

**Additional Estimates 2019-20**

**Agriculture, Water and the Environment portfolio, excluding Agriculture and Water – Monday 2 March 2020**

<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Program: Division or Agency</b>	<b>Senator</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Proof Hansard Page &amp; Hearing Date or In Writing</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Corporate: ALD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>FOI</b>	<p>1. Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for financial year 2019-20 to date.</p> <p>2. For 2019-20 to date, please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full;</li> <li>b. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part;</li> <li>c. The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and</li> <li>d. The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under the Freedom of Information Act.</li> </ul> <p>3. For 2019-20 to date, please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and</li> <li>b. The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request).</li> </ul> <p>4. For 2019-20 to date, please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the OAIC; and</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000169 (Env) SQ20-000106 (Ag)

				<p>b. The number of times has the OAIC overturned – in whole or in part – the Department’s decision to refuse access to material.</p> <p>5. Please provide the staffing (both ASL and headcount) of staff at the Department who work exclusively on FOI requests, broken down by APS level (e.g. three EL1s, four APS6s, one SES) for 2019-20 to date.</p> <p>6. Please also list the number of officers who are designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Department.</p> <p>7. In the past 12 months, has the Department seconded additional resources to processing Freedom of Information requests? If so, please detail those resources by APS level.</p> <p>8. Please provide the number of officers who are currently designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Minister’s office.</p> <p>9. Please provide the number of FOI requests currently under consideration by the Department. Please also provide the number of these requests that are currently overdue in response.</p> <p>10. Does the department consult or inform the Minister when it receives Freedom of Information requests? If so:</p> <p>a. How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and</p> <p>b. Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister.</p> <p>11. Has the Department consulted or informed another Department or agency about any FOI request in the past twelve months. If so, please provide the legal basis on which that consultation occurred (e.g. third party consultation, transfer of request).</p>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Corporate: ALD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Legal costs</b>	1. What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for FY 2019-20 to date?	Written	SQ20-000170 (Env) SQ20-000105

						(Ag)
3.	Corporate: ALD	Senator Kitching	CDDA Payments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>2. How many claims were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Accepted.</li> <li>b. Rejected.</li> <li>c. Under consideration.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations</li> <li>b. The date payment was made</li> <li>c. The decision maker.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000171 (Env) SQ20-000119 (Ag)
4.	Corporate: BCD	Senator Waters	Details on the work undertaken by departmental staff seconded to Minerals Council of Australia	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I'm also keen to know whether or not the person that's with the Minerals Council is actually working on submissions for the Minerals Council and departmental policy proposals.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> We'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Have any of those secondees, at any point in the past, ended up going to work permanently for the Minerals Council?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> Not that I recall, but we can clarify that as well.</p> <p><b>Senator Waters:</b> I'm likewise interested in whether any of the placement positions have ended up becoming permanent.</p>	Page 10 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000003
5.	Corporate: BCD	Senator Waters	Protections to ensure protected information about regulatory decision-making	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> They were not. I'm interested in any other protections to ensure that the Minerals Council is not given protected information about regulatory decision-making.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> Sure. I would have to come back on notice on the specifics. There are two things I will let you know. I said this morning it was a secondment. It isn't. Nonetheless, for secondments, there is an MOU that is put in place with the organisation. There is a specific agreement that talks through a bunch of those specific issues. We've had about 15 of those agreements with a range of organisations over the years.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Presumably those same protections don't apply when it's not a secondment, though?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> Again, there will be protections. I will spell it out.</p>	Page 80 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000053
6.	Corporate: BCD	Senator Waters	Staff placements – arrangements	In estimates, Mr Knudsen confirmed that a staff member (EL-1) had been granted one year leave without pay to take a contract position with	Written	SQ20-000113

			<b>with MCA</b>	<p>the Minerals Council of Australia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During estimates, Mr Knudsen initially indicated that the employee had responded to an Expression of Interest, similar to an EOI circulated by the Department for a secondment to WWF. Was an EOI circulated regarding the MCA position? If so, please provide details of how and to whom it was circulated.</li> <li>• Who approved the Leave Without Pay arrangement?</li> <li>• Was the LWOP arrangement conditional upon compliance with any restrictions regarding use or disclosure of Departmental information or work that would be undertaken during the time with MCA? If so, please provide details of any arrangements put in place.</li> <li>• Have any similar LWOP arrangements been approved for staff to work with MCA in the past 5 years? If so, how often has this occurred?</li> <li>• I understand that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade has a standing arrangement for staff secondments to the Minerals Council of Australia. Did the Department of Environment consult with DFAT regarding that arrangement when considering the LWOP request?</li> <li>• Mr Knudsen indicated that he was aware that the employee was working on the MCA submission to the EPBC review as part of her role. Did the Department seek any advice about whether this work would create any conflict of interest?</li> <li>• Please provide a copy of the EOI prepared in relation to the secondment to WWF, and any arrangements in place to safeguard confidentiality during the secondment. Was the secondment arrangement initiated by WWF or the Department?</li> </ul>		
7.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>Review of administrative</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Where are these arrangements documented?  <b>Dr Findlay:</b> That's a good question.</p>	Page 43 Monday	SQ20-000031

			<b>arrangements for support of park management</b>	<p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. We changed accountabilities in the structure, so we made it quite clear that the financial teams were working quite closely with the departmental CFO. At the same time the director also had their own CFO reporting, so we have a lot of documentation there. Is there one piece of documentation that answers that? I'd have to check.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> There's a 2001 memorandum of understanding, which does, I assume, seek to document the relationship between the two entities. There's a 2013 service delivery agreement, which presumably performs some similar function. It's referenced in the Auditor's report. Have either of those documents been updated or are they defunct?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> No. We took a different arrangement by having a service agreement between the Director of National Parks and the department. We're of the view that there continues to be a risk of duplication and a risk of not making an opportunity of combining corporate services to get the most out of activities.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Mr Cahill, it is a difficult thing to efficiently develop and deliver corporate services across two organisations. I accept that. The point that's being made in the report, as I see it, is a lack of clarity about who is doing what and a failure to document obligations, delegations and responsibilities. My question to you is: has that been remedied in a way that either a staff member or an external auditor or a parliamentarian, such as myself, could understand the relationship between the two organisations? Where do I find that information?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. We do have a range of documentation.</p>	2 March	
8.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Carr</b>	<b>Country of origin for A4 photo copy paper</b>	<p>From which country does the department and its agencies source A4 photo copy paper?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If from multiple countries please provide a breakdown of country of origin in percentage terms.</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000111
9.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Appointments – briefs prepared</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many times has the Department prepared a brief for statutory authorities, executive agencies, advisory boards, government business enterprises or any other Commonwealth body which includes a reference to a former Liberal or National member of parliament at a state, territory or federal level, since</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000172 (Env) SQ20-000113 (Ag)

				<p>the answer was provided for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20?</p> <p>2. For each brief prepared, can the Department advise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The former member.</li> <li>The board or entity.</li> <li>Whether the request originated from the Minister's office.</li> <li>Whether the appointment was made.</li> </ol>		
<b>10.</b>	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Board Appointments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members from the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates Round 2019-20.</li> <li>What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?</li> <li>What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid?</li> <li>What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors?</li> <li>What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000173 (Env) SQ20-000112 (Ag)
<b>11.</b>	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Commissioned reports and reviews</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date commissioned.</li> <li>Date report handed to Government.</li> <li>Date of public release.</li> <li>Terms of Reference.</li> <li>Committee members and/or Reviewers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost.</li> <li>The background and credentials of the Review personnel.</li> <li>The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel</li> <li>The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review.</li> <li>How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?</li> <li>What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000174 (Env) SQ20-000111 (Ag)
<b>12.</b>	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Briefings</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000175 (Env)

