

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
**Questions on Notice**  
**Supplementary Budget Estimates 2016-17, 17 October 2016, 22 November 2016**

**Infrastructure and Regional Development Portfolio**

<b>Senate Number</b>	<b>Program/ Division Agency</b>	<b>Senator</b>	<b>Broad Topic</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Proof Hansard Page and hearing date or Written Question</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
1.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Advertisement	<p><b>Ms Goodspeed:</b> That was a decision for the government. The department did not put that up on the YouTube site. That was the former minister's decision—Mr Jamie Briggs. They actually uploaded it onto the minister's YouTube video. The department did not have any involvement in that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know who determined to end it?</p> <p><b>Ms Goodspeed:</b> No, we do not. The department produced the video.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know how many hits it had?</p> <p><b>Ms Goodspeed:</b> Again, off the top of my head I would have to go back and get a final figure.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>	9 17/10/2016	
2.	Corporate Services Division	McCarthy	Annual Reports	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many agencies that were listed here today have published their 2015-16 annual reports?</p>	131 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to check. I think a number of them are due to be tabled this week.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can you tell us which ones they might be?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> No, I cannot. I would have to give that information for you.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You might be able to find out while we are speaking. If not can you take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think all of the agencies have completed their annual reports and are just waiting for tabling, I believe.</p>		
3.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	What types of credit and transaction cards (including Cabcharge Fastcard and eTickets) does your department issue?	Written	21/10/2016
4.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	What was the total expenditure for each type of card over the last three financial years?	Written	21/10/2016
5.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	Can you break down the credit card expenditure into categories?	Written	21/10/2016
6.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	What is the highest and lowest credit limit for each type of card?	Written	21/10/2016
7.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	How many times in the last five years has the credit limit been reviewed?	Written	21/10/2016
8.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	What are credit cards used for?	Written	21/10/2016
9.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	What are the governance/probity rules for employees to follow?	Written	21/10/2016
10.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	<p>Are cash advances allowed?</p> <p>a) Can you list the total amount of cash advances from credit and other transaction cards over the last three years?</p> <p>b) Can you provide details on the ten largest cash advances in your department and provide particulars</p>	Written	21/10/2016

				such as how much was accessed? c) Who approves cash advances in your department in the event of paying suppliers?		
11.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	Who reviews transactions in regards to all cards?	Written	21/10/2016
12.	Corporate Services Division	Gallacher	Credit Cards	Who provides assurance to the Minister in respect to probity governance and fraud control?	Written	21/10/2016
13.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Charter Letter	Has a Charter letter been issued within the portfolio? a) If yes, what is the Division of responsibilities for Ministers within the portfolio as outlined in the Charter Letter? b) Can you provide the Committee with a copy of the current Charter letter?	Written	27/10/2016
14.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Ministerial responsibilities	Which Minister is responsible for (if any area shared internally or with other Departments/agencies please list how and who is responsible for what): a) Infrastructure Investment approvals? b) Regional policy? c) Local government matters? d) Surface Transport policy? e) Infrastructure Australia? f) Aviation and airports policy? g) Policy & Research? h) Western Sydney Unit? i) Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC)? j) Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)? k) Airservices Australia (AS)? l) National Capital Authority (NCA)? m) Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA)? n) National Transport Commission (NTC)? o) Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB)? p) The Department overall? (eg corporate, budget) q) Northern Australia infrastructure?	Written	27/10/2016
15.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	\$18 million advertising campaign	At the last Estimates it was indicated that the infrastructure propaganda (“communications”) campaign would cease when the caretaker period began. Did that occur? a) What activities ceased? (paid advertising, website,	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>responding to queries)?</p> <p>b) The Government was re-elected.</p> <p>c) When it came out of caretaker, did the campaign resume?</p> <p>d) If not, wasn't the evidence last time that the campaign needed to go for six months to be effective?</p> <p>e) The previous evidence was that the campaign would finish on August 31 after six months.</p> <p>f) Why didn't the campaign resume after the election was over if the campaign needed six months to be effective?</p> <p>g) In February, 2016 Estimates Ms Goodspeed outlined the campaign's three objectives:</p> <p>h) Senator CONROY: Welcome, Ms Goodspeed. I know you gave a brief outline. What does the campaign involve? Could you take us through that?</p> <p>i) Ms Goodspeed: The campaign is an awareness raising campaign. It has three objectives:</p> <p>j) to educate road users of the important benefits of the Australian government's investment in road and rail infrastructure;</p> <p>k) to increase awareness and understanding of the Building Our Future deliverable of the government; and</p> <p>l) to build road users' understanding and knowledge of transport infrastructure in Australia at a national and local project level.</p> <p>m) The main aim of the campaign is to increase knowledge in Australian road users of why the Australian government invests in transport infrastructure and that long-term planning and investment is vital to ensuring the economy remains competitive, people and goods can move effectively on safer roads with less congestion with faster travel times as well as the economic and social benefits".</p> <p>n) Questions:</p> <p>o) Did the campaign achieve those objectives?</p> <p>p) What actual evidence is there that it did achieve</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>these objectives?</p> <p>q) There was a contract with Wallis Consulting to provide benchmarking and tracking services on the campaign (Ms Goodspeed's evidence in February 2016 Estimates)?</p> <p>r) Has this been undertaken?</p> <p>s) If yes, what were the findings?</p> <p>t) If yes, what was the cost of the contract?</p> <p>u) As far as you are aware has the Cabinet Committee that initiated the campaign (chaired by Minister Pyne) met since the Government's re-election?</p> <p>v) Are you aware of meetings?</p> <p>w) Have you been invited to any since the Government was sworn in this year?</p>		
16.	Corporate Services Division	McAllister	Staffing	<p>The following questions ask for information regarding the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development and the following agencies: Infrastructure Australia, Civil Aviation Safety Authority, Airservices Australia, Australian Maritime Safety Authority, National Transport Commission, Australian Transport Safety Bureau, and National Capital Authority.</p> <p>a. Please provide a breakdown of staffing levels as at 30 June 2016, nationally and for each state and territory, in a spreadsheet format by the following categories:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Full time equivalent (FTE);</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Head count;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. Gender;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">d. Ongoing;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">e. non-ongoing; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">f. classification level.</p> <p>b. How many engagements occurred in the 2015-16 financial year, by:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Classification;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. State or territory;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. Ongoing staff; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">d. Non-ongoing staff.</p> <p>c. How many separations occurred in the 2015-16 financial year, by:</p>	Written	28/10/2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Classification;</li> <li>b. State or territory;</li> <li>c. Ongoing staff;</li> <li>d. Non-ongoing staff; and</li> <li>e. Reason for separation.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. What was the total expenditure on contractors and consultants in the 2015-16 financial year.</li> <li>e. For each contract or consultancy in the 2015-16 financial year, please outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project or engagement;</li> <li>b. The value of the contract;</li> <li>c. The name of each firm or contractor engaged; and</li> <li>d. The purpose of the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. For each contract or consultancy in the 2015-16 financial year, please outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The names of each firm or contractor engaged; and</li> <li>b. Total payments made to each contractor or consultant.</li> </ul> </li> <li>g. For the 2015-16 financial year, please outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many staff were employed through labour hire arrangements;</li> <li>b. Total expenditure on labour hire staff;</li> <li>c. The contractors or labour hire firms engaged to supply these staff;</li> <li>d. Total payments to each of the organisations that provided staff through either a labour hire arrangement or other contractual arrangement; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The nature of the work performed by labour hire staff.</p>		
17.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Outsourcing	<p>I refer to answers in the February 2016 Estimates where the Department indicated that it had purchased the publication <i>What a Waste - Outsourcing and How it Goes Wrong</i>. With respect to this publication purchased by the department, who in the department read the publication – by public service pay level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The second chapter, entitled "Outsourcing, blame shifting, and major fiascos"? lays the charge that</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>outsourcing allows Government Ministers to 'avoid direct responsibility when things go wrong'. 'blame is then re-allocated to Government officials'. Have any officials in the department been blamed when outsourced services 'go wrong'?</p> <p>b) The third chapter, 'Unjustifiable Profit-taking on mundane contracts', argues that there has been a 'failure of political control when co-dependent state agencies cannot prevent major corporate players from gaming the system'. How would the Department characterize KPMG both advising on and being a beneficiary of the Government's outsourcing drive?</p>		
18.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Functional and Efficiency Review	<p>At the previous Estimates in May the Secretary outlined some of the recommendations of the Functional &amp; Efficiency Review conducted into the Department by KPMG: Can you update on what has happened with that review since May?</p> <p>Are you able to indicate if Cabinet has concluded its consideration of the report?</p> <p>Have any of the 18 recommendations referred to last time been accepted by Government?</p> <p>If yes, which ones?</p> <p>do any recommend outsourcing of existing Departmental functions? Details?</p> <p>do any recommend insourcing of existing outsourced functions?</p> <p>What has happened with the Airservices recommendations?</p> <p>Are there any recommendations that relate to the Australian Rail Track Corporation?</p> <p>If yes, do any relate to changed ownership structures? Details?</p> <p>Are there any recommendations that relate to Infrastructure Australia?</p> <p>If yes, does that relate to the governance structure of IA?</p> <p>What other recommendations are there?</p> <p>What is the expected timeframe around decisions by Government from this review?</p>	Written	27/10/2016

19.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Program resourcing	<p>Please provide an itemised table detailing the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it</li> <li>b) The total funding allocated for each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15;</li> <li>c) The number of organisations funded under the program in each in those years, the name of each organisation funded and the dollar value of that funding</li> <li>d) The number of individuals projected to be serviced or services to be delivered through each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15;</li> <li>e) The total funding actually expended on each in 2015-16 and 2014-15;</li> <li>f) The number of individuals actually serviced or services actually delivered through each in 2015-16 and 2014-15;</li> <li>g) The aggregate staff budget for each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15 broken down by i) permanent APS staff and ii) contractors.</li> <li>h) The number of permanent APS staff responsible for delivering each in 2016-17; 2015-16 and 2014-15, the classification of these staff and their geographic location;</li> <li>i) The dollar value of external advice contracted to support each in 2016-17, as well as the number of contractors engaged, the APS-equivalent classification these contractors were engaged at and their geographic location.</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016
20.	Corporate Services Division	Sterle	Program evaluation	<p>Please provide the following information for every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Copies of any evaluation reports or program analysis prepared by external advisers in the last five years;</li> <li>b) Copies of any evaluation reports or program analysis prepared within the department in the last five years.</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016

21.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Ministerial Functions	In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio since 1 January 2016, can the following please be provided: a) List of functions; b) List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff; c) Function venue; d) Itemised list of costs; e) Details of any food served; f) Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; g) Details of any floral arrangements or other decorations; and h) Details of any entertainment provided.	Written	28/10/2016
22.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Executive Office Upgrades	Have the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries, been upgraded since 1 January 2016? If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided?	Written	28/10/2016
23.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Facilities Upgrades	Have the facilities of any of the Department's premises been upgraded since 1 January 2016, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new furniture, fridges, coffee machines, audio visual facilities or any other equipment including kitchen equipment and utensils? a) If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrade please be provided together with an itemised list of costs? b) Can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?	Written	28/10/2016
24.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Vacancies	Please provide a list of all statutory, board and legislated office vacancies and other significant appointments vacancies within the portfolio, including length of time vacant and current acting arrangements.	Written	28/10/2016
25.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Media Monitoring	How much has the Department spent on media monitoring since 1 January 2016? a) Can a list of all Contract Notice IDs for the Austender website in relation to media monitoring	Written	28/10/2016

				contracts please be provided?		
26.	Corporate Services Division	Bilyk	Advertising and Information Campaigns	How much has the Department spent on advertising and information campaigns since 1 January 2016? a) Can a list of all Contract Notice IDs for the Austender website in relation to advertising and information campaign contracts please be provided?	Written	28/10/2016
27.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Melbourne Metro	<b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take on notice the list of the documents you have been given or have requested from the Victorian government for the Melbourne Metro assessment. If you could get that back to us today, that would be terrific. <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We have quite a list of documents for that project. We can give that to you.	12 17/10/2016	
28.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	WestConnex	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, 'acquired'. So if that is in there, that is fine. But if it is not—I do not know the area—but I believe it would be an extremely larger figure than the \$16.812 billion. So we need to clarify that. <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We will take that on notice.	16 17/10/2016	
29.	Infrastructure Australia	McCarthy	Tanami Road	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What was the last Infrastructure Australia case that you had for the Northern Territory? <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Tanami Road is the only one in the last year. There may be some previously, but we would have to take that on notice.	16 17/10/2016	
30.	Infrastructure Australia	McCarthy	Tanami Road	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In terms of the submission surrounding the Tanami Road project, it talks about it aligning with closing the gap for Indigenous communities. Can you explain how that will happen?	16 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> I am not familiar with that aspect of the business case to be able to comment on that. We could have a look at that.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could that be taken on notice? I would like to understand. Is there anyone else who can explain that?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I think that is a very good question. We all share that concern.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We will certainly take that on notice.</p>		
31.	Infrastructure Australia	McCarthy	Tanami Road	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> According to the submission online: 'it aligns with supporting the Australian government's closing the gap for Indigenous communities'. I would like to understand what that means and how that breaks down and which communities are we talking about in terms of the Tanami Road project.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> I think you referred to material that Infrastructure Australia has published online?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Okay. Let me just clarify. That is an earlier review of an earlier business case. That is not in respect of the current review of the updated business case.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So does that mean that the closing the gap component is not relevant?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> No, it does not. I cannot confirm whether the updated business case addresses the same issues in the same way.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I would be interested to know if it does or does not. Could you provide that</p>	17 17/10/2016	

				<p>response.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Yes. We could certainly have a look at that and get back to you.</p>		
32.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Western Distributor	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me—and maybe you will again need to take this on notice—as to what documents you have requested from or that have been provided by the Victorian government to help with your assessment?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Senator, we could take on notice the documents that we have been provided. Again, it is quite a long list of documents.</p>	17 17/10/2016	
33.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Western Distributor	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So is it of concern to you that you do not have the full transport modelling and the full economic modelling that has been done for the Western Distributor? In doing your due diligence, does that impact upon the quality of the assessment that you can do?</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> We continuously to and fro until we have got the information that we feel is necessary to complete our due diligence.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Can we just clarify, Senator, that we would not say that we do not have all of the economic modelling material or transport modelling material that is relevant for the assessment. You are correct. There may be other documents out there that we have not seen. That does not mean that we do not have everything that we do need. That assessment is still underway.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> If you could list for me all the documents that you do have—in particular, there</p>	18-19 17/10/2016	

				<p>are documents that are publicly known that are not available, that have been redacted from the business case, and then there are these independent peer reviews that were not even listed as having been undertaken. If you could list all the documents that you do have and the documents you have requested, that would be valuable.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Yes.</p>		
34.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Western Distributor	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes, but this is an extra benefit, not just travel time saving. It is the extra benefit that people are said to give. It is the top-up value if they are travelling on a road that is uncongested.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We would have to have a look at that and take that on notice.</p>	19 17/10/2016	
35.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Melbourne Metro	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> In response to your answer when you were talking about Melbourne Metro, you said you knew of the KPMG economic peer review but not of the peer review that was done by John Allard. Will you be requesting that peer review?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> As indicated, we are trying to move that evaluation towards its conclusion. We would have to consider whether we needed any additional information to be able to finalise that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take on notice then whether you will be requesting that peer review?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> As I said, we would only request that peer review if we thought there were particular—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That was released under a freedom of information request to my colleague, Ms</p>	19 17/10/2016	

				Hartland. I put it to you that it may be valuable to you to include in your assessment. <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Thank you, Senator.		
36.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	WestConnex	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> I want to go back to the table that I gave a copy of to Infrastructure Australia. It was taken from page 240 of the <i>WestConnex updated strategic business case: November 2015</i> . I really am struggling, Mr Parkinson. Table 3.16 states: For the purpose of this analysis capital costs exclude land acquisition, network enhancements and development costs. Has someone had the opportunity to correct the record for me and say, 'This is wrong,' or, 'Maybe we've given you the wrong answer'? I just want to clear it up, Mr Parkinson. <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Certainly, based on the table that we have, it is clear that these numbers do not include those additional costs. We would have to take on notice the costs that were included in our evaluation of the project and come back to you on those.	22 17/10/2016	
37.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle, Rice	WestConnex	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> That is good, thank you. So we have corrected the record there. So I have been told, and could you confirm, that 427 houses have been 'aquired'—is that the right word? <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Acquired. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Acquired—whatever. Bought out, anyway. <b>CHAIR:</b> I am not buying into that one. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> There are 427? <b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We would have to take on notice	22, 27 17/10/2016	

