ACCC	From submissions, assess MSF arrangements now?	✓
"	E188	ACCC	Fuel substitution - comments?	✓
"	E188-9	ACCC	LPG report - comments?	✓
	E189	ACCC	Has ACCC looked at the Australian fuel standards?	✓
	E189	ACCC	Provide brief on case re fuel substitution	✓

Date	Hansard Page	Org'n	Question on notice	Reply Rec'd
12/4	E195	DISR	Undertook to provide written advice re invalidity of bill and property concerns	
"	E204	AIP	Effects on rent of 50/50 rule from all four majors	
"	E216	AIP	Provide advice from four majors if they have valid legal opinion about operating MSF as a commission agent. Provide legal opinion, not summary.	
"	E217	ACCC	Provide information re course case where issue of franchisee as commission agent arose - Westgate Bridge sites	✓
"	E220	DISR	Department asked to provide outline on whether MSF as commission agent complies with the intent of Franchise Act - Westgate Bridge case	
"	E220	DISR	Has department taken any action in the last five years under Franchise Act?	
"	E227	ACCC	Does ACCC have any powers over oil majors' principles/undertakings?	