				<p>of Representatives since the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20? If so, can the following be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The subject matter of the briefing.</li> <li>The location and date of the briefing.</li> <li>Who proposed the briefing?</li> <li>Attendees of the briefing by level/position</li> </ol>		SQ20-000100 (Ag)
13.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Ministerial Functions</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio, can the following information be provided from the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of functions.</li> <li>List of all attendees.</li> <li>Function venue.</li> <li>Itemised list of costs (GST <b>inclusive</b>).</li> <li>Details of any food served.</li> <li>Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</li> <li>Any available photographs of the function.</li> <li>Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000176 (Env) SQ20-000096 (Ag)
14.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Acting Minister Arrangements</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister since the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20?</li> <li>Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000177 (Env) SQ20-000101 (Ag)
15.	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Market research</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies?</li> <li>If so, can the Department provide an itemised list for financial year 2019-20 to date: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject matter</li> <li>Company</li> <li>Costs</li> <li>Contract date period</li> </ol> </li> <li>Can the Department/agency advise what, if any, research was shared with the Minister or their office and the date and format in which this occurred.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000178 (Env) SQ20-000102 (Ag)

16.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Advertising and Information campaigns	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for the financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>2. What advertising and information campaigns has the Department/agency run in this time? For each campaign, please provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When approval was first sought.</li> <li>b. The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process.</li> <li>c. the timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000179 (Env) SQ20-000103 (Ag)
17.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Promotional merchandise	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for the financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided?</li> <li>3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000180 (Env) SQ20-000104 (Ag)
18.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Social media influencers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote?</li> <li>3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided?</li> <li>4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000181 (Env) SQ20-000109 (Ag)
19.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Stationary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in financial year 2019-20 to date.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000182 (Env) SQ20-000114 (Ag)
20.	Corporate:	Senator	Media monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000183

	<b>CBS</b>	<b>Kitching</b>		<p>press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the each Minister's office for financial year 2019-20 to date?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?</li> <li>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</li> <li>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2019-20?</li> </ol> <p>2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for financial year 2019-20 to date?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?</li> <li>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</li> <li>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2019-20?</li> </ol>		(Env) SQ20-000115 (Ag)
<b>21.</b>	<b>Corporate: CBS</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Communications staff</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following:</li> <li>2. By Department or agency: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location.</li> <li>b. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location.</li> <li>c. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location?</li> <li>d. How many are graphic designers.</li> <li>e. How many are media managers.</li> <li>f. How many organise events.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If yes, why.</li> <li>b. When was it established?</li> <li>c. What is the set up cost?</li> <li>d. What is the ongoing cost?</li> <li>e. How many staff work there and what are their classifications.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000184 (Env) SQ20-000116 (Ag)

22.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Departmental staff in Minister's office	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Duration of secondment.</li> <li>b. APS level.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000185 (Env) SQ20-000117 (Ag)
23.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Congestion busting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the Department/agency provide an update on how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks.</li> <li>2. Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department since an answer was provided for the Supplementary Estimates round 2019-20.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000186 (Env) SQ20-000118 (Ag)
24.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Executive office upgrades	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded from the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST <b>inclusive</b>).</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000187 (Env) SQ20-000098 (Ag)
25.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Green	Contract between department and JWS Research – subject matters	<p>With reference to the contract between the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment and JWS Research for the provision of market research services as detailed in Contract Notice CN3638828 published on AusTender on 5 November 2019, as amended by Contract Notice CN3638828-A1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the subject matters and issues covered by the market research services being provided by JWS Research include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Climate change?</li> <li>(b) Emissions reductions?</li> <li>(c) Energy policy?</li> <li>(d) Renewable energy?</li> <li>(e) Plastics?</li> <li>(f) Recycling?</li> <li>(g) The circular economy?</li> <li>(h) Biodiversity?</li> <li>(i) The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000149

				(j) Environmental approvals processes? What other subject matters will the market research being provided by JWS Research cover?		
26.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Green	Contract between department and JWS Research – research methods	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are qualitative research methods such as focus groups or structured interviews being used in this research?</li> <li>2. If yes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) How many focus groups or structured interviews have been conducted to date?</li> <li>(b) On what dates were each of these focus groups or structured interviews conducted?</li> <li>(c) How many people participated in each of these focus groups or structured interviews?</li> <li>(d) In what cities or towns were these focus groups or structured interviews conducted?</li> <li>(e) What were the demographic characteristics of the participants in these focus groups or structured interviews?</li> <li>(f) How many focus groups or structured interviews are planned to be carried out in the future under this contract?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Are any other research methods being used in this research?</li> <li>4. If yes, what other research methods are being used?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000150
27.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Green	Contract between department and JWS Research – contract value	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why was the value of the contract increased from \$1,100,000 to \$1,393,260 as detailed in Contract Notice CN3638828-A1?</li> <li>2. Was the decision to enter into this contract made or approved by Cabinet?</li> <li>3. If yes, when did Cabinet make or approve that decision?</li> <li>4. Was the decision to enter into this contract made by a Minister or Ministers?</li> <li>5. If yes, which Minister or Ministers made the decision to enter into this contract and when was that decision made</li> <li>6. If no, who made the decision to enter into this contract and when was that decision made.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000151

				<p>7. Was the decision to vary this contract to increase its value from \$1,100,000 to \$1,393,260 made or approved by Cabinet?</p> <p>8. If yes, when did Cabinet make or approve that decision?</p> <p>9. Was the decision to vary this contract to increase its value from \$1,100,000 to \$1,393,260 made by a Minister or Ministers?</p> <p>10. If yes, which Minister or Ministers made the decision to vary the contract to increase the value from \$1,100,000 to \$1,393,260 and when was that decision or decisions made?</p> <p>11. If no, who made the decision to vary this contract to increase its value from \$1,100,000 to \$1,393,260?</p> <p>12. Is the Department or the Government considering any further variations to this contract?</p>		
28.	Corporate: CBS	Senator Kitching	Facilities upgrades	<p>1. Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies subsequent to the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20? This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment.</p> <p>2. If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST <b>inclusive</b>)?</p> <p>3. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided?</p>	Written	SQ20-000188 (Env) SQ20-000099 (Ag)
29.	Corporate: FD	Senator Green	Machinery of Government changes	<p><i>With reference to the Machinery of Government changes that took effect on 1 February 2020:</i></p> <p>a) When did the Department first find out about the Machinery of Government changes and how was this communicated?</p> <p>b) Have there been any changes to any funding streams within the environment portfolio as a result of the Machinery of Government changes?</p> <p>c) Have there been any changes to program streams as a result of the Machinery of Government changes?</p>	Written	SQ20-000125
30.	Corporate: FD	Senator Green	Budget	<p>1) Please provide details of all programs relating to the environment for each year since 2013, including but not limited to, funding allocated, funding spent, and associated program outcome.</p>	Written	SQ20-000126

				<p>Please provide details of the total spend on each environment program for each year since 2013.</p> <p>2) Please provide details of the Department's overall budget, including administered and departmental funding allocated and spent, for each year since 2013.</p> <p>3) Please provide details about any changes made to any funding streams relating to the environment portfolio for each year since 2013.</p>		
<b>31.</b>	<b>Corporate: FD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Secretarial travel</b>	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department be provided from the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel.</li> <li>b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</li> <li>c. Accommodation for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</li> <li>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</li> <li>e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.</li> </ol>	Written	<p>SQ20-000190 (Env) SQ20-000108 (Ag)</p>
<b>32.</b>	<b>Corporate: FD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Staff travel</b>	<p>What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for FY 2019-20 to date.</p>	Written	<p>SQ20-000191 (Env) SQ20-000107 (Ag)</p>
<b>33.</b>	<b>Corporate: FD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Departmental functions</b>	<p>1. In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc. hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio, can the following information be provided from the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20:</p>	Written	<p>SQ20-000189 (Env) SQ20-000097 (Ag)</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. List of functions.</li> <li>b. List of all attendees.</li> <li>c. Function venue.</li> <li>d. Itemised list of costs (GST <b>inclusive</b>).</li> <li>e. Details of any food served.</li> <li>f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</li> <li>g. Any available photographs of the function.</li> <li>h. Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ul>		
34.	Corporate: PD	Senator Waters	List of department secondments	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Could you let me know, either on notice or perhaps when we come back, just the list of secondments that the department has presided over? I obviously am particularly interested in the safeguard mechanisms that you apply. And it does seem a little improper for a departmental staff member, while on secondment, to be working on departmental policy matters. Again, that seems insane to me.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> We'll take that on notice and we'll get a list of the secondments as well as the arrangements we put in place when staff are seconded.</p>	Page 9 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000002
35.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Comcare	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For financial year 2019-20 to date, can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status.</li> <li>2. Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the FY2019-20 to date?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000192 (Env) SQ20-000122 (Ag)
36.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Recruitment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000193 (Env) SQ20-000120 (Ag)
37.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency?	Written	SQ20-000194 (Env) SQ20-000125 (Ag)
38.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Public Interest Disclosures	For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many public interest disclosures have been received?	Written	SQ20-000195 (Env) SQ20-000126 (Ag)