				<p>the precise number. I doubt very much that that was specified in the business case. We could check on what is in the business case for that, but it may well be that the New South Wales government, in progressing that project, has made some minor variations around that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I suppose what I am just trying to clear up through you, Chair, is that there are 400-plus houses that have been bought, and I do not know what areas they are in. I believe that—you can take this on notice too—around 200 were heritage listed or something like that. I am not sure—you will find out for us. It would make, and this is not a hypothetical, a significant difference to the \$16.812 billion so far. Would the New South Wales government have provided that information to Infrastructure Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> The New South Wales government provided the business case to us. As I said, we could check whether those details are set out at that level of detail in the business case. It would be normal to include those sort of costs. I do not know and I cannot verify at this point which of those costs were included in this business case.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> We have land acquisitions of 400 properties which, on the real estate estimate I have been given, would be around \$1.5 billion. Four hundred properties in Sydney do not come cheaply.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> As I said to Senator Sterle, we would have to take on notice what property acquisition costs are included and what are not in</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				that \$16.8 billion. <b>Senator RICE:</b> But we are looking at an order of about 1½ billion.		
38.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I think, too, Mr Parkinson, that not only the land acquisition but also the network enhancements are not included in this, so we would need to know what that comes out at. What is the difference there, because I am sure that would be significant?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> In fact quite a lot of the project is network enhancement, so it really comes down to a definitional question of which network enhancements are included and which are not—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, of course.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> and that is not set out in this table. We would have to take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No, that is fair enough. And we would need, of course, the development costs. You are very clear that Infrastructure Australia has no reason to hide any truth, and I am glad the record is corrected now. I would say that the figure that is going to come back is going to be significantly higher than \$16.812 billion. We look forward to hearing back from you. Mr Parkinson, do you just want to comment?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We can certainly clarify which of these costs are included in the business case. We cannot confirm whether we can come back to you with a figure of other costs which are not included in the business case because that would belong with the New South Wales government, which is</p>	22-23 17/10/2016	

			<p>the proponent.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I fully understand that, but I am going to take advantage while Mr Mrdak is speaking to Senator Abetz. The department could certainly come back to us—isn't that right, Mr Mrdak?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Sorry, Senator?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Just nod!</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Sorry, Senator, I did not—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No, you do know that I am setting you up! It is tongue in cheek. As Mr Parkinson said very clearly, Mr Mrdak—oi! I am putting a question to you. I am giving you an opportunity here, and then you turn around and start talking while I am asking the damn question!</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am sorry, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You are the most professional Secretary out of all the departments. You are the last one I would expect to do that!</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am very sorry, Senator. I was distracted by another senator.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Oh, we are having a wink! Senator Abetz, leave him alone.</p> <p>Mr Parkinson has made very clear the difference between the land acquisitions, the network enhancements and the development costs. He has said that Infrastructure Australia could say, 'What was included in the original business case?' What I am asking the department and what we, the committee, want to know is what those costs came out to be, because they are not included. Could you take that on notice for us?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. I do apologise.		
39.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Of course, you would do. Is there a table or something you could supply to the committee that actually shows the projects that are P50 and those that are P90? Could you break that all down for us?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We could certainly take that on notice. Most of them are at P50.</p>	23 17/10/2016	
40.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> It appears to be the case that there will be substantially increased costs, and there are other costs as well that do not appear to be included, such as the development cost of other network extensions. Certainly in the public sphere there is a case being put that needs to be addressed. We need to know, if it is not the case, that the cost of this project will not be well north of \$20 billion. Are you looking at scenarios where the benefits are considerably higher to make up for that? The benefits in the business case are at \$22 billion at the moment. You would need to have massively increased benefits in order to come in at a reasonable benefit-cost ratio.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We are in danger of speculating on a different business case. The business case we have received is the one, as set out in our assessment, with the costs at \$16.8 billion and the benefits as set out in our assessment. That is what we have made the assessment on.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What are the benefits as set out in that assessment?</p>	29 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> I have it broken down into various components, but I do not have the total in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you add them up, please?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We will get back to you in a moment after we perform that addition.</p>		
41.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But that \$16.8 billion at the moment—does that include any acquisition costs?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> As I previously indicated to the committee, I certainly expect that it does include some of those costs. They are fundamental to the project. However, with the table that has been tabled indicating that there are land acquisition costs which may not be included, we would have to take that on notice and come back to you with details of what those might be.</p>	29 17/10/2016	
42.	Infrastructure Australia	McCarthy	Northern Territory Submissions	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Mr Parkinson, I want to go back to an answer that you gave with respect to the Tanami. I asked how many infrastructure submissions had come IA from the Northern Territory, and you said that, in the past 12 months, this was the only one. Would you be able to provide answers as to how many project submissions have come from the Northern Territory in the past five years?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Yes, we could take that on notice. If I could clarify: the discussion and the answer that I gave was with respect to business cases. We have received some other initiative proposals from the Northern Territory—some of which are published on the Infrastructure Priority List. We do not</p>	30-31 17/10/2016	

				<p>presently have business cases for those initiative proposals.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When you are taking that question on notice about how many projects in the past five years, could you also take on notice how many submissions to the IA in the past five years were unsuccessful?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> In terms of business case submissions?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Certainly.</p>		
43.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> No. This will take one minute, because I am happy for this to be on notice. In terms of the costs that are included in the WestConnex business case, you talked about taking on notice the land acquisition costs. The other costs that I am interested in are the operating expenses, the network extensions and the development costs, which have not been disclosed. What value has been put to those in terms of your assessment of the benefit-cost ratio?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We have already undertaken to take on notice to get the details of those network costs and development costs. With respect to operating costs, some of those are different matters that are confidential to the proponent. We would have to, again, take it on notice and see what we could come back with for you.</p>	32 17/10/2016	
44.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	Maldon-Dombarton	<p>IA at Estimates on October 17 said that the Maldon Dombarton Rail Link is one of the business cases currently being assessed. When approximately did IA ask the NSW</p>	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>Government for the additional information required for the Business Case?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Has there been any follow up from IA to NSW Government regarding the delay in getting this information? When does IA expect to get it?</li> <li>b) Has IA asked the NSW Govt for a report on what they spent the \$25 million grant provided to them by the Fed Govt in 2011-12 for engineering works on Maldon Dombarton?</li> <li>c) If yes, can you provide the Committee with that information?</li> </ul>		
45.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	Priority for projects	<p>Does IA accept that in the last twelve months it has released assessments of projects immediately prior to Government funding announcements? Why is that? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Inland Rail – May 2016 - \$594 million funding announcement was made that month</li> <li>b) Ipswich Motorway – Rocklea to Darra Stage 1 – \$200 million funding announcement made around the same time</li> <li>c) How does IA decide which projects to allocate assessment priority to?</li> <li>d) Does IA accept that it is established to work at arm’s length of Government and to order its work independent of Federal Government – or is it more complicated than that?</li> <li>e) Are there any projects being assessed that are not sponsored by the relevant State Government?</li> <li>f) What would happen if a State Opposition sponsored a project?</li> <li>g) What happens to IA’s processing of assessments when there is a change in State or Territory Government? Does that affect the rate of assessment of projects? If yes, why?</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016
46.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	Tax Loss Incentive for Designated Infrastructure Projects	<p>Has Infrastructure Australia had parties expressing interest in accessing the Tax Loss Incentive for Designated Infrastructure Projects in the past two years?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If yes, how many?</li> <li>b) Has IA provided formal guidance on steps to take to access the incentive?</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>c) If yes, on how many occasions?</p> <p>d) Are there any barriers to take-up of the incentive? If yes, what are the barriers?</p> <p>e) Are there improvements that could be made to make the incentive more accessible or attractive? If yes, what?</p> <p>f) What similar initiative will replace the incentive after June 30, 2017?</p> <p>g) Should the incentive remain available after that date?</p>		
47.	Infrastructure Australia	Sterle	Townsville Eastern Access Rail Corridor	<p>Has IA seen the business case for the Townsville Eastern Rail Corridor project?</p> <p>a) What is the scope of the project?</p> <p>b) What is the total cost of this project?</p> <p>c) What is IA's assessment of this project?</p> <p>d) What is the project's BCR?</p> <p>e) Has the Government asked IA to progress assessment of this project?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
48.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	Westconnex	<p>In its latest evaluation of WestConnex (April 2016), IA identifies that the methodologies the proponent has used for calculating the following have introduced the risk that the "benefits could be overstated":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the annualisation factor used ... to convert weekday traffic estimates to yearly estimates</li> <li>• vehicle operating costs</li> <li>• the high share of travel time benefits accruing to business travel</li> </ul> <p>Could IA provide a revised figure for these benefits, calculated according to Transport for NSW guidelines?</p> <p>a) Having now established that there is an allowance for Land Acquisitions within the figure of \$16.8B, can IA inform us if this allowance is still expected to be sufficient, and if not, what the impact on the quantum of Capital Expenditure will be?</p> <p>b) Having now established that "many of the network enhancements [associated with WestConnex] would have occurred irrespective of WestConnex", can IA quantify the cost of those network enhancements</p>	Written	28/10/2016

				<p>that would not have occurred if it were not for WestConnex?</p> <p>c) In its latest evaluation of WestConnex (April 2016), IA stated that according to the proponent, induced traffic has reduced the benefits by 25%. Which methodology has been used to calculate this figure? What has IA does to satisfy itself that a 25% reduction is a reliable figure?</p> <p>d) The RTA has said that travel time savings of less than five minutes "are often not realised and can be considered inframarginal". (<a href="http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/documents/projects/sydney-north/lane-cove-tunnel/m7-motorway-cct-lct-post-implementation-review-report.pdf">http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/documents/projects/sydney-north/lane-cove-tunnel/m7-motorway-cct-lct-post-implementation-review-report.pdf</a>) Can IA quantify the percentage of time savings associated with WestConnex that would be considered inframarginal using a cut-off of 5 minutes?</p> <p>e) Given that Operating Costs were provided in previous reports, why are they now confidential?</p>		
49.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Welcome. I refer to the 2015-16 final budget outcomes. You are familiar with those of course. Why is the final outcome for spending on infrastructure 20 per cent less than the forecast in the 2015-16 budget?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It reflects the actual spend by jurisdictions on the program. As you know, we do estimates at the start of each financial year based on what projected spends are by the states and territories on investment projects, and then—</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you tell me what that figure was?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will get that for you, if I may, on notice.</p>	5 17/10/2016	
50.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> You mentioned a project in Western Australia. What project was that?</p>	5 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We did have some indicative estimates of the Perth Freight Link Project, which is obviously delayed due to some legal challenges. That is one project in WA. For instance, that has gone more slowly than we had anticipated.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> And other projects? What about Victoria?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to take on notice Victoria. I think on the whole the Victorian project has spent quite reasonably. I think there were delays in other projects. I know there were delays in some of the projects in Queensland—on the Bruce Highway and the like and the start of the Toowoomba range crossing. I could take on notice to give you the exact numbers by jurisdiction of the differences.</p>		
51.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Mr Mrdak, in ballpark figures, can you recall the promised figure for that financial year was?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think it came in pretty close to that but I will check that.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> No, we are talking about the start figure, not the couple of weeks before the cut-off.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am getting that for you on notice, Senator.</p>	7 17/10/2016	
52.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> So what are those figures?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will get those for you. The projected in 2015-16 and the actual.</p> <p><b>Mr Thomann:</b> If you refer to the financial budget outcome, in there is table 42—</p>	6 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I am just asking you to tell me the figure.</p> <p><b>Mr Thomann:</b> The figure in that table—the infrastructure spending quoted there—is \$5.54 billion.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you tell us what the promised figure was?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomann:</b> I do not have the—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that for you as quickly as possible.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Why don't you have that figure?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomann:</b> I apologise, Senator.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that for you.</p>		
53.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can we turn to the 2014-2015 budget. Can you tell us what the figure was at the start of the process and what you ended up spending?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomann:</b> I can tell you what—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I will get that, Senator. We are just getting that for you now.</p>	7 17/10/2016	
54.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you give me a like-for-line figure on what you actually spent? So that is the estimated figure?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, and we will have that reconciliation for you this morning.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK:</b> For 2015-16.</p>	8 17/10/2016	
55.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Following on from Senator Farrell's line of questioning, the promise was about \$8 billion and the spend was about \$5.7 billion, and you can argue that a few million here and there. Can you break it down to how there can be a</p>	9 17/10/2016	

				<p>\$2.3 billion difference? That is all we want to know—where there might be money not spent or whatever.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> In relation to 2014-15 I think some of that was payments of asset recycling, but I will get that information for you this morning.</p>		
56.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Isn't it the case that the Premier, Jay Weatherill, has committed to redirecting South Australia's portion of the savings identified in the project?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> He certainly has done that, but he is also seeking the Commonwealth make an additional commitment to that project from Commonwealth savings on the Northern Connector. We do not have the information as yet as to whether those savings are available and how they are available, which would give us the confidence to advise the government that that is an available option to them.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are you saying that you have not seen a copy of the 2012 SKM Oaklands Park grade separation study?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to check. I am not personally familiar with that, but I will check with my officers.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps someone can let us know today.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. When we come to the next item, which is Infrastructure Investment Division, I will have my officers here who are more acquainted with the project.</p>	20 17/10/2016	
57.	Infrastructure	Sterle	Maldon-	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> I just want to ask a question	24	

	Investment Division		Dombarton	<p>about the Maldon-Dombarton rail link. You have said you looked at the business case. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us what stage it is up to.</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We have gone back to the proponent, the New South Wales government, with a range of questions, and we are waiting to hear back from them.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okey-dokey. Are there any hiccups? Do you envisage any hiccups, or is it simply dotting the i and crossing the t?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> I would say that those are not straightforward questions, and that is reflected in the time that New South Wales has taken to respond to them.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And they have been consulted all the way through?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> Yes, we stay in touch with proponents as we undertake business case assessments.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What is the value of that project?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I expect the department has great details on that.</p>	17/10/2016	
58.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Lambie	Regional Development - Cyrene	<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Are you aware of the joint-venture between Tasmanian based paper manufacturer Norske Skog and Circa, a small Australian research based company, to produce Cyrene, which is an environmentally friendly</p>	27 17/10/2016	

				<p>solvent used in pharmaceutical and agricultural industries?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am aware of it from media coverage of the firms' proposals. I have not seen details of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Does this come under your department?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, it does. It falls under the regional development part of the portfolio.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> How long has the department known about this request for the allocated money—the \$960,000, give or take?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will check that if I may during the morning tea break and come back to you if that is okay.</p>		
59.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Lambie	Regional Development - Cyrene	<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Are you aware that if the Cyrene project is successful it could provide up to 30 direct jobs and generate export revenue of around \$50 million per year for Tasmania?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I will check that. I am not familiar with the project in any depth or detail. I will see if my officers can assist after the break.</p>	28 17/10/2016	
60.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Lambie	Regional Development - Cyrene	<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> I would like to clear this up: is there \$20 million sitting around or not? Which is it?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am going to take that on notice and check for you.</p>	28 17/10/2016	
61.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Lambie	Regional Development - Tasmania	<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Senator Abetz was in here earlier on, and you gave him a list of money that</p>	28 17/10/2016	

				<p>was spent or going to be spent in Tasmania.  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, I gave the senator a list of our current commitments of \$923 million over the program for Tasmania.  <b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Could you please let me know when all those projects were agreed to and when they will actually start rolling out?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I can certainly give you that on notice, if that is okay</p>		
62.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So there is \$1.1 billion in asset recycling which we have to go and talk to someone else about, and you have a list of the other \$1.4 billion?  <b>Mr Thomann:</b> Because we manage the Infrastructure Investment Program, so we have gone through—  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we table that list? It would save me writing it down.  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It is a handwritten note, but we can provide it to the committee.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Mine was going to be handwritten too.  <b>Mr Thomann:</b> We can provide you with a—  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> A cleaned up version.  <b>Mr Thomann:</b> a cleaned up version.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Before we depart?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will do that today.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Excellent.</p>	31-32 17/10/2016	
63.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Back	Tolls	<p><b>Senator BACK:</b> So in your consideration of the business case are you able to share with us whether or not, as a prediction, revenue from tolls would be likely to fully fund the project over a given number</p>	35 17/10/2016	

				<p>of years?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to check the numbers, but I think in essence the project is based on a number of things: as I said, an extension of an existing CityLink concession, which provides a further revenue source; some mix of new tolls on trucks and vehicles using the new sections; as well as the Victorian government contribution to the project.</p>		
64.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I have some questions on the Western Distributor. Just to clarify, Mr Mrdak, does the department do its own independent assessment of the Western Distributor compared with Infrastructure Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We have separately, but we also work with IA in terms of sharing resources as necessary. We have also taken a look at the business case in providing advice to the government.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you request the same range of documents that Infrastructure Australia have requested from the state government?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We have worked from the November 2015 business case, which has been provided to us, and we have gone back with a range of questions in relation to that to seek further information.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What further documents? I asked questions about the independent peer reviews. Has the department requested those?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Not to my knowledge, but I will take that on notice.</p>	35 17/10/2016	
65.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Western Distributor	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Could you take on notice whether</p>	36	

				<p>you have raised with the Victorian government the issue of, in the economic modelling, the use of this factor of the extra travel time benefit of avoiding travelling in congested conditions. It has not been used in other Australian projects before.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly I will come back to you on that one.</p>	17/10/2016	
66.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Xenophon	Commonwealth Funding Guidelines	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Time is short—is there a benchmark or criteria by which you assess the state plans and the federal criteria to ensure compliance?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> There are criteria that are available online. I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Are there any criteria that are not publicly available in terms of the process by which the benchmark is addressed?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Not that I am aware of.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> If you can take that on notice, and does the Commonwealth ever audit compliance with these plans after a project commences?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It is more along the lines that they have outcomes to achieve, and then there are compliance checks in relation to them.</p>	36 17/10/2016	
67.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Xenophon	Commonwealth Funding Guidelines	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> What legal rights does the Commonwealth retain to examine state government and prime contractor project and financial documents associated with projects funded by the Commonwealth government to ensure compliance with federal policy and legislation?</p>	36 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I think that is best taken on notice, because I think we will find that there are different circumstances.</p>		
68.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	National Stronger Regions	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. But is there any groundwork or any formula to think we will have a rough idea of how many jobs? I mean we just come out and say 'jobs', which is great, tremendous. But are we talking 50, are we talking 1,000—is there any idea?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It depends on the scale of the project and the nature of it, as I said. I cannot give you a rule of thumb that a certain number of dollars will produce this number of jobs. It really does depend on the nature of the project.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What has it delivered in past episodes,?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Well, certainly, the first three rounds of National Stronger Regions have delivered a range of projects which have had job creation.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I would be happy to provide on notice some examples of the projects. as the secretary is saying, it is quite difficult to just give you a straight answer because of the range of the value.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I understand.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> We have some that are 10 million and some that are a few thousand. There is no standard job requirement build, if you like, that we look to.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I fully understand, but I just would like to know if there was something you</p>	39 17/10/2016	

				<p>could tell us. If you can take that on notice and tell us how many jobs were created. All the years that I have been hanging around this place—the same time as you, Minister—we all come up with every project ends with a perfect zero. I still, for the life of me, do not know how governments get to that, but anyway. In terms of job creation, fantastic, but it is nice to say, well, how many jobs are going to come out of it rather than just a statement.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> When they put their applications forward, the applicants are very clear about the quantum of jobs that they believe will be created from the project. That is a very clear assessment that goes through to the department at the frontend.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Good. If you can provide that to us, that would be great.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> A selection of some?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I would like to see all of them. If the government is doing something good and jobs are created, let's all cheer from the same bloody building. Let's all say, 'This is fantastic.' I am not having a crack at you; I just want to know what jobs are being provided—</p>		
69.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Siewert	Perth Freight Link	<p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> I want to ask about Roe 8. I will get through the questions that I can but I will have other questions that I will put on notice. I will ask a more general question first, compared to the more detailed questions I will have in a minute. How many projects receiving over \$100 million have you funded without a publicly released business plan—if you have at all?</p>	41 17/10/2016	

				<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I do not readily have such information.		
70.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Siewert	Perth Freight Link	<p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> But the announcement from last week—you have not seen the contract they have actually signed?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I have not seen the contract.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Are you able to table the information that you have received from them?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I have not got any information with me in relation to that.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Could you take on notice to table the information that you have?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> This is in relation to last week's announcement?</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>	41-42 17/10/2016	
71.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Public Transport	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> It has been refreshing. I want to generally talk about the issue of investment in public transport that is currently being undertaken by the government. I spoke with Infrastructure Australia earlier about only one of their high priority or priority projects being a public transport project and that this imbalance is not desirable in terms of Infrastructure Australia's infrastructure plan. Could you outline and confirm how much of the government's \$50 billion transport and investment portfolio is going to public transport projects at the moment?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly, Senator. As we have</p>	43 17/10/2016	

				discussed previously, there are a range of rail projects which are part of the current program—we will get you that information and the latest on those. As well, we have discussed previously a number of the major road projects that also include access for bus lanes.		
72.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Public Transport	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What time span is it, then? From 2013 through until forward estimates?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> These figures are from 2013-14 through to 2018-19, at this stage.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So we are looking at seven years.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Of that order.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So \$2.3 billion over seven years—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The other one I should mention, which has just been drawn to my attention, is, obviously, the Gold Coast light rail project stages 1 and 2. More recently, we saw two weeks ago that the Prime Minister opened the Moreton Bay railway in Brisbane.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Still, the overall estimated cost to the government, the investment by the federal government, is \$2.3 billion for both—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It is probably more than that. I will take it on notice and give you an exact figure for what the rail estimates have been.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Let's say \$2.5 billion over six or seven years?</p>	44 17/10/2016	
73.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Anyway, in his answer he said: The 2015 WestConnex Updated Strategic Business</p>	46 17/10/2016	

				<p>Case was provided to the Department on 17 November 2015 following its review and endorsement by the NSW Cabinet. The updated business case includes capital costs at the P50 level.</p> <p>The Department has separately been provided with P90 costs for Stages 2 and 3 of WestConnex. So, the most recent figures the department has for stages 2 and 3 are both different to those published in the 2015 business case. Is that true?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I have no reason to doubt Mr Foulds's evidence. I will check that, though, to see if anything has changed. But I think that would be an accurate reflection.</p>		
74.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Okay. So we will assume that the answer to that is yes. Now, can you explain to us what the P90 cost estimates are that you have currently for stage 1?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Stage 1, which is the M4 widening and extension—I will see whether we have those figures here.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I think given the discussion this morning about costs that we should probably come back to you jointly with that answer, along with the IA answer, because I think they are probably intertwined.</p>	46 17/10/2016	
75.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> My first question: can you give us the P90 cost estimates for stage 1, and then the P90 cost estimates for stage 2, and then the P90 cost estimates for stage 3? And then I suppose you can add all of those up and then give us the P90 costs for the whole of the project, if that is</p>	46 17/10/2016	

				<p>possible.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that for you as fast as we can.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Thank you. You would not like to make a ballpark estimate of what that figure might be, just to help us along in the intervening period?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think it is best that we do not. I would not want to further muddy the discussion, if I was to get it wrong.</p>		
76.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I have some questions related to that. In respect of P90 and P50, at the last estimates Mr Foulds stated at page 139—Ms Leeming: you have taken over from Mr Foulds?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I have, just recently, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Senator Rice asked the question of whether a P90 is more robust and stronger than a P50, and the answer was: It is a standard deviation, effectively. If you have a bigger number, then your project is more likely to fit within that bigger number.</p> <p>Can you tell us, as a result, what other costs are not included in the \$16.8 billion P50 estimate?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I think that goes to the nature of the question that was asked earlier in the day. We will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I understand that. I am just completing all of those questions.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that information. Predominantly it is around the size of the contingency that is provided, but we will go and have a look at what is in that contingent amount</p>	46 17/10/2016	

				and whether it comes around the risk issues for the project.		
77.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Is the department now aware of the additional coalition election commitments that were not captured in the incoming government brief?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes. As you know, after each election there is a process that determines election commitments which we may not have captured fully but which in the future will be funded under either the infrastructure or the regional development program. Yes, we have gone through a reconciliation process. That is yet to be finalised, but we have gone through a reconciliation process.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you tell us what is on that list?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not think I have the full list here with me. I can take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Do you have some of the items?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not think I have a full list of the regional commitments.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> There are hundreds.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Just to clarify for our officers: you are asking for both transport infrastructure investment programs and regional projects.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Correct, all of those. But if there are hundreds, I will not ask you to—just to be clear: there are hundreds of promises which the government made in the course of the election which were not in the incoming government brief. Is that what you are saying?</p>	47 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> No, I think Ms Zielke is referring to the total numbers, some hundreds, for projects that were identified in our incoming government brief, as well as some additional ones—as we have done the reconciliation across all portfolios—which have now become the responsibility of this portfolio, which is the process.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Yes, okay. So we are obviously going to have things in two lists: one that you obviously provide to the incoming government and then an additional list of those additional commitments that you became aware of afterwards.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> And, in total, they total some hundreds?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> And you can now give us, shortly, a total list of all of those commitments.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, I will provide that on notice.</p>		
78.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> You are talking about some projects going back to 2013. You obviously have had some projects in the lead-up to the election. Were any of these projects announced in the caretaker period?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> All of the announcements during the caretaker period were election commitments, to my knowledge. I will just check. I do not think there were any projects which had been previously agreed that were announced during the caretaker period.</p>	49 17/10/2016	

79.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Mr Mrdak, I am now going to go through a number of projects which fit into the category we have just been discussing. You might be able to tell me, with each of these projects, what discussions the department has had prior to the government's announcements with the relevant state governments in the case of the ones I am going to mention. The first is fixing roads in the seat of Dobell, which was \$12.3 million with the New South Wales Central Coast Council. Can you tell us what discussions the department have had in respect of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am just trying to identify that project. We have a range of projects. I would have to take on notice what discussions we have had with the state government in relation to those. We have a project at Hutton Road, The Entrance North. Those types of projects fit into that area. If I may take on notice what discussions were held with state governments.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> All right. I suspect that might be your answer to each of the—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I suspect so.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I will read out the ones that I have an interest in, and perhaps you can come back to me.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> The first one is the one I have just mentioned: fixing roads in Dobell for \$12.3 million; the Inverell roundabout at \$1.5 million—if you do happen to have some personal knowledge about these, please speak up.</p>	49 17/10/2016	
-----	------------------------------------	---------	----------------------	--	------------------	--

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We certainly will. If I or my officers know of them, I will let you know.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> That is obviously with New South Wales and the Inverell Shire Council. The Mount Eliza school parking upgrade—that was \$28,000 from Victoria; a study into the inland rail connection to the Port of Gladstone, \$25,000 from Queensland.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> On that one, I can confirm we had not had any discussions with the state government in relation to that.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> No discussions?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is a government initiative.</p>		
80.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Don't be embarrassed. He is often not clear about some of the things he says, so this would not be an exception. The other two I want to refer to are the Mayo road upgrades of \$1.2 million. Do you have anything on that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> No, I will get that information for you.</p>	50 17/10/2016	
81.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> And the Saltwater Bridge upgrade, for \$80,000, in Tasmania.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, we will take that on notice.</p>	50 17/10/2016	
82.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> We will come to the submarines tomorrow, and that will be a fascinating exercise. Secretary, let us be clear about this: you are saying that Victoria, with roughly 25 per cent of the Australian population, is only receiving 14 per cent of this government's infrastructure spend.</p>	55-56 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> With the current commitments that have been agreed with the state of Victoria, clearly—</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> What else can we talk about?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> the government has made provision. You mentioned earlier the additional \$3 billion for the East West Link project. Should that proceed, that would also change the equation for funding for Victoria.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Let us assume that Mr Turnbull unlocked that locked box and we got the \$3 billion out. About how many jobs do you think would be created with an infrastructure spend of that size?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Of that quantum?</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Yes. Mr Turnbull has a change of heart. He gets his key out and unlocks the box. We have the \$3 billion. How many Victorian jobs will that create?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to get some advice. It is very much as we were discussing earlier—the impact of individual projects depends on the scale and the nature of the project. I can certainly seek some advice about how many jobs were proposed under the East West Link project and others.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I guess from time to time the numbers could be slightly different, but I am just asking for a ballpark figure.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am happy to get some figures for you.</p>		
83.	Infrastructure	Sterle	Election	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have your people been able to	58	

	Investment Division		Commitments	<p>look at that list of infrastructure announcements made during the election, Mr Mrdak?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We have someone looking at that at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have you been able to get the committee a copy of the Victorian funding announcements made during the election that we have not got?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We were trying to do the comparison with the table that you provided. If you would like just a list of what we have by way of the Victorian election—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No. The Victorian election?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The Commonwealth election in Victoria.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, the recent federal election. In case there is any confusion, I have asked that the committee have a copy of that as well, please.</p>	17/10/2016	
84.	Infrastructure Investment Division	McCarthy	National Stronger Regions	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thanks, Senator. Mr Mrdak, in relation to the National Stronger Regions Fund I have a couple of questions, which you might like to take on notice. Firstly, I would like to know how many were from the Northern Territory in rounds 1 to 3.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Do you want them separate or added together?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So under round 1.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Under round 1 in the Northern Territory we received 15 applications, in round 2 in the Northern Territory again we received 15 applications and in round 3 we received nine</p>	61 17/10/2016	

				<p>applications.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What are you able to reveal about each of those applications?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I do not have that detail with me at the moment, sorry, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Yes.</p>		
85.	Infrastructure Investment Division	McCarthy	National Stronger Regions	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many applications have been received?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The department received around 36 submissions from the state and territory governments.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many from the Northern Territory?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> We received four proposals from the Northern Territory.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Are you able to reveal the total sum of those amounts?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I am afraid I do not have the information in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Would you be able to get that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Will you take that question on notice for me?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> Yes.</p>	62 17/10/2016	
86.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Watt	Northern Australia Beef Roads	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> That is right. It will be even longer still. Has there been any modelling done by either the state or federal governments about the likely</p>	63 17/10/2016	

				<p>jobs that would be created out of any of these projects or in total under this program?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I do not have that detail in front of me. We would expect that as those projects move toward the delivery phase we will have more information around the sorts of jobs that would likely be generated from the individual proposals.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Would you mind just taking on notice whether there has been any modelling done either as part of the submissions from the states or by yourselves as to the job benefits that might arise from that program?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>		
87.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Watt	Gold Coast-Brisbane	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Why is it that Logan and the Gold Coast are not getting the same funding deal that is being offered by the Commonwealth in all those other examples I just gave, whether it be in Queensland or interstate?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The upgrades along that area of the Pacific Motorway in Queensland over the last decade or more have traditionally been funded on a fifty-fifty basis, recognising that there is a significant urban nature to those projects. Since around the middle 2000s upgrades that have occurred on that stretch of road have been funded between the Queensland government and the federal government on a fifty-fifty basis. It is continuing that same funding approach that has occurred historically.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I am aware that there have been some instances where fifty-fifty has been provided</p>	64 17/10/2016	

				<p>for the motorway but at the very same time the federal government of the day was also providing a very large amount of funding for other Gold Coast infrastructure projects such as providing light rail stage 1 on the Gold Coast. I think the Commonwealth chipped in 60 per cent of that funding, at hundreds of millions of dollars, so could it be that that was the reason why in that instance fifty-fifty was being offered whereas at the moment there is nothing like that amount of money being put on the table for any public transport projects in Queensland by the federal government?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I think the contribution to Gold Coast light rail was in the vicinity of \$95 million, if my memory serves me correctly, stage 2—</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Which was about 45 per cent of the cost. The state government in Queensland is putting in about 75 per cent of the cost of stage 2 of the light rail, whereas I understand the Commonwealth government put in about 60 per cent of the cost of stage 1 of the light rail. Are those figures about right?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to check but that sounds about right.</p>		
88.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Watt	Gold Coast-Brisbane	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Are you aware of any representations that have been made by Gold Coast federal members of parliament that the government should be funding this on an 80-20 basis? Have they made any representations to you or the minister that you have had to respond to?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I</p>	65 17/10/2016	

				am not—		
89.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Watt	Gold Coast- Brisbane	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> If you could, that would be great. Similar to my question about beef roads, has the department or the state government done any modelling in making funding submissions? Have they done any modelling about the number of jobs that would be created as a result of these upgrades?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, we will check that in terms of the project proposals.</p>	65 17/10/2016	
90.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Watt	Northern Australia	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Are you sure that the projects that have ended up being funded under tranche 1 of NARP all scored highly in that northern Australia audit?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I cannot say that they all did, but it was a consideration in the scoring criteria, so I would expect a strong bias towards those. I can take that on notice, if you like.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> If you could—yes. I do not know exactly what level of detail we can get about that evaluation and the audit, but I would be interested to see the priority that those projects had under the northern Australia audit and how that was taken into account in that decision to allocate funding for those projects. Could you take one other thing on notice, which is the same question I have asked about other programs: any modelling that you have about the number of jobs that are likely to be created. I suppose what I am interested in is the \$600 million bucket as a whole, and the \$240 million that is left over. That would be great.</p>	67 17/10/2016	

				<b>Mr Pittar:</b> Certainly.		
91.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	National Stronger Regions	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have there been any changes to the allocation of funding or milestones for projects from round 1? Are all round 1 projects proceeding? Were there any dropped off? Or is there an 18-month lag before you can get the money on, or what?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I do not have the material here to answer that question at the moment.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We will need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. So that we are very clear: have there been any changes to the allocation of funding or milestones for projects from round 1? And your answer is that you do not know.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I do not have that information here today, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are all round 1 projects proceeding?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Why don't you know?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We do not have the list with us.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Does that indicate a lack of preparation?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It probably indicates the amount of information that we have. My apologies for not having it with us, though.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have there been any changes to the allocation of funding or milestones for projects from round 2?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Again, we will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are all projects in round 2 proceeding?</p>	70 17/10/2016	