39.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Staffing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at 1 March 2020? How does this differ from the figures presented in Budget Paper 4 in the 2019-20 Budget?</li> <li>2. How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing.</li> <li>3. How many redundancies have occurred in financial year 2019-20 to date? How many were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. voluntary</li> <li>b. involuntary.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies?</li> <li>5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff?</li> <li>6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> <li>7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in financial year 2019-20 to date?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000196 (Env) SQ20-000121 (Ag)
40.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Fair Work Commission	For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency?	Written	SQ20-000197 (Env) SQ20-000123 (Ag)
41.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Fair Work Ombudsman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000198 (Env) SQ20-000124 (Ag)
42.	Corporate: PD	Senator Kitching	Executive management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for financial year 2019-20 to date: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The total number of executive management positions</li> <li>b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.</li> <li>c. The change in the number of executive manager positions.</li> <li>d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000199 (Env) SQ20-0001095 (Ag)
43.	Corporate:	Senator	Terms of	<b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> On what date was the advice to government	Page 10-	SQ20-000004

	<b>PSD</b>	<b>McAllister</b>	<b>reference for Sydney Harbour Federation Trust Review</b>	<p>provided in relation to the terms of reference?  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. If I recall, I think we were giving advice on the draft terms of reference in about May of last year, but I'd have to take that on notice.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> May last year?  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> Yes, April-May. So, obviously where government is deciding to do an independent review, it would like to understand what would be the terms of reference of that review.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Yes, it would. You first provided advice in May last year?  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> I would say that we would have done some work before that. I'd have to take that on notice, but we would have given advice to the minister in the lead-up to or as part of the federal budget process for 2019-20.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> It is slightly pedantic but I find it a problem to have questions being answered with 'we would have'. Either we did or didn't. It would assist me if you could either say that you don't know or give me—  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> I would be confident that, in part of the portfolio budget submission for the 2019-20 budget, we raised the review of the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> You raised the review and did you provide advice on the terms of reference for the review? I'm just trying to understand the time line because it obviously ends with the minister releasing—  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> We'll come back on that.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Sorry?  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> I will come back to the actual detail on when we first raised it.</p>	11 Monday 2 March	
44.	<b>Corporate: PSD</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>Final Terms of Reference for Sydney Harbour Federation Trust Review</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> When were the final terms of reference provided to the minister? When were they finalised?  <b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 11 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000005
45.	<b>Corporate: PSD</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>Location of remediation liabilities of the</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> There's been some speculation about the remediation liabilities of the trust. From a financial perspective, where are those liabilities located?</p>	Page 11- 12 Monday	SQ20-000006

			<b>Trust</b>	<p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> That would be a matter for the Executive Director of the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> They're not liabilities of government?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> When you say 'liabilities', could I get you to clarify?</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> If you are in control of a piece of land and it is subject to environmental remediation liabilities or obligations, at some point they show up as a financial obligation on the books of an institution of some kind, and I'm trying to understand where I will find that. I'm having a look at the annual report of the trust and I can't see it there. I may be wrong and I may have missed it, but I'm trying to understand where I will see those liabilities in terms of the government's financial reporting.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> My understanding is that the liabilities sit on the Commonwealth books and they would be reflected in the balance sheet of the trust.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> In the balance sheet of the trust?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> We'll confirm that though.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Thank you. I'll ask about that.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> My understanding is that, at least through the trust history at some points in time, some of those liabilities have continued to be held by Defence pending negotiation of the outcome with the trust; so there may still be aspects of that in play too.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Are they subject to New South Wales law in terms of contamination or does the fact that they are Commonwealth property exempt them from the provisions of the New South Wales Contaminated Land Management Act?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	2 March	
46.	<b>Corporate: PSD</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>Contact between Cockatoo Island Foundation and Minister's office</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Has the minister's office had contact with the Cockatoo Island Foundation, Senator Birmingham?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I don't know.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Could we find out, please?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> We can take it on notice.</p>	Page 12- 13 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000007
47.	<b>Corporate: PSD</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>Invitations to the announcement of the Review</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Finally, who was responsible for organising the public meeting or the public announcement that Mr Zimmerman attended in relation to the review of the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust? Was the department involved in that?</p> <p><b>Mr Bover:</b> Yes, the department and Minister Lee's office were</p>	Page 13 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000008

				<p>involved in organising the announcement of the review.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Why was the decision made to invite Mr Zimmerman?</p> <p><b>Mr Bover:</b> The announcement was made at the Sub Base Platypus site, which is within Mr Zimmerman's electorate.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Even though many aspects of the trust are located in Mr Albanese's electorate?</p> <p><b>Mr Bover:</b> I believe Cockatoo Island is within his electorate, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Was any consideration given to inviting Mr Albanese? Did the department suggest that Mr Albanese be notified?</p> <p><b>Mr Bover:</b> I'm not aware that any advice was given on that matter.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Not aware? So you're personally not aware just as an individual? Did the department provide advice that suggested Mr Albanese should have been invited to the public forum?</p> <p><b>Mr Metcalfe:</b> We will check on that.</p> <p><b>Mr Bover:</b> I don't believe for the announcement, but certainly the department has provided advice to the reviewers on all of the local members so that the reviewers can meet with all of the local members, including Mr Albanese.</p>		
48.	Corporate: PSD	Senator Green	Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please provide details relating to the appointment of members to the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust, including information about their credentials and the date each member was appointed.</li> <li>2) <i>With reference to evidence provided to the Additional Senate Estimates hearing on 2 March 2020 in relation to the independent review of the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Mr Cahill said that the department provided advice on the draft terms of reference for the review into the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust in “about” May 2019. Please provide details of the specific advice that was provided, including the specific amendments made to the draft terms of reference.</li> <li>b. How many drafts of the terms of reference were there?</li> <li>c. Mr Bover claimed the department “reached out” to Mr Albanese’s office on behalf of the reviewers, on 17 January via email. Can you please provide a copy of this email?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000127

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Ms Darwell advised the trust rejected a proposal from Mr Berg in 2018. What was the basis for rejecting this proposal?</li> <li>e. Ms Darwell advised that “a briefing was provided to Mr Berg and associates around the act and the plans of the trust” after the trust rejected Mr Berg’s proposal in 2018. What was communicated to Mr Berg and associates at this briefing about the act and the plans of the trust?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) How many separate interactions has the Minister’s Office had with the Cockatoo Island Foundation. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> <li>4) How many separate interactions has the Department had with Cockatoo Island Foundation. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> <li>5) How many separate interactions has the Trust had with Cockatoo Island Foundation. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> <li>6) How many separate interactions has the Trust had with the AFL/Sydney Swans. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> <li>7) How many separate interactions has the Minister’s Office had with the AFL/Sydney Swans. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> <li>8) How many separate interactions has the Department had with AFL/Sydney Swans. What was the nature of those interactions?</li> </ul>		
<b>49.</b>	<b>Corporate: TMAD</b>	<b>Senator Kitching</b>	<b>Ministerial Overseas travel</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio please be provided from the of date the last answer for the Supplementary Estimates 2019-20, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister’s personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel.</li> <li>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister’s personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000200 (Env) SQ20-000128 (Ag)

				<p>departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister’s personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister’s personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister’s travel should also be provided.</p>		
<b>50.</b>	<b>1.1: BCD</b>	<b>Senator Rice</b>	<b>20 million trees</b>	Please provide any data on the survival rate (over any timeframe) of trees planted under the 20 million trees program.	Written	SQ20-000102
<b>51.</b>	<b>1.1: HRMD</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Great Barrier Reef Foundation</b>	<p>The Reef Foundation’s <i>Collaborative Investment Strategy</i> has an overarching financial target of \$300M – \$400M, comprised of a capital campaign, corporate giving and individual giving.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This target is less than the “dollar for dollar” commitment made when the Commonwealth granted \$443M to the organisation. Is the Department satisfied with the Investment target and strategies?</li> <li>• Has the Department been advised how much the Foundation has raised so far (excluding in-kind support)? If so, please provide details.</li> <li>• Of the money raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how much has been raised from within Australia, and how much from international sources?</li> <li>• how much has been raised from corporations, individuals and from the capital campaign?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Reef Foundation received \$60 million for Crown of Thorns Starfish (<i>COTS</i>) control. Its Reef Trust Program Investment Strategy has allocated \$57.8 million over 5 years to COTS control.</p>	Written	SQ20-000124