				<b>Ms Zielke:</b> We will take that on notice.		
92.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	National Stronger Regions	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are these difficult research questions? Or is it just—go and look in the box and find it?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It is scale. For example, as Ms Wall said, there are 51 projects in round 1, so it is about having the current status of all 51 of those projects in front of us, and I am afraid we do not have that today.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> But I thought there were 68 projects if you count the ones in the capital cities and the regions.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> No, what I said was that you need to take away from the 51 the 17 to get you to your regional, remote—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> When I used to play darts, three 17s was 51, so that means that 30 per cent are actually in major capital cities. The National Stronger Regions Fund is allocating 30 per cent of the projects in national capital cities! Oh, well. So, how are we going to deal with this? I going to ask repetitive questions and you are going to take them on notice. Do we get them today, or do we get them next month, or—</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I am happy to take it on notice for all rounds.</p>	70-71 17/10/2016	
93.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	National Stronger Regions	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is the department aware of any projects not recommended for funding by the department that did receive funding after the ministerial panel's decision?	71-72 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Ms Wall:</b> There were two projects. One was the construction of the Charleston Dam facility—Etheridge Shire Council was the applicant.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is that in Queensland, is it?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I believe so, yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Indeed, it is.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> The panel considered the department's recommendation and, based on the information the panel had available, they thought that the department had underestimated—</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> The ministers were able to bring additional information to the table. That information showed that we had underestimated the scoring against criteria one, two and four, therefore it was rated more highly and for that reason moved up in the ranking and was funded as part of the round.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much was it?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It was \$10 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And what was the information that was brought to the table that the department had not taken notice of, or had an oversight on or what?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I do not have the exact details in front of me. I am more than happy to provide that as quickly as we can, though.</p>		
94.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Election Commitments	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I just want to come back to the list of new Infrastructure Investment program announcements from the government during the election that was provided to the PBO. Firstly, there were 84—is that correct? I was counting</p>	72-73 17/10/2016	

				<p>them but I just ran out of time. Were there 84, Mr Mrdak?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I have not counted them.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You do not know—okay. Firstly, would we agree that that was the list that was provided to the Parliamentary Budget Office?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes. That was published as the coalition costing document.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Now, there are 80-odd there—proposals—and this is a total of \$859 million. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What I did ask was: how many were there from Victoria? Then one of the officials started listing Victorian announcements. I am not interested in those other ones—black spots or major projects. I am purely asking the question: how many announcements were made? These were predominantly made by backbenchers in their own electorates, holding hands with a senior member of the government and announcing truck bays or whatever they may be. How many Victorian announcements?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We are happy to table the list of Victorian projects that were there.</p>		
95.	Infrastructure Investment Division	McCarthy, Gallacher	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In respect of the Northern Territory agreement, what asset sales were recognised by the parties in that agreement?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> There were two asset sales: the sale of the Territory Insurance Office and the lease of the Port of Darwin.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you table that</p>	74 17/10/2016	

				<p>agreement, as you did with New South Wales and the ACT?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice. They are Treasury portfolio documents.</p>		
96.	Infrastructure Investment Division	McCarthy, Gallacher	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We were advised that the Department of Infrastructure provided copies of the signed asset recycling agreements with New South Wales and the ACT at previous estimates hearings.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am happy to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you will take on notice that we would like to see—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The NT.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In respect of the agreements with the Territory Insurance Office and the lease of the Port of Darwin?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.</p>	74 17/10/2016	
97.	Infrastructure Investment Division	McCarthy	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How much funding is being provided to the Northern Territory in respect of the Port of Darwin transaction?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> My understanding is that the total Commonwealth asset recycling payment to the Northern Territory is \$40.4 million.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is that over a period of time or is that a one-off payment?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to take it on notice as to when that is being paid.</p>	75 17/10/2016	
98.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am sure she is on her way, Senator. I am happy to try to assist. Perhaps while we waiting</p>	76 17/10/2016	

				<p>I will also answer another question on notice—to save the paperwork. Senator Farrell asked for job numbers for the East West Link project in Melbourne. I am advised that the Victorian government estimated that around 6,700 jobs would be created by the two sections of the East West Link project, stages 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps I could ask about the asset recycling and the 15 per cent figure and the \$40 million. You had TIO and the port. Was it 15 per cent of the price sale that they were supposed to get? How does that come out of \$40 million?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> They are the figures I have before me. I am happy to take that on notice. Mr Danks might be able to help.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You had two figures.</p> <p><b>Mr Danks:</b> It is 15 per cent of the allocation of the sale they put towards infrastructure. The NT government did not put the entirety of the sale proceeds towards infrastructure. They used some to retire debt. They put a component towards it and they got the 15 per cent, which was \$40.4 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So the two figures we have are—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> \$410.9 million for the TIO and \$506 million for the lease of Darwin port.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I was trying to work out how that was 15 per cent of \$900 million—and obviously it is not.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It was only what was applied to new infrastructure.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So we just subtract until we get to \$40 million. What are \$40 million and 15 per cent of?</p> <p><b>Mr Danks:</b> Off the top of my head, it is probably \$280 million. But we should probably take that on notice and confirm it.</p>		
99.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Gallacher	Asset Recycling	<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It varies across jurisdictions. New South Wales, for instance, had a very large infrastructure spend, utilising the asset recycling money.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So they get 15 per cent of \$10 billion for their power networks?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> They got a much larger number, which we can provide to you. I do not have the exact figures.</p>	77 17/10/2016	
100.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	East West Link	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mr Mrdak, you said that the Victorian government identified 6,700 jobs for the two stages of the East West Link project.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is my advice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is there a document that we could see that says that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice. I have just been given the numbers to try to give you an answer today. I will give you a more fulsome answer in writing.</p>	77 17/10/2016	
101.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Community Development Grants	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Minister Nash, can you shed some light on any of the projects that are coming forward? Is there a list available that we have not seen, or is there a spend next to the list—</p>	78 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator Nash:</b> The CDGs that were election commitments or that were outside of that?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Whatever gets swept up in the allocation of funding.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I was just going to say that as I outlined this morning to the committee there is still a process underway to finalise the list of CDG commitments through the mid-year economic forecast process that is now taking place. Once that is finalised, the government will be in a position to finalise the list of projects and recipients.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> But surely it would be reasonable to ask what list was announced in the election? If you are out there announcing projects under the CDG program there should be a list compiled that the committee can have a look at.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am advised that the list is nearing finalisation. That should be available shortly. I am happy to take that on notice to provided to the committee, via the minister, once it is finalised.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I suppose I will ask there how long a piece of string is! Minister, through you, if commitments were given through the election obviously they were in the 'Young bugle' or wherever they might be announced. With you coming to the rescue of a backbencher when you are having a three-way contest, I understand how it all works—but I do not think it is it unreasonable for the committee to ask or the list that was announced through the election period. Then, when you finish the final wish list, we will have that as well.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<b>Senator Nash:</b> We can do that. We will take that on notice.		
102.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Community Development Grants	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, but what was the election announcement for 2016? How much was that?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> We have not said that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> This is the one you are going to come back to us on. I am trying to find out where the \$363.9 million came from. Something in my head is telling me this might be election commitments. It might be around this figure that adds up to \$363.9 million, which is \$15-point-something million.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> In the coalition costing document that you handed out previously, under 'infrastructure, transport and regional development' the government included \$477.9 million worth of election commitments for CDG.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Minister, you said you would take it on notice when I asked about that. If, for whatever reason, you cannot provide that at this stage, could you tell us how much the election commitments were under the CDG program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> To add to that, in this document there are also a number of other projects in other portfolios that are being delivered through CDG. They have allocated \$32.5 million to the Central Coast Medical School. That is under 'education and training'. At the moment, under 'health, aged care, sport and rural health' we have two MRI licences for the Frankston hospital and the Maroondah Hospital.</p>	79 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I have no idea where Maroondah is.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Sorry, neither do I at the moment. So that is \$6 million each for them.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So that is \$12 million for the two MRIs.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Under 'trade and investment', there is a boost to tourism jobs and growth in the Dandenong Ranges, which was \$20 million in this document, and \$10 million will be delivered through CDG. When we provide the list you will see those items on there as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Minister, could you tell us how much was promised in the election?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I can take it on notice for you, to make sure that we get you the right figure. I would prefer to do that, given we are still finalising—</p>		
103.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Let me throw a few questions at you and see if you can help me out. Will Blackmore Oval in Leichhardt or Easton Park in Rozelle be made use of for drilling or staging areas during the construction phase of stage 3 of WestConnex?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not think we have that detail with us. Can I take that on notice?</p>	80 17/10/2016	
104.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, of course. Will access to the Canal Road Film Centre in Leichhardt be affected during the construction phase?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I think the issue with answering the questions, from the department's perspective, is</p>	80 17/10/2016	

				<p>that the actual design for stage 3 of WestConnex has not been released yet. We have a rough idea where the road is going to go, but the actual detailed design work has not been done.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That is fine.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> If you could place on record your questions, we will take them to New South Wales and get answers for you.</p>		
105.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> But if you have got an answer throw it at us. There is no drama. You will not get into trouble, Ms Leeming, if you answer the question. There are no dramas there. If active recreational space currently used by local sporting clubs and for other community uses is lost during the construction phase or permanently, will funding be made available to provide replacement space and facilities?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again.</p>	80 17/10/2016	
106.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes. Given there is no interchange planned for Leichhardt, is the drilling or dive site required to be located there at all?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not have an answer, but we will chase that up for you.</p>	80 17/10/2016	
107.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us which locations in Leichhardt, Rozelle and Camperdown are being considered for use as dive or drilling sites during the construction phase of the stage 3 of the project? Once again, I know what you are going to say, Mr Mrdak—no worries. Beyond the properties already identified for acquisition on Victoria Road, Rozelle, are there any properties being considered for acquisition to enable the</p>	80 17/10/2016	

				construction of stage 3 of the project? How many property owners in Victoria Road, Rozelle, have been made formal offers for the acquisition of their properties? Where will the emissions stacks for the Rozelle and Camperdown exchanges be located?		
108.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Since it was announced at \$10 billion, has there been any approach for more money from New South Wales, or is that it?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is the Commonwealth's commitment to this point. We are awaiting advice in relation to the next stages of the project, which are what is called the Sydney Gateway component, which is the road between WestConnex stage 2 and the airport and the port, and, obviously, stage 3. New South Wales is yet to finalise those and make any funding requests in relation to those.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will not harp on it, but we have established now that we are getting closer to \$20 billion.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We are checking that with New South Wales.</p>	81 17/10/2016	
109.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>ACTING CHAIR (Senator Sterle):</b> Tremendous—thank you very much. The Chair has requested that the Australian Rail Track Corporation come now. While we are waiting for them, I might just quickly flicked to you, Mr Mrdak. I want to go back to earlier questions from today, on the differentials for the 2015-16 budget from the 2014 one.</p> <p>Do you remember the \$2½ billion, and then we chucked on the GST? So the final outcome was the different figure. The official at the table explained</p>	126-127 17/10/2016	

				<p>some underspends, but those totals were nowhere near the gap. This is without taking into account what I had talked about with the \$490 or \$499 million GST fix to WA. So I would just ask if you could please check your figures for the variances with these two points and verify those for us.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. The tables we tabled with the committee earlier today give you most of that. They were the major movements of funds. To go to the next level, which is the minors, I can certainly see if there is any further detail we can provide. Obviously, that will be on notice.</p>		
110.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Budget Outcomes	<p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> All right. And while you are at it: in particular, is the Treasury \$1.1 billion figure inclusive of the GST figure? You may want to take that on notice as well.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The WA GST—</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Yes, the WA GST 'fix'. I will call it a fix.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Clearly, what we have also identified in there is the asset-recycling money, which has been moved as well. It is an essential component of that.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Yes. I think we saw about \$7 million, or something like that? No—there is a voice from the back of the room! Great.</p> <p><b>Ms Potter:</b> The variance for asset recycling was actually \$1.3 billion.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Oh, \$1.3 billion. Thank you for that. And what is the movement of funds held in general subcontingency between the 2014 budget and the 2015-16 final budget outcome?</p>	127 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Ms Potter:</b> I am sorry, I do not have that information.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>		
111.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	National Stronger Regions Fund (program now closed)	<p>How much funding from the National Stronger Regions Fund was allocated to major capital cities in Rounds 1 – 3?</p> <p>a) How much funding from the National Stronger Regions Fund was allocated to regional, rural and remote councils in the program?</p> <p>b) Have there been any changes to the allocation of funding or milestones for projects from Round 1? Are all Round 1 projects proceeding?</p> <p>c) Have there been any changes to the allocation of funding or milestones for projects from Round 2? Are all Round 2 projects proceeding?</p> <p>d) What was the nature of the advice that the Department provided to the Ministerial Panel on Round 3 projects? - For example did it rank projects, or just simply provide a list of those that meet criteria and could be funded?</p> <p>e) Was it a condition of funding that projects had received planning approval or local government approval before having funding approved?</p> <p>f) Is the Department aware of any projects not recommended for funding by the Department that did receive funding after the Ministerial Panel's decision?</p> <p>g) Were there any projects that were recommended for NSRF funding in the Department's advice to the Ministerial Panel which did not receive funding?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
112.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Infrastructure program	<p>In written answer 94 from February 2016 Estimates, Infrastructure Investment estimated "total funding Australia-wide" for the period from 2014-5 to 2019-20 onwards as being \$41,961 million. How much of this funding is for the years 2020-21 onwards?</p> <p>a) How much Bruce Highway funding is currently allocated for 2020-21 onwards?</p>	Written	27/10/2016

113.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Oakajee	<p>Is the \$339M for the Oakajee port still in the Budget for 2016-7?</p> <p>a) If yes, what is the status of this project?</p> <p>b) What is the project's completion date?</p> <p>c) Has the WA Government asked for this project to proceed?</p> <p>d) If yes details? If no, what is the actual status of this project?</p> <p>e) Has the WA Government made any requests of the Department about the allocation of the Oakajee funds?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
114.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	<p>How many projects is the Department active on, that are likely candidates for the NAIF?</p> <p>a) What are they?</p> <p>b) Has the Department been consulted by the Department of Industry, or the NAIF, about projects it is looking at? If yes, which projects?</p> <p>c) Has the WA Government proposed projects to the NAIF? If yes, which projects?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
115.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Roads to Recovery	<p>Has the Department done any assessment of how increases to the Roads to Recovery programme have impacted the backlog in local roads maintenance around Australia?</p> <p>a) How much additional funds did Narromine Shire receive in 2015-6 and 2016-7 from Roads to Recovery?</p> <p>b) Have these funds been applied for and paid?</p> <p>c) What priority does waterlogged sections of Jamea Road in Trangie have on Narromine Shire's road maintenance program?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
116.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Westconnex concessional loan	<p>Leaving aside the timing benefits, what net financial benefit does the addition of the Commonwealth to the concessional loan facility bring for the NSW Government?</p> <p>a) What net extra costs would NSW have incurred without Commonwealth involvement?</p> <p>b) What are the costs to the Commonwealth from the establishment of the concessional loan facility between the Commonwealth and NSW, and with the banks? For instance cost of engagement of consultants like PWC.</p>	Written	27/10/2016

117.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Westconnex land acquisition	I refer to the answer given on October 17 relating to land acquisition costs being included in the \$16.8 billion figure. a) What amount is allocated for “land acquisition costs” within that cost estimate? b) What amount is allocated for compensation to businesses within that cost estimate? c) Does the Federal Government support the use of Federal funds for land and business acquisition where impacted by a Federally-funded project?	Written	27/10/2016
118.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Contingencies	What is the current position on contingencies in the Infrastructure Investment Program? a) Unallocated national contingency in the Infrastructure Investment program? b) Unallocated Bruce Highway contingency? c) Unallocated Pacific Highway contingency? d) Unallocated Midland Highway contingency? e) Are there any other specified contingency amounts? f) If yes, what are they and what is the current contingency?	Written	27/10/2016
119.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Projects during election	The Government’s list of spending commitments (Coalition’s Policy for a Stronger Economy and Balanced Budget) during the recent election campaign for the Department includes the following spending amounts profiled over the forward estimates: a) Building Better Regions Program - \$297.7M b) Community Development Grants - \$477.9M c) Jobs and Growth in Regional Australia - \$200M d) Smart Cities - \$50M  For each of these programs, please list all the projects that are funded.	Written	27/10/2016
120.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	National partnership Agreements	Are all the National Partnership Agreements with States and Territories that are published on the Department website as at October 26 2016 the current agreements? a) If not, which ones have been superseded? b) Why isn’t the current version/s published?	Written	27/10/2016
121.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Sterle	Townsville Eastern Access	How much has the Government committed to this project? a) What is the total cost of the project?	Written	27/10/2016

			Rail Corridor	b) What is the IA assessed BCR for this project?		
122.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	How much has the Australian Government already contributed to the Ellerton Drive Extension project? a) What have the funds been used for and when? Are these funds part of or additional to the \$25 million grant announced in June 2014? b) Has the department or any other department of the Australian Government prepared a business case or a risk assessment for the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension? Please provide details? If not, when will this work be undertaken?	Written	28/10/2016
123.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	What requirements or benchmarks must be met before the Australian Government will release [the balance of] funds it has committed to the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension? a) How will the department assess whether these benchmarks have been met? b) Should the department assess that the benchmarks have not been met, what does it propose to do?	Written	28/10/2016
124.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Has the Australian government had any discussions with the NSW about financial contingencies? For example, in the event that the actual construction costs are higher than the estimated, has the Australian Government provided any undertakings to cover any shortfall in funding that cannot be met by the proposed NSW and Australian government grants, and the loan that Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council proposes to raise to cover the developers' financial contribution to road construction costs? \ a) If so, please provide details? b) If not, what is the department's/government's view about providing any such financial 'safety net' for the council for this project?	Written	28/10/2016
125.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Has anyone in the department read the Financial Risk Assessment prepared for Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council and published on 28 June 2016?	Written	28/10/2016
126.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Has the department assessed the Council's proposed funding approach to be financially prudent? If so, on what basis?	Written	28/10/2016
127.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Is the department aware of the following financial risks associated with this project?	Written	28/10/2016

				<p>a) Council has used forecast housing starts far in excess of historical averages, which influence whether and over what period section 94 contributions will be received to repay the proposed Council loan to developers for their contribution to the Ellerton Drive Extension construction costs?[The council expects the average number of new housing developments in Queanbeyan over the next 20 years to be about 460 per year but over the past 14 years the average number of new houses has been 289 per year, which the council ascribes to a lack of land. If housing development is not as high as forecast, the council will take longer to recoup the developer contributions needed to finance the loan and may need to finance part of the loan, at least temporarily, from other revenue. Source: <i>Queanbeyan City Council Supplementary Council Meeting Attachment 1</i>, 16 December 2015][The financial risk assessment notes that the real estate market in the catchment areas for Googong has been flat since 2010, largely because of cuts to the APS employment. Staffing cuts continue and are projected to do so for some years. See pg 3 of the assessment.]</p> <p>b) The prospect of council having to renegotiate section 94 contributions to fund cost overruns on the road construction, noting that as a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) is in place for Googong, the Googong township developers would need to agree to renegotiate section 94 agreements.[Over the next 20 years, each new housing lot in greater Queanbeyan will make an equal contribution to the EDE. For a \$25m loan the EDE contribution per housing lot will be about \$3,980; for a \$40m loan, it will be about \$7,020. The amount per lot will be adjusted according to the final cost of the EDE.]</p> <p>c) The prospect of Council having to find alternative sources of funding in certain housing demand settings, which could cause other infrastructure to be</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>deferred. [Under a low demand setting and construction costs of \$81.4 million, developer contributions would fall short and the loan would take longer to repay. See pp 6-7 of the financial risk assessment.]</p> <p>What analysis, if any, has the department undertaken of each of these risks? What was the outcome of any analysis?</p>		
128.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	How has the department/government satisfied itself that the Ellerton Drive Extension presents 'value for money', in particular given that the previous Queanbeyan City Council conceded before the councillors were dismissed in May 2016 that it would <i>also</i> need to build Dunns Creek Rd, scheduled for 25 years' time?	Written	28/10/2016
129.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	The Googong and Tralee traffic study ruled out the northern bypass on the grounds it was too expensive but at the time there was no contemporary costing for the northern bypass. Has the department sought an estimate of the cost to build the northern bypass? If so, when and what was the estimate?	Written	28/10/2016
130.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Is the department aware that the previous Queanbeyan City Council confirmed that the Ellerton Drive Extension would reduce through traffic in the city centre by just 5%, providing minimal relief compared to previous claims by the council?	Written	28/10/2016
131.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Is the department aware that the NSW Roads and maritime Services has declined to designate the Ellerton Drive Extension as a state road, and that Council has downgraded the road to a single carriageway?	Written	28/10/2016
132.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Ellerton Drive Extension	Is the department aware that the contrary to its recommendation in support of the Ellerton Drive Extension, the Googong and Tralee traffic study actually identified a combination of the northern bypass and Dunns Creek Rd as providing the best traffic solution for Queanbeyan?	Written	28/10/2016
133.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Westconnex	The \$2bn concessional loan for WestConnex Stage 2 was granted on the condition that the Stage 2 Trustee be granted the toll concession for the existing M5 West from 2026 to 2060, and for the existing M5 East from 2020 to 2060. Commuters from Southwest Sydney will go from paying almost nothing for using the M5 today, to about \$3,300 a	Written	28/10/2016

				<p>year from 2020, and about \$6,500 a year from 2026.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Has there been any assessment of the risk that the NSW Government will renege on its promise to extend the M5 West toll concession to 2060, due to political pressure?</li> <li>b) If the NSW Government does renege on its promise to extend the M5 West toll concession, how would this affect its ability to repay the concessional loan? And how would this affect the financing for WestConnex Stage 3?</li> <li>c) Has there been any assessment of the impact on future WestConnex traffic volumes of increasing the M5 toll from effectively \$200 at present to \$6500 a year?</li> </ul>		
134.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Infrastructure Investment Breakdown	<p>Could the Department please provide an itemised list of previous and agreed to Commonwealth contributions to all rail projects (including passenger and freight, light and heavy) between September 18 2013 and June 30 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Could the Department also please provide an itemised list of previous and agreed to Commonwealth contributions to all road projects between September 18 2013 and June 30 2020.</li> <li>b) Additionally for both the above, please note where contributions have already gone over to the states or where there is an agreement for money to go over to the states yet the sum has not yet been transferred to the states.</li> <li>c) Also please outline where a specific contribution is a concessional loan as opposed to a full Commonwealth contribution.</li> </ul>	Written	28/10/2016
135.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Rice	Freight and Bruce Highway	<p>Is the Department, in partnership with the Queensland Government, still committed \$8.5 billion to a ten year Bruce Highway Upgrade Programme from 2013-14 as part of the Infrastructure Investment Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What has been the outlays from 2008 to date by the Commonwealth Government towards upgrades of the Queensland North Coast railway line north of Petrie (excluding the new Moreton Bay railway).</li> <li>b) Is the Department aware of a recent detailed report</li> </ul>	Written	28/10/2016

				<p>that considers that the Queensland North Coast railway line is in need of a \$2.5 billion upgrade to avoid large volumes of freight being forced off rail and onto the Bruce Highway.</p> <p>c) Is the Department aware that during 2015-16, an old wooden bridge over a Cabbage Tree Creek north of Bundaberg was replaced by a concrete one without a dangerous nearby curve (site of the 2004 tilt train derailment) being eased.</p> <p>d) Has the Department considered funding upgrades to the Queensland North Coast railway line between Petrie and Cairns.</p>		
136.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Brown	Carers Foundation	<p>a) During the election Minister Peter Dutton announced funding of \$400,000 for The Carers Foundation, is the Department aware of this commitment?</p> <p>b) Is the funding being progressed by the Department? If so, where in the Department is this funding coming from?</p> <p>c) Can you explain what this funding is for, including who will be able to access funded services?</p> <p>d) Is a funding agreement in place yet for this funding?</p> <p>e) How does this funding fit with the Department's work on an Integrated Plan for Carer Support Services?</p> <p>f) Will additional respite funding be made available in other areas of Australia or just in Mr Dutton's electorate of Dickson? If so, where will the services be, what is the quantum of funding, what program will this be funded under and who will be eligible to access the services?</p> <p>g) Is there any other funding for carers that the Department is managing that was announced by the Government as an election commitment? If so, where will the services be, what is the quantum of funding, what program will this be funded under and who will be eligible to access the services?</p>	Written	28/10/2016
137.				<i>Question transferred from Infrastructure Investment</i>		

				<i>Division to Australian Rail Track Corporation. See below.</i>		
138.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Griff	Sports Facilities	What is the projected timeline for the construction of the Mount Barker Regional Sports Hub?	Written	28/10/2016
139.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Griff	Sports Facilities	What is the projected timeline for upgrading sporting facilities for Strathalbyn Football Club, the Adelaide Hills Soccer Club, and the Yankalilla Hockey Club?	Written	28/10/2016
140.	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Okay, so these are questions I could properly put towards Airservices, and I will. But my understanding is that Airservices is required to provide a risk assessment to CASA arising out of organisational change. Is that the case?</p> <p><b>Mr Tiede:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Have they done this in this case?</p> <p><b>Mr Tiede:</b> They have.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Are you able to provide us with a copy of that risk assessment?</p> <p><b>Mr Tiede:</b> I do not have it with me, but yes.</p>	85 17/10/2016	
141.	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Can you provide details to this committee of the information that has been requested, including any emails, correspondence, notes or other documentation as to the flow of information between CASA and Airservices Australia about this organisational change.</p> <p><b>Mr Tiede:</b> We will be able to do that—not right now.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I realise that. I am asking you to take it on notice.</p>	85 17/10/2016	
142.	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Xenophon	ADS-B	<b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I am. I am very close. Can I just say that if aircraft fly below cloud cover,	88 17/10/2016	

				<p>visually—if aircraft do not have ADS-B, they have to fly visually—correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Yes, they have to fly visually. That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> The point that Dick Smith has made to me just again today is that that poses a risk to pilots. There has never been a case of a mid-air collision in this country involving aircraft in clouds—is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I did see a quote to that effect. I assume it is correct; I have heard that.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> He has expressed a concern previously and again today that requiring pilots who cannot afford to install ADS-B to fly visually below clouds itself is problematic from a safety point of view. Is that something you have assessed?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Not to my knowledge. I can take that on notice and see whether we have. I do not know the answer to that, I am sorry.</p>		
143.	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Xenophon	ADS-B	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> My final question is a follow-up. The base of your assertion is that it might be more expensive in a few years time, and that did not work for flat screen TVs or other technology.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Different technology. But that is just an assertion in the same way as it is an assertion that it will get cheaper, if I may, by AOPA.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> And that generally happens with new technology?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> It might.</p>	88 17/10/2016	

				<b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Could you get back to me on that. Thank you, Chair, for your patience.		
144.	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Xenophon	ADS-B	What empirical or other data does CASA have to ground the claim that that ADS-B prices will go up as a function of time? Please table this data.	Written	28/10/2016
145.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	Accelerate	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will stay focused and get back onto the question I just want to ask you here first. What is the number of proposed changes to job classification level? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can provide that on notice—all the specifics. We can provide all that.	90 17/10/2016	
146.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	Accelerate	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> That is great. Just give it straight to the secretariat. Thank you. Could you tell us then also the number of proposed jobs that will move to individual contracts? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> No. I can provide that exact information; however, I think what that question relates to is a process that we are currently undertaking. As of the start of last week we announced what we call the team structures—the structures for staff at what I will call frontline areas; I will call it below the management level, in consultation with the previous management level. With the release of that information there are a number of positions that we have deemed to be leadership positions in the new structure, and they are currently being offered at this particular stage as contract management positions. We are currently going through a merit selection process and at the end of that process there will be a discussion with the successful individual. So I	90 17/10/2016	

				cannot tell you how many are converting at this particular stage, but I can show you what we have consulted on and what we have published. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> If you could provide that, that would be good. Is there a target that you want to achieve?		
147.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	Accelerate	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> That is good. Could you give us a list by area of the work-level descriptors for the changed roles? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> What they are? We can provide that. That might take a little bit longer than tomorrow. As a result we are still in the middle of the process and finalising those over the next two weeks. So we can provide them after 24 October, if that is okay. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> That is fine. And work functions that will be ceased or done differently? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> That have changed? We can provide that. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right. Can you provide the total number of staff who have been moved from enterprise agreements to individual contracts over the last 24 months? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, we can provide that. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> There are the ones you are talking about now—and if there are any further ones planned for the next 24 months. <b>Mr Harfield:</b> If I can just clarify so I get this correct: we were not talking about people who have applied for roles before this change who have then—	91 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No, I am aware we have not.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> So it is in regard to the change—on the areas that we have proposed. We can do that. We chose the same answer to the previous questions you have just asked.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, so that will alleviate my concerns—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The information you have already asked for will cover that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, and perhaps you could include their position title, years of service and date of transmission of industrial agreements and on to contracts for us.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can do that.</p>		
148.	Airservices Australia	McCarthy	Aviation Firefighting	<p><b>Ms Bennetts:</b> Yes, in relation to training, at the time of the coroner's report we took a good look around the country and internationally at what other services do—state services as well as other emergency services providers—in relation to training their people and what policies and procedures they have in relation to driving under emergency conditions. Then we formulated a new policy framework around that and set about training our people in accordance with that policy framework.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What is the training that you provide?</p> <p><b>Ms Bennetts:</b> I would have to take the detail on notice, but it is things such as the rules around when they are approaching intersections, for example, and at what speed they can go through</p>	92-3 17/10/2016	

				the intersection, and that they must stop before they proceed—those sorts of things. Then we would train them in those procedures. But if you are after more detail that that, I can certainly provide that on notice.		
149.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> The questions we were putting to CASA were that the committee wanted to make sure that CASA are absolutely across where all these redundancies are going—you would have heard the lines of questioning, Mr Harfield, so that would be no surprise to you—and to make absolutely sure that air safety would not be compromised by the 900 odd redundancies. So, you have made that very clear that the only redundancies at the core, at the front-line services, are VRs and they are people that for whatever reason have lost their—what did you call it?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> As you recall, we have refocused the organisation around what we do so those jobs are no longer required, or they could be released. What I can do is provide the committee with the list of documentation and consultation that we had with CASA, all of that so that we can show all the processes we have undertaken to ensure that that is the case.</p>	94 17/10/2016	
150.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> And are you able to provide to this committee details of any memoranda relating to the deliberations of the committee? In a sense, the entire board acted as the safety committee, rather than it being delegated to the safety committee.</p>	95 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Considering that these are risks to the organisation, I can provide you the information that was provided to the board to provide them with the assurance that we were undertaking the safety processes. In the governance of an organisation, the board is there to oversee and ensure that management are adhering to the policies and the processes of the organisation. So, considering the board decision to go ahead with the Accelerate Program, I put forward the risk assessment and the processes we were undertaking to ensure that we would maintain aviation safety. One of those was excluding aviation rescue and firefighting, and air traffic control from the active frontline operation of the program. Then they would continue to monitor those processes, to ensure that that is the case.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So is there an email trail, or a paper trail, of the level of the forensic look that the board took to assess the risks—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The board's oversight is all auditable and there is a trail on what information has been provided to the board so that they could make their judgement and ask the question—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Right. Can you provide those documents to the committee, please?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I can provide those documents.</p>		
151.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Is Airservices required to provide a risk assessment to CASA resulting from organisational change?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> It depends on what level of change</p>	95-96 17/10/2016	

				<p>and where it affects our operating certificates that are overseen by CASA. For example, if I change something in our finance department for payroll, I do not have to consult CASA on that.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Unless you stop paying people! But that is not—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> If I stop paying people then I have a problem in the air traffic control environment, for example. So it depends on where it affects those certificates.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Sure. But in this case, given the magnitude of the change and given the potential implications—given that you say that the entire board considered the issue of safety, because the safety committee was not enough, in a sense, that is not a criticism, for the entire board to look at this—did Airservices provide a risk assessment to CASA arising out of the organisational change?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We provided CASA with the requirements under our safety register, which was that beginning notification on 17 May, when we did the high-level structure of the organisation. This involved working through a number of documents which make up an overall risk assessment. It is continually updated as we go through this process. We can provide that.</p>		
152.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Right. Would it not therefore be logical, or reasonable, that given the magnitude of the change there would be a risk assessment provided to CASA arising out of the organisational change?</p>	96 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> A risk assessment associated with the areas that CASA are interested in. There is not a risk assessment handed to CASA for all of the risks associated with the entire organisation—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So what areas are CASA interested in?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The effects on our air traffic services; our engineering and aerotechnical area, our air traffic services training area, our procedures design area and our aeronautical information management, as well as aviation risk and flight—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I just want to race through this. Thank you for that. If there is any—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can provide this information—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Get me a list. But I want to understand what triggers a risk assessment, because I am concerned about the information I have—that the risk assessment was not carried out to CASA as some considered it ought to have been. In other words: who determines whether there should be a risk assessment, given the magnitude of these changes? Is it your call, or does CASA tell you what they want?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, we have a safety management system that determines it. For each particular change, we make a determination through what we call a safety case determination. We go through that to determine what the magnitude of the change is for the area affected, as well as what the significance is. That will then tell us what level of safety work is to be done. We have also completed what is called a safety plan, which details all the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>safety work that has to be undertaken through a particular change. We can provide that to you.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> If you could provide all those documents to the committee, that would be useful. My understanding was that CASA had some difficulty getting this information. Was any concern expressed to Airservices by CASA about any difficulties in getting this information—a risk assessment of these organisational changes?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I am aware of a couple of instances where certain requests were made and there had to be a discussion about what exact information was required, but there has been no withholding of information or cases of information not provided.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Could you provide copies of those documents or that interchange? That might put in context the concerns that have been expressed to me. My understanding is that, in the first round of redundancies, there were 240 redundancies in ANS—could you help me with the acronyms?</p>		
153.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	Accelerate	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Was there a safety case or a risk assessment done of the quite significant cuts you have had to engineering and IT—that that would not affect the work of your front-line air traffic controllers?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That is correct. As I said, we worked through every one of those individually to ensure that they would not have an effect. We also looked at it collectively—for job families—to make sure that was the case.</p>	97 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Was there a risk assessment undertaken?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, there was.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Could you please provide us with that?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, I can.</p>		
154.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And you may be able to refer to it in answer to some of my questions. So, Mr Logan, I will come back to you: how often is very often, or quite often?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> Sorry, if I said, 'very often', that was not my answer. We review them from time to time. I have only been in the role for the last 12 to 18 months. In that time I have taken on the ANAO recommendations and have sought—as Mr Harfield is handing it through—to bolster the practices and procedures.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mr Logan, it is not assisting me, so, if you do not know, say you do not know—that is quite all right.</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> So I do not know how often in prior times.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, so we have changed from 'quite often' or 'often' to 'do not know'—that is fine. Thank you. If you do not know, maybe someone else might—or Mr Harfield, who has been around a long time too. Can you tell us the last time you reviewed your procedures and procurement policies prior to this committee writing to the ANAO to seek an audit of Airservices?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> I do not know; I can find out.</p>	100 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mr Harfield?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I do not know.</p>		
155.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Did Thales meet all 3,000 requirements under the tender evaluation process?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> As I said just previously, no tenderer was fully compliant. Part of the negotiation period is to make sure that we establish all of those requirements.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Of the 3,000, how many short were Thales?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I cannot tell you off the top of my head. I can take that on notice.</p>	101 17/10/2016	
156.	Airservices Australia	O'Sullivan	ANAO Audit	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> We will get to the Allens report, because there was a less than favourable reference made to it in terms of whether those involved were provided with all of the relevant information needed to allow them to properly make recommendations and findings. Thank you for all that, but it did not address the burden of my question. Door to door, house by house, what current members of the board were there when this was allowed to happen—by name?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The engagement of these two individuals in their capacity contracting through ICCPM first occurred in 2012, so I would have to have a look at who the board was at that particular stage in 2012.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> You have no independent—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I am just trying to work through it. The chair of the board depends on the timing. The</p>	104 17/10/2016	