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Department already taken an admin fee for the COTS control program, as it does with GBRMPA, as part of a broader admin fee for the Reef Trust Partnership? If so, how much is the fee (in dollar value and as a percentage of allocated funds)?</li> <li>• Has the Foundation also taken an admin fee? If so, how much is the fee (in dollar value and as a percentage of allocated funds)?</li> <li>• Has the Department done any analysis of the comparative efficiency of a direction appropriation to GBRMPA, rather than funding the COTS program through the Department and the Reef Foundation? If so, what did the analysis conclude?</li> <li>• Please advise how many hours of GBRMPA staff time is dedicated to Departmental reporting mechanisms, compared with on-ground COTS control activities?</li> </ul>		
52.	1.1: HRMD	Senator Waters	Water quality of the Reef	<p>According to stakeholders who attended a Reef Foundation workshop late last year, a report commissioned by the Foundation found that the total investment needed to meet all the water quality targets in the Reef 2050 Water Quality Improvement Plan 2017-2022 is \$4.5B. However, this figure was not included in the Foundation's final report.</p> <p>Australia's State Party report to the World Heritage Centre (Appendix B) includes an investment table that shows the total current Cth/Qld investment over a 10-year timeline from 2015-2025 is \$826 million. If the \$4.5B figure is correct, this leaves a shortfall of \$3.674B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the Government recognise the significant shortfall in funds necessary to address water quality, which the govt has recognised as one of the greatest threats to the Great Barrier Reef?</li> <li>• Will the Government commit more money in the May Budget to address this shortfall to allow the 2025 targets to be met?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000123
53.	1.1: HRMD	Senator Green	Great Barrier Reef	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What is the Department's understanding of the role of the Reef Envoy?</li> <li>2) To what extent does the reef envoy inform policy responses to the continuing degradation of the Reef?</li> <li>3) In order of priority, list in numbered order the key threats to the health of the Reef, 1 being the most important and impactful. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Indicate where on this list single use plastics sits due to</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000128

				<p>its importance and impact to the Reef.</p> <p>4) Is it the Department's position that the level of coral bleaching to the Great Barrier Reef experienced in the last ten years has been happening for millennia?</p> <p>5) Is it the Department's position that the impact climate change on the Great Barrier Reef experienced in the last ten years has been happening for millennia?</p> <p>6) Which government minister or member is responsible for policy on single use plastics?</p> <p>7) How many staff have been appointed to assist Mr Entsch as the Reef Envoy?</p> <p>8) Has the Minister received any briefing in relation to a potential third mass bleaching event on the Great Barrier Reef.</p> <p>9) What actions is the department taking to avoid a third mass coral bleaching in recent years.</p> <p>10) What was the cost to local economies of the last two mass bleaching events?</p> <p>11) <i>With reference to the approximately \$444 million grant provided to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much of this funding has been spent by the Foundation. Please provide a breakdown of these costs.</li> <li>b. How much has been spent on administration of the grant.</li> <li>c. How many staff are now employed at the Great Barrier Reef Foundation?</li> </ol>		
54.	1.2: CARD	Senator Waters	3.4 degrees briefing	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Have you sought briefings from the BOM on that 3.4-degree prediction and what it means for our environment?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I haven't personally. I've been in the job for five days.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> With respect, I'm not asking about you personally; I'm asking about the departments.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I know that material has been provided and we'd be reviewing it, but I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Is there someone else who might be able to answer?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> Again, those officials will be here this afternoon.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Has the department undertaken a costing of what</p>	Page 9 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000203

				3.4 degrees will mean? <b>Mr Cahill:</b> They'll have to take that this afternoon.		
55.	1.2: CARD	Senator Roberts	Scientific evidence of climate change and effects of human activity on the climate which affect the Great Barrier Reef	<p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Can I just put it on notice, Chair, that I'd like the specific page numbers for the evidence—the empirical scientific evidence that proves that carbon dioxide from human activity affects climate and needs to be cut; secondly, the location of the statistically significant empirical evidence that shows there's been an actual change in climate processes; and, thirdly, the exact location of what you consider to be unprecedented if anything.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> You know he doesn't get any messages—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Order! You were heard in silence.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> Senator, the department is—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Mr Cahill, when you get the call I will let you talk. Senators, you were heard in silence. Please do not harangue people just because you disagree with their view. Mr Cahill.</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> Senator, the department's happy to take that on notice, recognising that the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources also has a range of material as well. We will look to coordinating a document and references for you.</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Yes, I'd like to know the exact location of the empirical evidence that proves causation.</p>	Page 34-35 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000023
56.	1.2: CARD	Senator Hanson-Young	Glasgow Climate Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which department is responsible for developing our pledges for Glasgow at the end of the year?</li> <li>• When do you have to have your updated pledges ready for Glasgow – November, or earlier?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000065
57.	1.2: CARD	Senator Rice	National Environmental Science Program	<p>A response to a <a href="#">previous QoN</a> specifies additional funding is committed for the National Environmental Science Program until 2022-23, and that specific announcements will follow - but the departmental website still listed the conclusion date as 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has funding been committed?</li> <li>○ When will specific commitments be announced?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000101
58.	1.2: CARD	Senator Green	National Centre for Coasts, Environment and Climate Change	<p><i>With reference to a commitment of \$25 million to establish a National Centre for Coasts, Environment and Climate, announced by the Hon Greg Hunt, to be run by the University of Melbourne and Monash University at Point Nepean:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has this funding been expended?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000141

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has this funding been used? Please provide a breakdown of costs required to establish the centre.</li> <li>• What new activities will be carried out by the centre with these funds?</li> <li>• What was the basis for committing this funding and what assessment processes were used in the awarding of these funds.</li> </ul>		
59.	1.4: BCD	Senator McAllister	Environmental Restoration Fund – bushfire recovery	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> That's useful. How much is the fund in total?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> With the bushfires, it's \$130 million.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> What is the profiling for that fund?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> It was approximately \$25 million per year initially. The bushfire funding is front-loaded to the first two years.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> And \$15 million in each year?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> Not quite.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> So it commences in 2019-20?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> As announced in the budget?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> So it's roughly \$25 million in each year for the core funding and then the \$30 million is for which years?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> In 2019-20 and 2020-21.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> If you want, we can come back with that specific detail.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> That sounds good. I would appreciate that. I wasn't here at the last Senate estimates. You said that you had allocated around \$70 million of what was then a \$100 million fund. Has that changed?</p>	Page 64-65 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000043
60.	1.4: BCD	Senator McAllister	Advise provided to the Minister on implementing commitments post election	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Section 13.11 of the Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines says: Officials should consider the options available for selection processes— It canvasses the possibility that you might recommend a closed non-competitive process. It goes on to say: In determining the most appropriate application and selection process for a grant opportunity, officials should consider and document a range of issue associated with the available options...</p> <p>Did you do that?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I believe we did. We provided our advice to the minister on the best way to deliver those election commitments.</p>	Page 67 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000044