				<p>chair changed from David Forsyth to Angus Houston. Angus Houston was a member of the board. Dr Warren Mundy was the deputy chair. Ms Annette Kimmitt at some stage during 2012 came on board with Mr Paul Lucas, Ms Sam Betzien and Mr Tony Mathews. I would have to recollect to see who was there in 2012. There were some changes on the board during 2012.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I am loath to have you take things on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can look up annual reports—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Would you take that on notice? I am interested in the identity of board members at the time that these appointments were ratified by the board, acknowledged by the board and when the board was briefed about them and those who remain on the board today. So you understand the clarification of my question?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, I do.</p>		
157.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sure. So in 2013, without any approach to the market to identify other possible strategic partners, Airservices and ICCPM entered into a strategic partnership for the duration of the OneSKY program—correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> For which there was no business case prepared—is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No performance indicators were established to enable monitoring and evaluation?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That is my understanding.</p>	105 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No documentation of the nature of services Airservices intended to obtain from or through ICCPM?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> There was an intent. Whether it is documented I am unaware.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So you will take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, I will take that one on notice.</p>		
158.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	ADS-B	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> How many general aviation aircraft have complied with the ADS-B to date?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I cannot tell you exactly. What I can give you is the statistic that for all IFR flights 87 per cent have been equipped and, for those that are operating below 10,000 feet, 60 per cent or 6 out of 10 aircraft have already equipped. VFR aircraft do not have to comply with the mandate—380 of those have actually self-equipped because of the benefits associated with it. As we approach the mandate, we have talked to the 70 top GA fleet that have not equipped and by that stage we are expecting to have 92 per cent equipped. Out of 931 airframes that are yet to equipped with ADS-B 50 per cent of those airframes do less than two IFR flights per month. If the 200 most active of those equip we will have 99 per cent of all flights ADS-B equipped by February.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> That does not take into account all of the GA IFR aircraft at all, does it?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, it is not saying that is all of them. I am saying they are the statistics that include GA IFR aircraft.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> We do not know at this stage</p>	107 17/10/2016	

				<p>what percentage of GA aircraft have got ADS-B?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> We do. I can provide that to you.</p>		
159.	Airservices Australia	Xenophon	Adelaide Aripport	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I have one final question to be put on notice in relation to that. I want to go to the question of helicopter noise at Adelaide Airport. Representations have been made to me about helicopter noise disturbances over Adelaide's western suburbs during curfew hours. I presume Airservices has a record of all operations in the vicinity of Adelaide Airport, or does a curfew not apply to helicopters?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The curfew applies to the landings and take-offs of certain categories of aircraft. I am sure you will be aware that aircraft do depart and land at Adelaide Airport outside the curfew hours—turboprops, some freighters. They do not meet the threshold. But we can provide you with the information reference.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Further to that, could you provide me please with a list of air movements outside the curfew hours for the past three months and whether helicopters are identified as part of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> So you want operations during curfew hours and helicopter operations. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Just a list of air movements outside curfew. That might be a bit onerous, actually.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> You are looking at movements that—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Helicopter movements.</p>	108 17/10/2016	

				Presumably any other aircraft movements would have to comply with the curfew. I only need helicopters. Thank you very much, Chair.		
160.	Airservices Australia	Back	Airport Noise	<p><b>Senator BACK:</b> Do you have monitoring equipment? I know you do at the major airports, including Perth Airport; we have had inquiries on this in the past.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK:</b> But do you have noise-monitoring equipment that can be positioned around—let's call it this—a light aircraft airport such as Jandakot?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I would just have to take it on notice on where we have them placed in the Perth region, because it would be picking up noise around Jandakot anyway. We usually have noise monitors—I could get the numbers wrong—within, say, 30 kilometres or 50 kilometres of the actual main airport, which would capture the metropolitan airports. But I would have to confirm what radius it is.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK:</b> Could you let us know that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p>	109 17/10/2016	
161.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You cannot be any more honest than that. The extensive use of ICCPM to assist with the delivery of OneSKY by Airservices was highlighted by the ANAO, and I will quote them: Since 2012, there have been 42 engagements of ICCPM employees and sub-contractors through 18 procurement processes. The engagements were given effect through six contracts, 10 contract variations and four uses of an on-call</p>	109 17/10/2016	

				<p>services schedule under one of the contracts. Under the various contractual arrangements, Airservices agreed to pay ICCPM total fees of more than \$9 million.</p> <p>Is that figure correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Who were the subcontractors?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I would have to take that on notice to give you the full list, but there were a range of services used from a variety of different people: Harry Bradford and Keyholder Services. It included Andrew Pike, Deborah Hein, Stephen Hein and a range of other employees to do other services. We could reply to that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, sure. Take that on notice. Off the top of your head, would you know how many contractors we are talking about?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Off the top of my head, no.</p>		
162.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, that is fine. Can you elaborate for the committee on what an on-call services schedule is.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I am not sure what was written down in the on-call schedule of service, but it was that, if we needed a particular capability, we would go to ICCPM and they would provide it. It is sort of like a labour hire company. You go and say, 'Can I have this particular capability,' and you would bring that—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, I get an echo.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> It is like a temp hire company or an engineering hiring company. You would go along and say, 'We need a capability for a scheduler', or, 'We need a capability for a planner,' and then they</p>	110 17/10/2016	

				<p>would provide that particular capability.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> So ICCPM would go off and find it.  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> That is correct.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, and you will be able to provide who they are.  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Correct.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> And the cost.  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p>		
163.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You cannot add any more to that. Furthermore, has Airservices ever attempted to negotiate rates of services charged by ICCPM?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes. There have been a couple of occasions where that has occurred.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> How did you go?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> We had some reductions because of the longer term nature.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> When you say 'some'—you might want to take this on record, Mr Harfield—can you give us examples of what they were, how much for and how many times?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I can give you the whole thing on notice. Rather than just speculating on getting a figure right, we can provide that on notice. That is no problem.</p>	110-111 17/10/2016	
164.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	ANAO Audit	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> It was between 2012-13 and December 2015. Airservices paid ICCPM a total of \$5.8 million in consultancy fees and expenses. Between 2012-13 and 2014-15, the payments from Airservices amounted to 75 per cent of the revenue reported by ICCPM, as derived from consulting</p>	111 17/10/2016	

				<p>work. What consultancy work was completed and what expenses were made using the \$5.8 million?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That was the contract capability we just discussed beforehand. So it is the Harry Bradfords doing lead negotiation, and the Andrew Pykes and those sorts of people. So it is not extra consultancies on top of that; it is those fees that paid for all those people that we just mentioned previously. I am going to provide, on notice, the work and their costs.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Of the contractors and employees?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, contracted—brought in—for that. But they will be put in a consultancy bucket.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So the \$5.8 million is part of the work being done by the contractors?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes. That is that amount.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And you are going to give us some examples and break it down. That is fine. If 75 per cent of the revenue of ICCPM in those years mentioned came from Airservices, where did the remaining 25 per cent come from?</p>		
165.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<p><b>Senator CAMERON:</b> Did you provide information in relation to the new proposed west merge point and east merge point?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We provided some advice. I would have to take on notice exactly what advice we provided to the department.</p>	111-112 17/10/2016	
166.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<p><b>Senator CAMERON:</b> Could you provide me with details of the concept, that was put to, that</p>	112 17/10/2016	

				<p>determined how these flight paths would be—  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can provide you with the advice that we gave.  <b>Senator CAMERON:</b> The advice you gave is one thing—  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> The concept designs, correct.  <b>Senator CAMERON:</b> You can provide me that, but can you also provide me with the details of what was put to you—what were the restrictions, what were the parameters that you started designing your flight paths on?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Designed on the flight paths that—current airspace constraints as well as the flight paths of Kingsford Smith were not to be touched.  <b>Senator CAMERON:</b> There would be a document somewhere that says that. Can you provide me with that document or documents associated with the parameters that were put to you when you designed the flight paths?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p>		
167.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<p><b>Senator CAMERON:</b> When you designed these parameters and the flights were taking off over Erskine Park, St Marys and some parts of Penrith why did you come to that position, to take over fairly densely populated residential areas?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I cannot answer that. You would have to take it on notice, how the concepts were put with those design parameters. I do not have that detail.</p>	112-113 17/10/2016	
168.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<p><b>Senator CAMERON:</b> On notice, can you provide</p>	113	

				me with details of any discussions you have had about those alternate merge points? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.	17/10/2016	
169.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<b>Senator CAMERON:</b> Okay. You can provide us with information on whether there has been discussion on no-fly zones. Is that correct? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> We will provide you with what we have been asked to provide advice on.	114 17/10/2016	
170.	Airservices Australia	Cameron	Western Sydney Airport	<b>Senator CAMERON:</b> Have you had any complaints about noise impacts of the current airport in Bradfield? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will need to take that on notice but we have seen an increase in noise complaints from, I will call it, the Western Sydney and the Blue Mountains area. <b>Senator CAMERON:</b> What about the electorate of Bradfield? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Not off the top of my head but I will take that on notice.	114 17/10/2016	
171.	Airservices Australia	McCarthy	Aviation Firefighting	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I wanted to go back, Mr Harfield, to my initial question from earlier this evening relating to the coroner's report. I would like to get a dollar figure for what Airservices is putting towards the education and training of staff in relation to those recommendations. <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I do not have that figure off the top of my head, but we can take it on notice and provide the answer.	117 17/10/2016	
172.	Airservices Australia	Rhiannon	Gold Coast	I understand that a stakeholder meeting, including Air	Written	28/10/2016

			Airport Report	<p>Services Australia, was held in August about the potential contamination of the aquifer at the Gold Coast Airport and previous use of PFCs. At that meeting ASA identified ASA has done additional testing to that previously available from the 2008 report on the issue, and that ASA had yet to put the new information into a formal report which would be available for dissemination in early September to interested parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please provide a full copy of that report.</li> <li>b) Please specifically provide a copy of the Phase 1 investigation at Gold Coast Airport within the framework of the <i>National Environment Protection (Assessment of site contamination) Measure 1999</i>.</li> </ul>		
173.	Airservices Australia	Rhiannon	Gold Coast Airport Report	<p>A sampling strategy was then to be identified to clarify the extent of contamination off the Gold Coast aquifer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Where is this up to?</li> <li>b) Where is sampling being conducted in the area?</li> <li>c) Is there a copy of the strategy available?</li> </ul>	Written	28/10/2016
174.	Airservices Australia	Rhiannon	Gold Coast Airport Report	<p>Is there any early indication that contamination of the aquifer might be substantial?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If it is too early for such indications, what is the timeframe for receipt of the sampling results to inform those market gardeners, aquaculture and poultry/egg producers, including backyard producers, who might be affected?</li> </ul>	Written	28/10/2016
175.	Airservices Australia	McCarthy	Airport Noise	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I have a list that I want to go through with you. Let me know if you are able to answer these questions now or if you would like to take them on notice. How many noise complaints have been lodged with Airservices for these airports for the following years—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I think an individual year basis is a level of detail that we would need to get from Airservices, but we are happy to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take it on notice.</p>	118 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So can I give you the years: 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. Will you take all of that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>		
176.	Airservices Australia	Sterle	Movements	<p>How many movements between 11pm and 6am occurred at each of the following airports in the following calendar years?</p> <p>a) 2010 b) 2013 c) 2014 d) 2015</p> <p>How many total movements occurred at each of the following airports in the following calendar years?</p> <p>e) 2010 f) 2013 g) 2014 h) 2015</p> <p>The airports are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melbourne Airport</li> <li>• Brisbane Airport</li> <li>• Perth Airport</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016
177.	Aviation and Airports Division	McCarthy	Cape Preston	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is the department aware of a proposal to build an airstrip at Cape Preston in Western Australia?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No, that is not one of the federally leased airports that we have responsibility for.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> There is no airport there. The question was are you aware of one—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It is more likely to be subject to a Western Australian planning process at this stage.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So it has not reached you?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We are not aware of it.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you are not aware of any</p>	118-119 17/10/2016	

				<p>of that discussion at all? Would there be any other federal agency that might be?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We can certainly ask the Civil Aviation Safety Authority or Airservices Australia. We will take that on notice to see whether they have had any contact in relation to that.</p>		
178.	Aviation and Airports Division	Rice	Carbon Emissions	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What percentage of revenue tonne kilometres of international aviation is Australia currently accountable for?</p> <p><b>Mrs Rosengren:</b> I would have to check. I think we are about 18th on the international listing but I do not know what our current percentage is. We can take that on notice.</p>	119	17/10/2016
179.	Aviation and Airports Division	Rice	Carbon Emissions	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You have targets, but what are the mechanisms for reaching those targets?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> There is a range of policies and programs the government has put in place. I can get you some details on those. That would probably be the best way.</p>	120	17/10/2016
180.	Aviation and Airports Division	Sterle	Airports Land Swap	<p>It is understood that the Federal Government and State of Western Australia entered into an agreement for a 'land swap' (many years ago) for certain lands in the vicinity of Perth Airport. This includes Lot 15370 on DP43802 which is proposed to be transferred to the Federal Government and then leased to Perth Airport. Lot 15370 on DP43802 was identified for the extension of Adelaide Street to Abernethy Road in the Western Australian Planning Commission's Hazelmere Enterprise Area Structure Plan. The extension of Adelaide Street to Abernethy Road is critical to the development of industrial lands within Hazelmere.</p> <p>Apparently, the Department of Lands (WA), the Federal</p>	Written	13/10/2016

				<p>Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development and Perth Airport have been discussing the exclusion of the land from the ‘‘land swap’’ so that the land could become available for the Adelaide Street extension to Abernethy Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Can the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development confirm its position on the exclusion of Lot 15370 on DP43802 from the proposed ‘‘land swap’’ arrangement between the Federal Government and State of Western Australia to allow for the connection of Adelaide Street to Abernethy Road as set out within the Hazelmere Enterprise Area Structure Plan?</li> <li>b) If the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development is favourable to the setting aside of Lot 15370 on DP43802 for the extension of Adelaide Street what has occurred, or is proposed to occur to facilitate this outcome, and what is the proposed timing?</li> <li>c) If the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development will not support the setting aside of Lot 15370 on DP43802 for the extension of Adelaide Street can it be advised why?</li> </ul>		
181.	Aviation and Airports Division	Sterle	Lead impacts and aviation	<p>Is the Department aware of any concerns about lead impacts on communities near airports arising from aviation activity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If there are lead discharges, what research has been done into the impacts on human health?</li> <li>b) What was the outcome of that research?</li> <li>c) What is known generally about the impact on human health from lead discharges around airports?</li> </ul>	Written	27/10/2016
182.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	Abetz	Cost Recovery Proposal	<p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> And the cost recovery proposals seem to be imposing costs that are way out of whack with what is currently being charged, and without providing all the current services. I refer in particular to the Tasmanian situation where under Model 1, commercial shipping operators will be,</p>	121 17/10/2016	

			<p>on average, paying 72 per cent more under Model 1 and 64 per cent more under Model 2. On top of that, in Tasmania some vessel operators have indicated that they currently pay for cost recovery through MAST, which is the Tasmanian body; but that AMSA will not be taking over marine radio, navigation, facilities, maintenance and management of ports and harbours which will then be an extra impost on top of the 72 per cent or 64 per cent increase that your current model is suggesting. Is that correct, to your knowledge?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would have to check those percentages. It is certainly true that the figures that we have gone out with to consult on—we are talking there about 2019 prices when at the moment the states and territories, in agreeing that AMSA should take on the service delivery, have also agreed that they would provide some level of subsidy for two years.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Yes, for two years.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> So talking about those out years—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Yes, 2019 onwards—</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> we are aware we are talking about prices which are more than what MAST, for example, are currently charging for their administrative fee. I would have to check on the exact percentages but I know there have been some figures which have been thrown around in Tasmania which—I think we have questioned some of those. One of the things that we are now doing—the consultation period closed on 10 October. We are now at the stage of actually</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				correlating all of the responses that we had. As you said, there are a lot of people who are concerned about the actual quantum of cost recovery. While I think we still have people who are very supportive of the overall reform and then examine—		
183.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	McCarthy	National Reform Process	<p><b>Senator McCARATHY:</b> I have a couple of questions to help me understand the compliance regime a little better. How many vessels are affected by this regime?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> This is the domestic commercial vessel regime. I think it is about 10,000 vessels under survey.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARATHY:</b> And where are they located?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Again, I could get you better information on notice. But the biggest jurisdictions by far are Queensland and New South Wales and there is then a fairly even scattering around the rest of the states and the Northern Territory.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARATHY:</b> What percentage would be in the Northern Territory?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would have to take that on notice.</p>	124 17/10/2016	
184.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	McCarthy	National Reform Process	<p><b>Senator McCARATHY:</b> The consultation booklet says:</p> <p>Currently, each state and territory recovers the cost of delivering their services to varying degrees. For example, some jurisdictions recover less than 15 per cent of costs, with the rest subsidised by taxpayers.</p> <p>Mr Kinley, can you indicate what percentage of cost recovery there is each jurisdiction?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I can see if I have that information here, but I can give that to you on notice. It varies widely—</p>	124-125 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Why don't you just tell us now instead of taking it on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I will just see if I have the percentages for each state, but I am not sure that I do.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Let us start with New South Wales.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Hang on, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> This will save you a lot of work, and it will save us having to read it.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> No, I think it will be more accurate if I actually give it—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have you got it there? We can wait a couple of minutes; there is no stress. I would rather do that and so would Senator McCarthy.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Let me just check.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I am sure that a man of your experience would not have come to Senate estimates without it.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> No, I do not have it with me.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You have come without it?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I do not have each state's current level of cost recovery.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you give us any?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> No, it would be better if I sent you the whole package.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mr Kinley has been doing this for years and years. He absolutely knows everything about AMSA, Senator McCarthy, and I reckon that he has the figures there. I cannot believe that you do not, Mr Kinley.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I do not have them for each state and territory because it is not something that I was</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>expecting to be getting into here.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> As Senator Abetz was saying, it is pretty wedgy issue in certain states or for certain industries. You have been out there consulting, you have seen the good end, and you have obviously seen the pointy end. You should be able to tell us and ease some of our fears.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I can tell you that at the lower end of cost recovery, for example, is Victoria, which I think was down at about nine or 12 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> They will get the biggest hit?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Keep going, sorry.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Tasmania was at the highest end of cost recovery. They were up at around 90 to 100 per cent. My recollection is that the Northern Territory was fairly low—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> They will get a decent whack?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes. I think New South Wales was about mid-range. It varies with each jurisdiction and—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> There are only two states left to go. What was South Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would be going way off the script, or I would just be making those numbers up. There is quite a great range. The problem for us is that constitutionally we have to charge a national fee, so it does make it very hard for us to adjust that to deal with the impact of each jurisdiction. In fact, it makes it impossible for us to deal with the impact in each jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Would you be able to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>provide information on those states that you have not yet provided?  <b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And if you need to clarify the information that you have given us in that detail that would be good.  <b>Mr Kinley:</b> Including the distribution of the ship fleet, yes.</p>		
185.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	Sterle	National Reform Process	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Given that the Navigation Act qualifications exemption expired on 30 September, has AMSA made an assessment of whether there are still ratings serving on regulated Australian vessels who were not issued with the appropriate licences or endorsements to meet the requirements of Marine Order 73? If it has found there are such ratings on those RAVs, what is AMSA's compliance and enforcement plan in those circumstances?  <b>Mr Kinley:</b> I will have to take that one on notice.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has AMSA made an assessment of the number of ratings who may not have achieved the necessary requirements by 30 September?  <b>Mr Kinley:</b> I will also take that on notice.</p>	126 17/10/2016	
186.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	Sterle	Coral Knight - future	<p>Is it true that the party AMSA contracted with to build and supply a replacement vessel for AMSA's rescue and salvage vessel that is used to protect the Great Barrier Reef, the Coral Knight, will now not be delivered due to some problem with the new build in a China shipyard?  a) If yes, can AMSA confirm that it will now be retaining the Coral Knight to perform the rescue and salvage function, say over the next 5-10 years?  b) Has AMSA given any consideration to finding a</p>	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>replacement vessel for the Coral Knight in light on the non-supply of the new vessel from the Chinese shipyard?</p> <p>c) Can you confirm that the requirement for a replacement vessel be that it be (i) Australian flagged under the General Shipping Register, (ii) crewed by Australians engaged under an enterprise agreement?</p> <p>d) Can you confirm if AMSA has had representations from any ship operator that has suggested to AMSA it could provide a cheaper alternative to the Coral Knight because the operator operates under a partnership agreement rather than a traditional employer-employee relationship?</p> <p>e) If yes, what are the details?</p>		
187.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	Sterle	Cost recovery for domestic commercial compliance	<p>The consultation booklet says: “Currently each state and territory recovers the cost of delivering their services to varying degrees. For example, some jurisdictions recover less than 15% of costs, with the rest subsidised by taxpayers”. Given AMSA has the information, can you indicate what cost recovery there is currently for each jurisdiction, as a percentage of cost:</p> <p>a) NSW  b) Victoria  c) Queensland  d) WA  e) SA  f) Tasmania  g) NT</p>	Written	27/10/2016
188.	Australian Maritime Safety Authority	Rice	Oil Spills	<p>Can you provide a list of the chemical dispersant types in Australia and volumes available for use in the event of a catastrophic oil spill?</p> <p>a) What plans are in place to figure out precisely how many litres of oil were spilled in Montara? Has this been quantified and if so what is the amount?</p> <p>b) What plans are in place to quantify volumes of oil from any future spills?</p> <p>c) What ongoing monitoring is being conducted of the impact of the Montara spill? What practices are in</p>	Written	28/10/2016

				place for the ongoing monitoring of any oil spills?		
189.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Williams	Yamba Port	<p><b>Senator WILLIAMS:</b> Can you take on notice: have there been any applications to any state authorities to dredge the Yamba Port? Is that something you would be able to do?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, Senator, we can make inquiries of the New South Wales EPA and also the Commonwealth environment department to see whether any proposals have been put forward.</p>	25 17/10/2016	
190.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	NHVR	<p><b>Senator BACK:</b> Finally: table 1.2 on page 18 of your portfolio budget statement shows \$4 million movement of funds marked against the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal. Can you please tell us what the allocation fate of that \$4 million is?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is, essentially, to support further enforcement and compliance work by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. I will ask Ms Zielke to take you through a number of steps involved in that program.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> The funding was provided through the closure of the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal. That funding is being provided to the National Vehicle Heavy Vehicle Regulator, and is available over the next three years. The funding will be used for a range of activities, from improvements to the current camera network that is used to monitor trucks around the country—at the moment the particular focus is on the eastern seaboard—to other activities in relation to working more consistently across all of the states and territories in relation to their roadside activities in checking</p>	54-55 17/10/2016	

				trucks. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will put you on notice, Ms Zielke: can you tell us what these roadside activities will be? Truckies can get filmed more often than they are now, I suppose, but you will be able to defend that. We will see how the truckies like that, shall we?		
191.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme	<p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Could you confirm how much has been paid out under the extension to the Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is in our Surface Transport Policy Division. We do not have the officers here who deal with the Tasmanian freight program—they are on later in the agenda. Surface transport looks after our transport freight equalisation scheme, and the Bass Strait vehicle subsidy scheme is also in that surface transport area.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> More specifically then, around the policy implications of this: if the amount that has been paid out is significantly under what had been budgeted for—so there is a gap there and it has not been utilised, essentially—would that money be potentially available to be hypothecated to other funding for infrastructure in Tasmania?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It traditionally has not. It is an on-demand program, so the expenditure follows the demand profile. Generally, where the actual has been under the estimates it has been returned to the budget, essentially.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Has that been the case historically?</p>	58 17/10/2016	

				<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, it has.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Could I get, on notice, how often or how significant that has been in the past—just over a short period of time; say, five years?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, the last five or ten years.</p>		
192.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	NHVR Cameras	<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Those cameras will then enable linkages to be made with the cameras in New South Wales and Queensland so that there will be better coverage in relation to how trucks are actually travelling, not just from a perspective of pointing out when somebody is doing something wrong but also to improve the knowledge that the NHVR has in relation to where the trucks are travelling and how greater access to roads et cetera might benefit them. The next thing is fast-tracking the development and uptake of industry codes of practice. NHVR is out consulting at the moment with industry in relation to those sectors that would like to take an industry code of practice approach.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us what those codes of practice will address? Is there any indication?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> In particular, it is about practices that that sector would like to adopt on a voluntary basis that make sure that their actual group is working in a certain way. I am sorry, I do not have an example in my head at the moment. There is a consultation document that I could provide you with.</p>	75 17/10/2016	
193.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	NHVR	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That would be good. Thanks, Mr Mrdak. I will now go back to the \$15-odd</p>	77 17/10/2016	

				<p>million that has been transferred to the NHRV. So far we have heard about cameras. How did we spend the \$15 million? What is a camera worth?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I do not have the details with me; I am sorry. Perhaps when we come back in surface transport I will be able to give you a more detailed answer.</p>		
194.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Flags of Convenience	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Of the approximately 7,500 voyages the department has authorised under temporary licences issued since 1 July 2012, when the Coastal Trading (Revitalising Australian Shipping) Act commenced—undertaken by an estimated 2,000-plus ships—how many on-board inspections have departmental officers undertaken to ensure that a temporary licence is displayed on those ships in accordance with section 40(b) of the Coastal Trading (Revitalising Australian Shipping) Act?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> That is probably a question for the department.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will have to take that on notice. I have recently written to the MUA in relation to the handling of such matters. I will take it on notice and come back to you on our arrangements for regulatory oversight.</p>	126 17/10/2016	
195.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Flags of Convenience	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us how many different foreign ships have undertaken voyages authorised under TLs in each year since 2012?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I cannot answer that specific question. We can tell you how many temporary licences have been issued.</p>	126 17/10/2016	

			<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> From 2012?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> From the commencement of the legislation, yes. There have been 271 applications for temporary licences since the commencement of the act in 2012. Of those, 235 have been granted, and they are across 69 organisations. Vessels are not actually licensed; operators are licensed. So they may have access to more than one vessel.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Why would the other ones not have been granted? Is there a reason? Obviously there is a reason, but could you shine a light on that for us?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> A variety of reasons: they might not have been eligible at the time they actually applied, or they might not have had the number of voyages required—for example, you have to have a minimum of five voyages to actually be able to apply under the act—or there may have been some other grounds on which they were not considered to be appropriate for some reason. I could come back with possible examples for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If you could, please, that would be good. And can you tell us what the rate of compliance or noncompliance is, given those ship numbers in each year?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No, I am sorry, I do not have any compliance figures with me at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Please take that on notice, if you could? And could the department explain what actions it has taken to ensure compliance?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We can come back to you with some process explanations in relation to that.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

196.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Coastal Trading	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How many instances of non-display has the department found from its compliance activity in each year since 2012?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I do not think we have that level of detail with us here tonight. I will check with my colleagues, but I think it is best if I give you an answer on notice.</p>	126 17/10/2016	
197.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	NHVR	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How do I find out how all those geniuses at NHVR have worked out where they are going to spend this money? I am from WA and I am not agreeing to the NHVR and I do not care what anyone says, because we aren't being sucked into your crappy fatigue management project. What you think about that? I think I have said that about six or seven times!</p> <p><b>Mr James:</b> I cannot give an opinion on that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You can't, but I can! Who has all the keys to the ideas box?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We can ask NHVR for that information and come back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can they appear here?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They are not actually a Commonwealth company. So I do not believe they are actually covered by the arrangements. But I am sure if we were to ask NHVR for this information they will consider that request. We are happy to take on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, because it is \$3.8 million of taxpayers funds. I would be very interested in seeing, because I am all about road safety as everyone here knows—proper road safety, not</p>	131 17/10/2016	

				meetings were they sit around talking about chain of responsibility. I had the misfortune of crapping on with that lot—I was not crapping on but they were—back in the 1990s about this, and they did everything they could to avoid it. It is amazing how they got sucked into it eventually.		
198.	Surface Transport Policy Division	McCarthy	Shipping Reform	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Just on those 18 stakeholder organisations, where did they largely come from?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Sorry, Senator. It was over an 18-month period.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> It was over an 18-month period with stakeholders?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Yes. I am very happy to give you a full list of all of the organisations that we consulted with as part of that process.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> That would be good. Thank you.</p>	132 17/10/2016	
199.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Shipping taxation incentives	<p>What are the names of the 4 companies and the relevant ships for which a Notice was issued for the Income Tax Exemption during 2015?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the name of the company and the relevant ship for which a Notice was issued for the Refundable Tax Offset during 2015?</li> <li>What are the names of the 2 companies and the relevant ship for which a Notice was issued for Accelerated Depreciation during 2015?</li> <li>Can the Department explain why there is such a large discrepancy between the number of Certificates issued and the number of Notices issued? For example, in 2015, 13 Certificates were issued for the Income Tax Exemption, but only 4 Notices were issued (Notices presumably being a proxy for actual receipt of the exemption)?</li> </ol>	Written	27/10/2016

				<p>d) In total, what was the value of the forgone revenue to the Commonwealth as a result of companies accessing these tax incentives over 2015, in relation to each of the 3 incentives mentioned?</p> <p>e) Does the Department consider that the lack of provision for deemed franking credits in respect of dividends to resident shareholders and the lack of a dividend withholding tax exemption in respect of dividends to non-resident shareholders is a factor in the take up of the Income Tax Exemption?</p>		
200.	Policy & Research Division	Rice	Mass Distance Charge	<p>Mass distance charges for heavy trucks have been in place in New Zealand since 1978. Current mass distance charges for heavy six axle articulated trucks operating in New Zealand are about NZ56 cents per km, and as such are about three times that charged in Australia through annual registration fees and a diesel road user truck for such trucks hauling long distances each year.</p> <p>According to that rate, a Sydney Melbourne Hume Highway one way line haul of approximately 840 km, the difference between Australian and New Zealand road cost recovery for a six axle articulated truck is about \$28 per haul.</p> <p>Would the Department agree with this price different, and if not, what dollar figure would the Department approximate?</p> <p>a) Has the department considered any scheme similar to the New Zealand system, where the use of B - Triples on the Hume Highway would be on a mass distance location basis at New Zealand levels?</p> <p>b) If so, has it considered the difference between these and current charges being applied to additional climbing lanes on hilly sections of the Hume Highway?</p>	Written	28/10/2016
201.	Australian Rail Track Corporation	Rice	Inland Rail	<p>What progress has been made in the third quarter of 2016 towards starting work on the Inland Railway between Melbourne, Parkes and Brisbane</p>	Written	28/10/2016
202.	Australian Rail Track Corporation	Rice	Curve Radius	<p>Would ARTC be prepared to consider mandating a minimum curve radius of 1200 metres for new track in all terrain, with a preferred minimum curve radius of 2200 metres, in line with</p>	Written	28/10/2016

				Queensland Government track design standards for Gowrie to Grandchester (with a new tunnel under the Toowoomba Range).		
203.	Australian Rail Track Corporation	Xenophon	Track Standards	<p>It is noted from your website that “<i>Across five states we manage and maintain an 8,500km rail network. We’ve invested billions of dollars to build, extend and upgrade our network to get freight off the road and onto rail. That’s good for business, motorists, the environment and communities. We work with rail operators to provide access to rail for businesses and producers across Australia</i>”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Can ARTC advise what involvement it has with respect to track standards?</li> <li>b) What do those standards involve – are they specified as an Australian Standard?</li> <li>c) Are ARTC responsible for the procurement of track and replacement track?</li> <li>d) What requirements do ARTC put on procurement of rail with respect to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Value for money (are tax receipts, spill overs etc. taken into consideration)</li> <li>b. Australian Industry Participation, including the source of the raw product?</li> </ol> </li> <li>e) What is ARTC forecast with respect to future steel track needs (next 5 years)?</li> </ol>	Written	28/10/2016
204.	Australian Transport Safety Bureau	Xenophon	Drone Regulation	<p>Noting the current consideration with respect to Drone regulation changes, what data did ATSB provide CASA with respect to Drones incidents and accidents?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Was this data provided to the Minister?</li> <li>b) Was this data provided to any MPs in the recent briefing to MPs and Senators on the Drone regulations?</li> </ol>	Written	28/10/2016
205.	Australian Transport Safety Bureau	Xenophon	Pel-Air	Please provide an update on the Pel-Air report.	Written	28/10/2016
206.	Western Sydney Unit	Sterle	Mitchell & Partners	<p>There are three DIRD contract notices on Austender for advertising services via Mitchell and Partners - CN3378253, CN3379300 and CN3379301. What are each for?</p>	Written	27/10/2016
207.	Australian Rail Track	Sterle	Rail Girding	Are you familiar with a company called Speno Rail	Written	27/10/2016