				<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Can you table that advice?  <b>Mr Costello:</b> I don't have it here, no.  <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Can you agree to table that advice? There's about 100 people sitting in the room. I'm sure we could get it emailed across.  <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> We'll take it on notice.</p>		
61.	1.4: BCD	Senator McAllister	Contact with organisations receiving money from the fund prior to announcement of recipients	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Well, I'll ask you a flat question. Did you have contact with every one of these organisations before announcing publicly that they were the lucky recipients of your largesse?  <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 68 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000045
62.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Environmental Restoration Fund grant guidelines	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me specifically when? You may need to take these on notice because these are specific questions about these grant guidelines.  <b>Ms Campbell:</b> When they were approved, because it would have been an iterative process.  <b>Senator RICE:</b> When you developed them.  <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> 'Developed' is a process, Senator Rice. You've got the answer that they were published on 14 November.  <b>Senator RICE:</b> When did it start? What were the processes up until the final publishing of them?  <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> We'll take it on notice.  <b>Senator RICE:</b> When did officials advise the minister in relation to the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act and the Commonwealth grant guideline requirements under section 4.4 of the guidelines?  <b>Mr Costello:</b> On a couple of occasions. Specifically, when grants are approved, there are requirements to identify those requirements.  <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take it on notice when?  <b>Mr Costello:</b> Yes.</p>	Page 72 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000047
63.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Approval of funds	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And when were funds approved?  <b>Mr Costello:</b> Well, there have been a couple of different processes. For the grant processes, just in recent weeks.  <b>Senator RICE:</b> Just in recent weeks. Can you be more specific than that, please?</p>	Page 72 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000048

				<b>Mr Costello:</b> I could take on notice the specific date, but it was about two or three weeks ago for the grants.		
64.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Comprehensive, adequate and representative reserves underpinning Regional Forest Agreements (RFAs)	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I will quickly go to the interaction of the fires and the regional forest agreements. I will start by confirming that underpinning the RFAs is a requirement for comprehensive, adequate and representative reserves.</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That's right. And is this required to be maintained throughout the life of an RFA?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> Yes. When the RFAs were agreed, there were comprehensive, adequate reserves set up. That resulted in significant inclusions of reserves. More than 10 million hectares were added.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> It required that those reserves be comprehensive, representative and adequate throughout the life of the RFA?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> Those reserves stay in place. The RFA has had a framework for managing forestry operations, understanding the fires have had an impact on both native species and forestry operations. We understand that the states and territories are considering how to continue the balance of those outcomes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Brilliant.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> I might suggest that you come back on those. You've asked a very specific question. Because these are unprecedented circumstances, I think it would be wise for us to make sure and confirm our answer on that before we are absolutely clear. I'm not sure what 'comprehensive' is.</p>	Page 74 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000049
65.	1.4: BCD	Senator McAllister	Curiosity bait commercialisation	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> What about the Curiosity bait commercialisation?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> They are going to be ad hoc grants. So those organisations have been invited to apply based on policy advice from the department that advancing these feral cat control methodologies would have extremely beneficial outcomes for threatened species, particularly at this time.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Can you table the advice, please?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I can't table it, but I can take it on notice. I don't have the advice with me.</p>	Page 75 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000050
66.	1.4: BCD	Senator Smith	Breakdown of \$50 million wildlife	<b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Do you have any further breakdowns for me? So \$18.6 million has been expended. How many projects have	Page 76 Monday	SQ20-000051

			<b>recovery package following 2019-20 bushfires</b>	<p>actually commenced?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> We can take the number of projects on notice. There's quite a few. Or Steve can count them.</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> About 20 projects.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Could you table what you are looking at?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> Yes. But I will then not be able to answer questions on it.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> You don't need to table it at this specific moment. If there's detailed information there, I would appreciate you submitting that to the committee. I want to take you to the dunnart on Kangaroo Island. How much funding has been used to support wildlife recovery groups on KI in preserving the dunnart?</p>	2 March	
67.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	<b>Advice sought by New South Wales Government on logging fire affected forests</b>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> In my final two minutes, I want to ask about some more questions about logging and RFAs. I will start with the New South Wales government's plan to log burnt forest, which is swift parrot winter habitat in south-east New South Wales. Has the New South Wales government sought advice from the federal government about logging fire affected forests and specifically about logging that habitat of the critically endangered swift parrot?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> It is not to my knowledge that New South Wales has sought our advice on that issue.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Take it on notice, then. Do you know which scientists or experts were consulted about the logging, on which the New South Wales EPA claimed it had consulted?</p>	Page 82 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000058
68.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	<b>Meetings of Victorian-Commonwealth joint RFA</b>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to move to RFAs, including the Victorian RFA rollover. In the last questions I asked, you were waiting on input from the Victorian government. Have you discussed the Victorian RFA with the Victorian government since we last met?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> Yes, several times.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you expect that the RFAs will renew or roll over after their extension expires in March?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> It remains government policy to seek to extend the RFA. The governments are in negotiation. Ultimately it will be a matter for governments.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can I put on notice, then, the details of the conversations you've had with the Victorian government since we last discussed this?</p>	Page 83 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000059

				<p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> We can do that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Similarly, when did the Victorian-Commonwealth joint RFA working group last meet?</p> <p><b>Ms Elphinstone:</b> We'll take the exact date on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can we get copies of the minutes of any of those meetings, please?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> Yes.</p>		
69.	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Expected timeframe of the Greater Glider Recovery Plan	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> My final question is about recovery plans for the Leadbeater's possum and great gliders. When can we expect to see the recovery plan for the Leadbeater's possum?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> As you know, we've been working on the Leadbeater's recovery plan. I think we spoke—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> For a very long time.</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> For a very long time. We spoke at the last hearing about aiming to get it finalised by the end of last year. We needed to look through the impacts of the Victorian government's announcement that it would stop old-growth logging on the RFA. We're close to finalising that assessment. It's been overtaken a bit in our priorities by the bushfire response. We're hoping to brief the minister shortly on options.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Shortly. Options shortly?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> On the way forward. The minister would need to write to her Victorian counterpart and ask her to jointly make the Leadbeater's—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Jointly make an announcement, but at the moment there are still only options for your minister. So you haven't got a specific recommendation?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> It's advice to our minister. How the minister chooses to take that advice, of course, is up to the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So is it based on the recommendations from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee?</p> <p><b>Ms Campbell:</b> The minister will certainly be provided the advice from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee. Ministers will make their own decision.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What is the timing in which you were expecting the Leadbeater's possum recovery plan to be announced?</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> We haven't yet briefed, as Ms Campbell said, the minister. But our intention is to brief shortly.</p>	Page 83-84 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000060

				<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What does 'shortly' mean? Shortly has meant for the last four years. The whole time I've been in the Senate we've been waiting on the recovery plan for the Leadbeater's possum.</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> As Ms Campbell said—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Meanwhile, they're critically endangered.</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> In the last few months, we've spent a lot of time working on the bushfire response and some other things have gone by the wayside. We are still very committed to getting this plan finalised as shortly as possible. I can't give you any more certainty than that at this point.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take on notice a similar range of questions about the greater glider recovery plan?</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> Okay.</p>		
70.	1.5: BCD	Senator McAllister	Notes relating to meeting with Minister Taylor on March 20	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Mr Knudson, I think you made mention of the notes taken at the meeting on 20 March. You explained what happened. You read out the topics that were canvassed at that meeting. You said that that was, in effect, the notes of the meeting with Mr Taylor that we've gone through. Can you please table the notes of that meeting with Mr Taylor?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> Mr Richardson was the individual in the meeting. He is the person who developed the action items coming out of that meeting.</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> As Mr Knudson said, I was the senior official present at that meeting with Minister Taylor on 20 March, along with an individual from Minister Frydenberg's office. The note that Mr Knudson was referring to there, I think, is my email that followed within three or four days afterwards, which sets out essentially the action being taken following the meeting. That was the note of 24 March.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Can you please table that note from 24 March?</p> <p><b>Mr Richardson:</b> That note has been provided in at least four FOIs, so I'm happy to table it again. It is available publicly.</p>	Page 55 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000037
71.	1.4: BCD	Senator Hanson-Young	Environment Restoration Fund and Communities Environment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was the grant funding administered for the two programs?</li> <li>• How were organisations invited to apply?</li> <li>• When were organisations informed of the outcome of their application? Why were public announcement of decisions made before organisations were informed, or in some cases, had even applied for the grant?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000068