	Corporation		Contract	<p>Maintenance Australia Pty Ltd?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) And that they do rail grinding work for several States and large mining companies including Rio Tinto?</li> <li>b) And that they manufacture their grinding machines in Perth?</li> <li>c) Has the ARTC ever contracted with Speno?</li> <li>d) Has the ARTC ever sought a tender from Speno?</li> <li>e) How many times?</li> <li>f) How many times have they been successful?</li> <li>g) Has Speno recently tendered for any ARTC work?</li> <li>h) How long was the contract/s?</li> <li>i) What was the result?</li> <li>j) How many responses to the request for tender were there?</li> <li>k) Who was successful?</li> <li>l) Is the ARTC aware of concerns from Speno that it is not being fairly treated?</li> <li>m) What steps has the ARTC taken to address those concerns?</li> <li>n) Has the ARTC assured itself that the tenders it calls are being managed with proper oversight as to process?</li> <li>o) Is the ARTC certain that its rail grinding contract has delivered value for money as against Speno's offering?</li> </ul>		
137.	Australian Rail Track Corporation	Rice	Freight Trains	<p>Has there been any reduction in transit time for the Melbourne-Sydney freight trains and for the XPT due to various track upgrades undertaken since 2008 by the Australian Rail Track Corporation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If so, by how many minutes for most freight trains?</li> <li>b) What is the government's position on investment in deviations, to speed up freight and passenger trains, between Macarthur and Junee.</li> </ul>	Written	28/10/2016
208.	Policy & Research Division	Rice	National Cycling Strategy	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> My understanding is that for the period the National Cycling Strategy has been in place there were some targets of increase of cycling rates, but, in fact, over that period of time</p>	5 22/11/2016	

				<p>we have seen a decrease of cycling rates. Is that the case?</p> <p><b>Ms Spencer:</b> I understand there has been an increase in cycling rates.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That is good to hear. Last time that I asked the question, a year ago, there had been a decrease in the immediate period before then, so maybe things have changed in the last year.</p> <p><b>Ms Spencer:</b> Maybe they have. I will take that on notice and get the exact numbers for you.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That would be good.</p>		
209.	Policy & Research Division	Farrell	City Deals	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> The Launceston City Heart Project?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I am sorry; I am not familiar with that one.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Would you be able to get back to us with that one?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Yes.</p>	9 22/11/2016	
210.	Policy & Research Division	Farrell	High Speed Rail	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Has the potential for linking the HSR and the Western Sydney rail through the airport been considered as a potential stage 1 for the HSR?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> Just adding to that, in terms of the current study, that is correct. There have been earlier studies, as you are probably aware, on high-speed rail which did look at lines that would venture further west of Sydney than the lines that were identified as preferable in that study, and which found that the additional travel time associated with heading further west would be so significant that it would not be viable from that</p>	13-14 22/11/2016	

				<p>point of view.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> How far west? Where does the unviability come in?</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> I do not have that information now.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> When was that study done?</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> I can find you the dates.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> There were several done a matter of years ago, which—</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Were these done under the former government—the Rudd government?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They were done under the former government, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> And that is the study that you are referring to, is it, Mr Whalen?</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> I would have to check which government was in at the time.</p>		
211.	Policy & Research Division	Rice	Road Pricing	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What is the timing for coming back to COAG next year?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> From memory it is midway though next year. I do not believe it is in early 2017. I can take that on notice, though.</p>	17 22/11/2016	
212.	Policy & Research Division	Farrell	Oregon Road Charging Trial	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I started to ask some questions about the Oregon trial, and we diverted to Transurban. Can you tell us what the department has learnt from the Oregon trial?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Sorry, but I do not believe I could give you enough detail. I am happy to take that on notice, though. That is probably a more effective way.</p>	17 22/11/2016	
213.	Policy & Research Division	Farrell	Oregon Road Charging Trial	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Yes, if you could. You do not happen to know what the government in Oregon plans to do with the results of the trial, do you?</p>	17 22/11/2016	

				<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They have actually been applying it, as I understand, so they have moved to where they have put charging in place on a voluntary basis. From memory they have a 10-year engagement schedule. But, again, it is probably best if I take that on notice and come back to you.</p>		
214.	Policy & Research Division	Chisholm	Regional jobs and investment package	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> In terms of the boundaries for each region—and this might be something you might have to take on notice—is it possible to provide what is the area that is covered by these announcements?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Yes, we will take that on notice. But it is fine to provide that</p>	35	22/11/2016
215.	Western Sydney Unit	McCarthy	Western Sydney Rail Costings	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I am curious to know about the costings. If I can seek some guidance here, I have six options here that I would like to put forward. If I could do that, you could take it on notice or at least be aware that the committee would like to have some indication of these costs. Could I just provide this to you?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I am happy to take the list from you, but I am very conscious that until such time as the scenarios have been prioritised and considered, and until we have proposals on the table that are actually able to be costed, it is extremely difficult. At the moment we would not be able to respond to those questions at all. It would be quite some time in the future before we were able to address that. The process of seeking input from industry and from various proponents et cetera in coming up with those costings is quite lengthy and quite costly, particularly for industry.</p>	12-13	22/11/2016

				<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I want to understand this a little bit better. The most expensive option is about \$25 billion, so you have clearly thought of the costings in some respects there. I just want to work out how that statement can be made if costings are not done at least roughly.</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> We need to be very general on costs for transport in New South Wales, just to give the public some indication of the relative magnitude of different options. Probably the best thing is if you provide those particular routes to us on notice and we can determine whether we can provide any more information.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> All right. I will read through them to put these six options on notice. Option 1 is western Sydney airport to the South West Rail Link. Option 2—</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> Sorry, Senator. To help us out, can you identify where exactly? The South West Rail Link is—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Where would you see the end of that link be?</p> <p><b>Mr Whalen:</b> Are you talking about Leppington?</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> It sounds like Leppington. If you provide those, we can do our best to put some geography around that.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Option 2 is WSA to Sydney Metro Northwest. Again, I will be guided by your location on that. Option 3 is WSA to Liverpool. Option 4 is WSA to T1 Western line via Saint Marys. Option 5 is a direct rail express service from WSA to Parramatta. And option 6 is a north-</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				south link—Macarthur, WSA, St Marys to Schofields. Thank you very much for taking that on notice.		
216.	Australian Transport Safety Bureau	McCarthy	Drone Incidents	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Taking you back to those statistics that you gave me earlier, you said you have completed five investigations. Would you share with the committee the outcome of those investigations?</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> Certainly. They are publicly available, as are all our reports, on the website and I would be happy to provide those to the committee.</p>	21 22/11/2016	
217.	Office of Transport Security	Farrell	Organised crime announcement	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> I have some other questions regarding the serious and organised crime announcement. In the incoming-government brief, the OTS identified a commitment on 28 June 2016 by the Prime Minister and Minister Keenan and in fact provided a brief. The commitment is described as being to 'strengthen the background checking regimes to ensure individuals with links to serious and organised crime cannot gain access to our airports, ports or other Commonwealth sites where security is a concern'. Is a copy of that announcement available?</p> <p><b>Ms Wimmer:</b> I am sure we could track it down for you. We can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Thank you. Was there a media release associated with that?</p> <p><b>Mr Farmer:</b> I do not think there was a media release.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> But you can supply us with a copy of the announcement?</p> <p><b>Ms Wimmer:</b> We will see if we can find you one.</p>	28 22/11/2016	

				<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Where will you look for that, Ms Wimmer?</p> <p><b>Ms Wimmer:</b> Most likely the internet.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Thank you very much.</p>		
218.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Rice	Autonomous Vehicles	<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Yes. In that they have accepted the work plan but will progress the issues. Obviously, at this stage, we are not in a position whereby automated vehicles can be put on our roads. We do not have infrastructure in place. We do not have a number of regulatory requirements in place, so therefore the discussion paper that NTC prepared was largely focused on: so how can we move forward and what are the positions that we need to be considering—and that is what NTC laid out in that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I am interested as to why NTC came up with that position and it was subsequently accepted. You say how it aligns with the position of the US federal Department of Transportation—their position is that the entity responsible for the automated driving system should be legally responsible rather than the driver for complying with road rules. So why the difference between what is being proposed for Australia with what is being proposed for the US?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> My general understanding in that regard is in relation to the regulatory arrangements that the US has in place as opposed to our system here in Australia where they have taken decisions to allow certain arrangements to occur in some areas of the US, not across the whole of the US. In Australia, we have taken an arrangement whereby</p>	14-15 22/11/2016	

				<p>we would agree to that across the country where we can before moving forward. At this stage, we do not have a basis on which to proceed with a rule other than that. It does not mean that testing or trialling cannot be undertaken—and we have a number occurring around the country; particularly, various states are showing a great deal of leadership in relation to how to move forward; and also technology—so we have companies that are heavily involved in various forms of technology to work on how we move to automated vehicles. They were other issues that were raised in that same paper.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Obviously, it is a rapidly developing field where progress is being made quicker than what people thought was going to be made. Could you take on notice why the analysis as to why it is—</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> A further explanation in relation to—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> appropriate for us having the driver responsible compared with the US position, because I would have thought the technology is going to be global—there is no doubt about that. It is already here, and we have got to US taking one position and we seem to be taking another.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I do not know about taking different approaches but, most certainly, I will come back to you with that detail.</p>		
219.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Rice	Autonomous Vehicles	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> It is a pretty fundamental difference in terms of legal liability as to whether it is the driver who is responsible or the manufacturer of the vehicle that is responsible.</p>	15 22/11/2016	

				<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> The NTC paper does actually talk about the range of options going forward but it restates what our current position is, and so it actually opens the conversation in relation to all of the other arrangements. I will take on board the difference between the two and come back.</p>		
220.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Rice	Autonomous Vehicles	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> If the driver is sitting back and not paying attention, it does seem to be strange that our system would say that they are still legally liable, particularly given the US have decided that, no, it is a fully automated vehicle and it is the manufacturer that is liable for the decision-making of that vehicle.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I agree, and the paper does suggest that that actually be the case at that time. What has been stated is the current case, not what would be the case for automated vehicles. It is probably best if I come back to you with that in detail.</p>	15 22/11/2016	
221.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Autonomous Vehicles	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has NTC had any input into those conversations—that by 2020 there will be a resolution to put to governments?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I do not believe so, but I am happy to take that on notice.</p>	16 22/11/2016	
222.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Sterle	Driverless Truck Trial	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If you could please. While you are at it, has the NTC had any follow-up or involvement in the Coors brewery driverless truck trial in San Francisco about four or five weeks ago?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I am sorry; I would have to take that one on notice</p>	16 22/11/2016	
223.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Farrell	Autonomous Vehicle	<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I think there is so much interest in this that, yes, the pace of research being undertaken</p>	19 22/11/2016	

			Research	<p>particularly by companies is increasing tremendously. Google, Apple and all of those players, for example, obviously see this as an opportunity for the future.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Are any of them doing research on it in Australia or is it all being done in the United States?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I think there is some work being done here, but I would need to take that on notice to confirm it for you.</p>		
224.	Surface Transport Policy Division	Farrell	Coastal shipping volumes	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you tell us whether coastal shipping volumes increased in 2013-14 over 2012-13 and, if so, by how much?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Basically the goods being moved by ships around the coast have not been increasing in volume if they are considered as part of the total freight volume that Australia is responsible for. Road transport has been increasing, for example; however, the maritime sector is not increasing or is not showing an uptake in relation to the goods that it is moving in comparison. But overall, yes, there has been an increase.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Can you tell us by how much?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I think it is probably best if we take that on notice for you.</p>	29-30 22/11/2016	
225.	Local Government and Territories Division	Sterle	Financial Assistance Grants	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What was the total figure again?</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> The amount of funding that we provide to local governments annually is around \$2.3 billion. There was a pause to indexation, and the savings from that pause were estimated at around \$925 million over the three years.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Over how many councils?</p>	32 22/11/2016	

				<b>Ms Fleming:</b> Council numbers have recently changed with some of the amalgamations. From memory, it is around 544 councils now. I believe that is the current number, but I will take that on notice and confirm.		
226.	Local Government and Territories Division	Sterle	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will just come back to the grants commissions. Have any of those grants commissions quantified the funding loss from their states as a result of the FAGs freeze? <b>Mr Dreezer:</b> Not that I am aware of. I think we would need to take that on notice.	32 22/11/2016	
227.	Local Government and Territories Division	Sterle	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>Ms Fleming:</b> I will ask my colleague to tell you the amount that is distributed to each state for this financial year. We would have to take it on notice for the previous financial years.	33 22/11/2016	
228.	Local Government and Territories Division	Sterle	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>Ms Fleming:</b> What we have is the \$2.3 billion disbursed to the states. There is an estimated saving over the forward estimates; I would have to take on notice how that related to each state. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, I just wanted to see what the cuts were to each state. <b>Ms Fleming:</b> There were not cuts; there was a— <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Freeze. <b>Ms Fleming:</b> There was a freeze on indexation. <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, wrong word. <b>Ms Fleming:</b> So we cannot predict, other than the global figure, how that would have been disbursed by states. We would have to take that on notice.	33 22/11/2016	
229.	Corporate Services Division	Farrell	Efficiency Dividend	<b>Senator FARRELL:</b> What savings are this particular department being asked to provide? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The cumulative effect of the efficiency dividend—and there are several, dating back some	28 22/11/2016	

				<p>time to successive governments—operates at around \$6 million to \$8 million per annum year-on-year for us.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Those are the savings that you are expected to deliver?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Each year.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> But in respect of this part of the process, how much of that \$6 million is being—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It would be apportioned across the division. I would need to take that on notice. The cumulative number is around \$6 million to \$8 million a year.</p>		
230.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> My question relates to the cost-benefit analysis of WestConnex. I asked questions of Infrastructure Australia about it at estimates on 17 October. Further to that, the committee received some correspondence from an individual who was also asking about the benefit-cost analysis and the correspondence that he had with Mr Parkinson. I will read what he has said to you: 'At the supplementary estimates hearing, Senator Rice put to Mr Parkinson that the WestConnex benefit-cost analysis of 1.7 was based on costs of \$13.5 billion, and Mr Parkinson replied, "As set out in our project evaluation summary for the WestConnex project, for capital costs we are using the \$16.8 billion figure.'" He goes on to say: 'My own calculations match those of Senator Rice. The benefit-cost analysis of 1.7 is broadly consistent with a cost of \$13.5 billion and is inconsistent with a cost of \$16.8 billion.' He says, 'I duly made an</p>	24-25 22/11/2016	

			<p>inquiry of Mr Parkinson. He was good enough to reply that the \$13.5 billion total cost figure is the present value of total cost at the seven per cent real discount rate. The \$16.8 billion capital cost figure is a nominal outturn figure which is not discounted. In other words, Mr Parkinson has privately acknowledged that, contrary to the answer he gave Senator Rice, the benefit-cost analysis of 1.7 is based upon discounted costs of \$13.5 billion, not upon the undiscounted cost of \$16.8 billion.' I want to clarify then, given what is going on here. He knows it is not a trivial matter and that the difference here is in excess of \$3 billion of public money.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice and get you an answer as quickly as possible. I suspect we will need to clarify. As you are aware, there are essentially two assessments underway. We have the nominal outturn cost, which is the \$16.8 billion, to which the benefit-cost analysis would normally apply, because that is your capital cost.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes. Exactly.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The \$13.5 billion, as I understand it, is effectively the net present value assessment, which is a different assessment to the benefit-cost analysis. Generally, with most business cases, you will end up with a benefit-cost analysis, which is the number that is greater than one. Separately, you will have what we call an NPV analysis, which is essentially the discounted financial transaction cost, which gives you essentially your financing value of the project. I will take on notice the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				question that has been raised by the correspondent and yourself and will come back to you, if I may, in detail.		
231.	Infrastructure Australia	Rice	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What you just said and what I was going to ask is: in normal practice, you would use the \$16.8 billion, but it appears that the benefit-cost ratio has used the \$13.5 billion.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is what I need to establish. Generally, under a business case you will have what we call an NPV, a net present value of a project, which is the discounted cash flow analysis, essentially, and then you have the benefit-cost analysis, which is done on your outturn cost. It might just be a case of having to explain the definitions of the two assessment methodologies that would be utilised. Let me take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Mr Mrdak, the secretary will make an attempt to produce a redacted copy of the correspondence that we have and then we will give consideration as to whether there are any implications in providing you with that, but you will have the exact figures and terminology used to assist you.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That would be utilised, and we can obviously—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We will try to do that through the break, if we can.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is fine. I will get an answer and an explanation for Senator Rice as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> This evening?</p>	25 22/11/2016	

				<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not think I would be able to do it this evening because I need to go back. Given the hour, I just do not think I would be able to get hold of the officers who have the details, including Mr Parkinson. I need to take it on notice, I am sorry.		
232.	Infrastructure Investment Division	Farrell	Inland Rail	<p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Who is the responsible minister for the study linking Inland Rail to the Port of Gladstone?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> That would be Minister Chester.</p> <p><b>Senator FARRELL:</b> Is that in any way linked to the Adani mine proceeding?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I would need to take that on notice—I am not familiar enough with it. I do not believe it is.</p>	8 22/11/2016	