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why weren't the grant funding guidelines published until seven months after the announcement of the Environment Restoration Fund?</li> <li>• Were any grant outcomes or decisions made after 11 April 2019?</li> <li>• Was electorate location captured in any grant administration or assessment documentation?</li> <li>• When were Funding Agreements executed for successful applicants?</li> <li>• Why have so few successful organisations signed onto Funding Agreements? What's the cause of the delay?</li> <li>• What briefing was provided to the Minister's Office for these grant funds?</li> </ul>		
72.	1.4: BCD	Senator McKim	<b>Logging in the Future Potential Production Forests</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Tasmania Government intends to log previous forest conservation reserves that are included in the Recovery Plan for the Giant Freshwater Crayfish (<i>Astacopsis gouldi</i>), the world's largest invertebrate. What is the Department's plan to prevent impacts on the Giant Freshwater Crayfish?</li> <li>2. Will the Australian Government ask the Tasmanian Government to abandon its plans to allow logging in areas that are home to endangered species? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If not, why not?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Does it concern the Department that state-owned logging agency Sustainable Timber Tasmania continues to log old-growth forests that include swift parrot habitat, despite the presence of a National Recovery Plan for the Swift Parrot (<i>Lathamus discolor</i>)? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If so, what is the Department's plan to prevent impacts on the Swift Parrot?</li> <li>b. If not, why not?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Has the Department evaluated the role that Tasmania's forests play in buffering climate change impacts? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If not, why not?</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Does the Minister, or the Department on her behalf, intend to request that the Tasmanian Government abandon its plans to allow logging in 356,000 hectares of carbon-rich, biodiverse forest in the Future Potential Production Forests (FPPF) from</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000098

				<p>April 2020?</p> <p>a. If not, why not?</p> <p>6. Does the Department acknowledge that logging the FPPF could create the carbon emission equivalent greater than Australia's entire domestic aviation emissions in 2016-17 or equivalent to approximately 7-8 times Tasmania's entire transport emissions in 2016-17?</p> <p>a. If not, what is the Australian Government's accounting on logging the FPPF, and what standards and assumptions were used in these calculations?</p>		
73.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program	<p>1) <i>With reference to the funding allocated to the Communities Environment Program:</i></p> <p>a. Please provide an explanation as to why there is a discrepancy in funding assigned to this program between the 2019-20 Budget (\$28.3 million), and subsequent media releases and on the department's website (\$22.65 million).</p> <p>b. Of the \$22.65 million, how much has been spent? Please provide this figure for each month since 17 October 2019.</p> <p>c. How will the unspent funds be used</p> <p>2) How much of the funding allocated to the Communities Environment Program has been allocated, and how much has been expended.</p> <p>3) How much funding has been spent on the administration of the Communities Environment Program?</p> <p>4) How much funding was provided to the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science to administer the Communities Environment program, where did these funds come from, and how much was spent.</p> <p>5) Does the Government have plans to administer the Communities Environment Program again?</p>	Written	SQ20-000129
74.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program – Project applications	<p>1) <i>With reference to applications made under the Communities Environment Program:</i></p> <p>a. How many projects have been approved under this program?</p> <p>b. How many applications were received under this</p>	Written	SQ20-000130

				<p>program?</p> <p>c. How many projects were rejected under this program?</p> <p>d. How many projects were deemed ineligible after submission? Of those, how many were able to resubmit. How many were successful in their resubmission.</p> <p>e. Please provide a breakdown of all projects that were rejected, by reason for rejection. E.g. ineligible entity, ineligible activities.</p>		
75.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program – Staffing	<p>1. <i>With reference to staff working to deliver the Communities Environment Program:</i></p> <p>a. How many staff worked on the administration of the grants in the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science? Of these, how many were existing employees within the department.</p> <p>2. Please provide a breakdown of all organisations, agencies, entities etc. that were involved in the Communities Environment Program.</p> <p>3. Other than departmental staff, how many people were paid to assist with the Communities Environment Program?</p>	Written	SQ20-000131
76.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program – contracting of Regional Land Partnership Services	<p>1. <i>With reference to the contracting of Regional Land Partnership Services to assist with the Communities Environment program as detailed in information provided to Electorate Offices on Thursday 10 October 2019 via email:</i></p> <p>a. When were Regional Land Partnership Services first approached about being contracted to assist with the CEP. What are the details of this contract?</p> <p>b. How much funding was provided to Regional Land Partnerships to assist with the CEP and where did this funding come from.</p> <p>c. Was the 10 October 2019 email the first time contact information for RLPs were provided in relation to the CEP.</p> <p>d. Where did the idea to engage RLPs to assist with the CEP first come from? How and when was this communicated to the Minister?</p>	Written	SQ20-000132

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. When the program was announced in March 2019, was it known that RLPs would be contracted to provide advice in the last week.</li> <li>f. How many phone calls did the RLPs receive from electorate office staff in relation to the CEP?</li> <li>g. What, if any, training materials were provided by the Department to the RLPs in relation to this program.</li> <li>h. What advice was provided by the Department to RLPs about the eligibility of projects or applicants?</li> <li>i. Please provide any emails, correspondence, or training materials provided by the Department to the RLPs about the program.</li> </ul>		
77.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program – closing date	<p>1 <i>With reference to the decision to extend the closing date for the CEP to 17 October 2020:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What were the reasons for extending the closing date?</li> <li>b. Who made the decision to extend the closing date and what advice was provided by the department to inform that decision.</li> <li>c. What interactions were had between the Environment Department and the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science, in the lead up to this decision?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000133
78.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment Program – management and administration	<p>1 <i>With reference to the involvement of two departments in the management and administration of the Communities Environment Program:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How frequently did the two Departments interact about the program and what was the nature of these interactions.</li> <li>b. How was information fed back to the team responsible for the program in the environment department?</li> <li>c. How many departmental briefs were provided to the minister in relation to this program?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000134
79.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Communities Environment	<p>1 <i>With reference to evidence provided by Mr Dean Knudson in Additional Senate Estimates Hearings in relation to the CEP, in</i></p>	Written	SQ20-000135

			<p><b>Program – advice provided regarding eligibility of schools</b></p>	<p><i>which he said, “My colleagues will correct me if I am wrong, but I don’t think we provided clear enough advice”:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What has the department identified as the reason clear advice was not provided?</li> <li>b. What plans does the government have to rectify the lack of clear advice provided?</li> </ol> <p>2 <i>With reference to the eligibility of schools to be applicants under the CEP:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please provide details of how many schools applied under this program, including those that were deemed ineligible at first instance, and those that were eventually approved.</li> <li>b. When were state education departments first contacted by the federal government in relation to his program, and what was the nature of that contact.</li> <li>c. Was a formal request made by the Commonwealth to state education departments to assist with enabling schools to be eligible to apply under the program?</li> <li>d. What contact was made with state environment departments in relation to this program? Who made that contact and when was it made.</li> <li>e. Were state education departments contacted by the department about the program before 17 October 2019?</li> <li>f. What processes were communicated to individual schools after they were deemed ineligible in relation to becoming eligible entities?</li> <li>g. Please provide details about the complaints made in relation to this program, including amount, reason for complaint, origin of the complaint, when and how the complaint was made.</li> <li>h. Will there be an evaluation of this program, and when and how will that evaluation be carried out.</li> <li>i. Please provide any correspondence relating to the award (or attempted award) of Community Environment Program funds to community members</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				or groups in the electorate of Dunkley, including between the ministerial offices, departments, and the former member Mr Chris Crewther, prior to the election.		
80.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Environment Restoration Fund – list of commitments	<p><i>With reference to the list of commitments made under the Environment Restoration Fund provided to the committee in Additional Senate Estimates Hearing on 2 March 2020:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have there been any changes to this list since it was tabled.</li> <li>b. What guidance was provided to the Minister from the Department in relation to the awarding of these funds?</li> <li>c. How many departmental briefs were provided to the Minister in relation to the awarding of these funds?</li> <li>d. Who was the decision maker in relation to approving commitments under this program?</li> <li>e. Did the process for committing funds under this program change at all since the announcement of the program in the 2019-20 federal budget?</li> <li>f. What is the timeline for determining where the funds will be spent for commitments that assigned “unknown projects, yet to be determined?”</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000136
81.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Environment Restoration Fund – National Landcare Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 To what extent does the National Landcare Program fund the Environment Restoration Fund?</li> <li>2 What is the relationship between the National Landcare Program and the Environment Restoration Fund?</li> <li>3 Please provide details and any related documents relating to the assessment processes used to determine eligible and successful applicants under this program.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000137
82.	1.4: BCD	Senator Green	Bushfire recovery package for wildlife and their habitat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 With reference to the description of the \$50 million bushfire recovery package for wildlife and their habitat as a “down-payment”, when can Australians expect to see the subsequent environmental payment?</li> <li>2 Has any consideration been given to the use of existing funds within the department to pay for bushfire recovery? For</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000138

				<p>example, the Environment Restoration Fund.</p> <p>3 Of the \$50 million allocated to the bushfire recovery package, how much has been expended.</p> <p>4 What relevant individuals, organisations or community groups have been informed about this grant opportunity? Please provide details of the advice they received about applying for funds under this program.</p> <p>5 What funding has been provided to assist with rescuing native fish?</p> <p>6 When were guidelines drafted and finalised for each aspect of this package.</p>		
<b>83.</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Senator Green</b>	<b>Kangaroo Island</b>	<p>1 How much funding has been allocated to support wildlife recovery groups on Kangaroo Island? Please provide a breakdown of those costs.</p> <p>2 How many Felixer cat traps have been purchased using federal funds for Kangaroo Island?</p> <p>3 How many ecologists working on Kangaroo Island have been paid using federal funds?</p> <p>4 Once the Bushfire Wildlife Recovery Fund money has been dispersed to the states, what oversight does the commonwealth have over its use?</p> <p>5 What oversight does the government have over third parties in receipt of Bushfire Recovery funds they receive through the states and territories?</p> <p>6 What is the Government doing to assist with the reopening of the national parks on Kangaroo Island?</p>	Written	SQ20-000139
<b>84.</b>	<b>1.4: CD</b>	<b>Senator Hanson-Young</b>	<b>Koalas and koala habitat</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the devastating impact of the recent bushfires on koala populations across the country, what is being done to address habitat destruction through land clearing, which has resulted in mass kills like what we saw in Cape Bridgewater?</li> <li>• What is the economic loss to Australia if the koala goes extinct?</li> <li>• How are you working with state government departments to address this mass loss?</li> <li>• Given the devastating impacts from fire on koalas this summer and lax NSW native vegetation regulations, is the Department undertaking any koala-related strategic engagement or targeted</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000067

				<p>compliance monitoring?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many allegations of actions impacting koala habitat has the Department received in the last 12 months</li> <li>• How many open compliance cases does the Department have relating to actions affecting koala habitat?</li> </ul>		
85.	1.4: HRMD	Senator Hanson-Young	World heritage listing for the Great Australian Bight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the last Estimates hearing, the department said that the Great Australian Bight is not being assessed for its potential as a World Heritage property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Given the decision of Equinor to pull out of the Bight, and ongoing threats to the bight through oil drilling, why isn't the department considering World Heritage listing?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As a member of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, Australia committed to providing more "focus on listing natural places of Outstanding Universal Value". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What work has the department done to support this?</li> <li>○ What work has the department undertaken as part of Australia's 2017-2021 term on the Committee?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000070
86.	1.4: HRMD	Senator McKim	2018-19 Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area fires	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Australian Government has a statutory responsibility to protect World Heritage properties, including the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, which lost 200,000ha in the 2018-19 bushfires. Has the Department calculated how much carbon was released from the forests that were lost in the 2018-19 bushfires? a. If any calculations were made, please provide a breakdown of those calculations and findings.</li> <li>2. Has the Department conducted an impact assessment in the TWWHA to determine: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The extent of the bushfire damage;</li> <li>b. The cost and feasibility of rehabilitation;</li> <li>c. The amount of carbon emissions caused by the fires; and</li> <li>d. Any potential impacts on climate change? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If not, why not?</li> <li>ii. If so, please provide detailed findings.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Does the government have a plan to protect the TWWHA from future fire damage with specific contingencies prepared for a</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000099

				<p>scenario where multiple fires are occurring concurrently both in Tasmania and on the mainland?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If not, why not?</li> <li>b. If so, please provide detailed plan.</li> </ol>		
87.	1.4: HRMD	Senator Rice	<b>Gondwana Rainforests of Australia Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee</b>	<p>What proportion of the Gondwanan rainforests of northern NSW and southern Qld have been burnt? When was the last time such a high proportion was burnt?</p> <p>A UNESCO site on the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia describes a Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee, and a Community Advisory Committee, as having operated since 2002. They're referred to in numerous state government websites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are they still functioning?</li> <li>• If so, who is responsible for supporting those Committees? What input does the Commonwealth have?</li> <li>• When did they last meet?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000103
88.	1.4: HRMD	Senator Waters	<b>Gondwana Rainforest</b>	<p>In November 2019, the World Heritage Centre expressed concern about the impacts of the bushfires and said it was “<i>currently verifying the information with the Australian authorities, in particular regarding the potential impact of the fires on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide an update on the total area of World Heritage-listed Gondwanan Rainforest lost in the summer bushfires.</li> <li>• What information was provided to the World Heritage Centre in response to its inquiries? Please provide a copy of any correspondence with the WHC.</li> <li>• Has the World Heritage Centre or IUCN required any action from the Australian government to protect or monitor the WH values of the site?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000122
89.	1.4: HRMD	Senator Green	<b>Australian heritage Grants 2019-20</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 On what date will the outcomes of the Australian Heritage Grant 2019-20 be publically released? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many applications were submitted?</li> <li>b. How many applications were approved?</li> <li>c. What is the total value of all applications?</li> <li>d. Did the Minister approve any applications not</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000140

				recommended for approval by the assessment committee? e. Did the Minister approve any application that was not compliant with any aspect of the grant guidelines?		
90.	1.5: BCD	Senator Waters	Rainforest Trust Australia	<p>I understand that the Department has received complaints regarding the activities of the Rainforest Trust Australia (RTA - formerly the Australian Rainforest Foundation, ABN 44 073 434 563) and, in particular, its compliance with funding obligations in relation to the restoration and maintenance of Lot 5 RP 800379, Hayter Rd, Maria Creek (near Mission Beach). The property was purchased to establish connectivity between cassowary habitat ranges in the area, but has recently been sold for development purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide details of any investigation undertaken in relation to Rainforest Trust Australia (or its predecessor).</li> <li>• What action has the Department taken to audit the use of grant monies given to Rainforest Trust Australia / Australian Rainforest Foundation?</li> <li>• What action has the Department taken to ensure that the grant objectives of protecting cassowary habitat have been fulfilled? Is any further compliance or enforcement action proposed?</li> <li>• Has the Department taken any compliance action against RTA, its Directors or staff members?</li> <li>• Has the Department provided any advice or information to the Australian Charities and Not-for Profit Commission regarding the activities of the RTA? If so, please provide details.</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000120
91.	1.5: CD	Senator Green	Compliance investigation of Jam Land Pty Ltd	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> What are the maximum penalties for breaches under the laws you are investigating?  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> I believe the maximum penalties are \$1,050,000. There are a range of other enforcement outcomes that could be taken for native vegetation clearing offences under the act.  <b>Mr Knudson:</b> Because there's also other provisions relating to what an individual can be subject to, it would probably be good for us to come back on notice and give you the full list of what a breach of the law might entail for the person or corporation, because they are different.  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> Yes.  <b>Senator GREEN:</b> Are the penalties different for a breach for an</p>	Page 49 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000035

				<p>individual and a corporation?  <b>Mr Knudson:</b> That's correct.  <b>Senator GREEN:</b> And you don't know what those are now at the table?  <b>Mr Knudson:</b> I don't off the top of my head. That's why I offered to come back on notice on that.</p>		
92.	1.5: CD	Senator Waters	Meetings with department, Minister Taylor and Minister Frydenberg's office	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you very much. How many meetings did Angus Taylor have with the department and Josh Frydenberg's office regarding the natural temperate grassland of the south-eastern highlands?  <b>CHAIR:</b> Senator Waters, I just remind you again about using the correct titles for members of the other place.  <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Minister.  <b>Mr Knudson:</b> We would have to take it on notice. We're obviously aware of one, which we supported, which was on 20 March 2017. But that's the only one that I am aware of. Otherwise we'll take it on notice if there are additional meetings.</p>	Page 54 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000036
93.	1.5: CD	Senator McKim	Commencement of Riley Creek mine	<p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> The company wrote to the department on 17 July 2019. In that letter, it was evident that ore had been extracted on the site commencing on 27 November 2013. So my understanding is that, as a result of that letter, the department became aware that they had substantially commenced, because it met with the definition of an extraction of ore.  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> In 2013?  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> That's right, yes.  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> The department became aware in 2019 that the mine had actually commenced in 2013. Is that right?  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> In the letter that they wrote to us. I haven't got the full history, but I understand that there was some really early activity on the basis of a 2013 approval. It stopped shortly thereafter and then it was this—  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> Stopped short?  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> The activity—  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> Stopped shortly thereafter.  <b>Mrs Collins:</b> Stopped shortly thereafter. Then it was the letter to the department in 2019, where they indicated they would like to recommence. It was the recommencement in the letter that made us</p>	Page 60-61 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000039

				<p>aware that they had, in fact, extracted ore in the early stages and, therefore, commenced the activity.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> The company has advised the ASX that, on 28 May 2014, it was forced to cease preliminary clearing of the processing plant site pre-ore extraction activity. So is that statement consistent with the letter that you say you got from the company in 2019, which claimed that they had extracted ore in 2013 when in 2014 they advised the ASX that they were in the pre-ore extraction phase?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> We had to go back to the company and get clarification from them of exactly what happened and when. Under the EPBC Act approval, the approval-holder was meant to notify the department of when they commenced their activity.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> But they didn't, did they?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> They didn't. As a result of that, the department issued a penalty notice for non-compliance with that decision.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> So it was the \$25,200 penalty notice?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> There were two penalty notices. Each was \$12,600. One penalty notice was a failure to comply with that particular condition.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> And the other one was the devils situation.</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> The other one was that they were meant to contribute to the Save the Tasmanian Devil Program.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Could you provide a copy of the letter that the company wrote to the department on 17 July 2019?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p>		
94.	1.5: CD	Senator McKim	<p><b>Record of personal inspections of Riley Creek mine since referral of proposal</b></p>	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> The reason I'm asking is the department has fined this mining company for failure to comply with its permit conditions to notify the department of the substantial commencement of the mine. You say you found out in 2019 that they had actually commenced the mine in 2013, six years down the track. Did you take any steps to satisfy yourself that, in fact, they did substantially commence the mine in 2013?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> We went through a process of asking the proponent for information to verify their claim in their letter. To be clear, my understanding is that they commenced on that date and stopped undertaking the activity in 2014. So it hasn't been continuous and it was only that they wrote to us that they were going to recommence more recently in 2019.</p>	Page 62 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000041

				<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> So what was the nature of the commencement of the mine in 2013?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I haven't got the full details in front of me, so I'm happy to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Sure. You may recall whether or not they are claiming they extracted ore from that site. Was that at least part of the reason?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> My understanding is that they claim that they had extracted ore from the site and therefore—</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> How much ore?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I don't have the details in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Would you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Did you check? Did the department go down and see whether this company—given they've got a track record of failing to comply with their permit conditions for two separate reasons and that they've been fined an amount by the department for that—had extracted ore or not? The people that have been to that site tell me personally there's been no ore extracted from that site. They have not substantially commenced their operations.</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I'll have to take on notice specifically whether we went down to the site this time. I know we had a lot of engagement with the approval-holder.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Have you been to the site since July last year?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I'll have to take on notice whether the compliance officers have been there.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> You would probably remember, though, wouldn't you, if you had been in the last eight months?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> We do a lot of compliance variations, so I apologise that I don't specifically remember.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> I want to be clear what I'm asking you to take on notice. Could you please provide a record of any or all of the trips to make personal inspections of the site from the time the department first became aware that the application was being made, which I presume was 2012 or 2013? I'm making an assumption about those years. It is from that time.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> I will clarify. Since the time of the referral of the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				proposal.		
95.	1.5: CD	Senator McKim	Inspection of Riley Creek mine	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Will the department go down and have a look at that mine now? I'm happy if you take this on notice. I don't expect you to make a decision on the fly. If not, why not? Take that on notice, please.</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 63 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000042
96.	1.5: CD	Senator Waters	Power to review and/or revoke the EPBC Act approval with regards to Adani	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I understand that it's about a Queensland approval, but it goes to whether the proponent is a fit and proper person to hold an EPBC approval—hence my question on whether the department has sought advice about whether you have the power to review and/or revoke the EPBC Act approval or whether you provided any advice to the minister along those lines.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> As you would know, Senator, we certainly did at the time of the approval, when the environmental history of the proponent is absolutely a consideration the minister may take into account. So we did that at that time. On your specific question, Mrs Collins has carriage of compliance matters.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> They have a conviction.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> With respect to the original approval. I think that's something I will have to come back on notice about. I will have to talk to our legal area and figure out whether they sought advice on that issue.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you. If you can't answer me now, I would appreciate you taking that on notice. If you can answer me now, great. Has the department sought its own advice? Has the department provided advice to the minister about the ability to review and/or revoke the EPBC approval on the basis of the Queensland approval conditions breach prosecuted?</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> My understanding is, no, the department hasn't. The reason is that the conviction in Queensland doesn't relate to a requirement that has to do with the Commonwealth approval.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I'm perfectly aware of that.</p> <p><b>Mrs Collins:</b> That's right. The minister may consider the finding in the Queensland court in any future decisions under the EPBC Act as part of consideration of a proponent's environmental history. But my understanding is that the finding in the Queensland court is not a grounds to consider revoke, vary or amend.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I want to clarify. You initially said no. I thought</p>	Page 80-81 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000054

				<p>you meant: no, you hadn't sought advice. You are in fact saying: no, you are not able to reconsider or revoke? Which of those did you just say?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> It comes back to my answer, which is that we'll come back to you on notice and confirm. What Mrs Collins has said is our best understanding. I want to confirm by going back to our legal area.</p>		
97.	1.5: CD	Senator Green	Compliance action involving Jam Land	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 When is the compliance investigation expected to conclude?</li> <li>2 What is the deadline for the finalisation of this investigation?</li> <li>3 Why hasn't a deadline for the finalisation of this investigation been issued?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000142
98.	1.5: CD	Senator Waters	Jam Land Investigation	<p>In response to QON 230 from the last supplementary budget estimates, the department provided an email dated Tuesday 30 January 2018 that says "Brief on the grasslands for the Minister's meeting with the PM".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was this meeting? Did it take place and on what date?</li> <li>• Why did the department prepare a brief on the grasslands? Was it requested and by whom?</li> <li>• Did the department prepare any other briefs for the Prime Minister's office about either the grasslands or the Jam Land case? If yes, on what dates and what were those briefs about?</li> <li>• Does the PM's office often seek briefings regarding compliance issues? If not, why was a briefing sought in relation to this matter?</li> </ul> <p>In the <a href="#">document pack for FOI 191003</a> there is an internal department email dated Wednesday 17 February 2017, 11.04 am with the subject RE: Possible Compliance Action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is the author of that email?</li> <li>• Who were the recipients of that email?</li> <li>• In the body of the email, the author refers to the compliance case at Corrowong and says: "Below is talking points I believe went to the Minister's Office about the matter... It would be good to find out who is asking and why".</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000121

				<p>Was the email author concerned that the request may have originated from Minister Taylor? Did the Department make inquiries about who was asking about the investigation? If so, what was the response?</p> <p>An email dated 16 February 2017, 10.35 am, subject “FW: Clearing of Grasslands [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]” refers to Hansard searches made to try to find out where in parliament the natural temperate grasslands compliance case was raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who requested those searches?</li> </ul> <p>On 6 March 2017, 10:38am, Monica Collins sent an email to unknown recipients (and Geoff Richardson) entitled “RE: Monaro grasslands”. That email says “Could you also please provide an answer to: what are the available avenues/ process to review a listing decision? MO has requested we respond by end of today so would appreciate you giving priority to meet this deadline”. A reply was received on 7 March 2017, 7:50am.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who were the recipients of the 6 March 2017 email?</li> <li>• Who was the author of the 7 March 2017 email?</li> <li>• The Guardian has previously reported that the Minister’s office asked similar questions about reviewing the listing in late April 2017. Was the information in the 7 March 2017 email sent to Minister Frydenberg’s office at that time? If so, why did the Minister’s office request the information again one month later?</li> </ul> <p>The handwritten note from Stephen Oxley dated 3 May 2017 headed “Adviser catch-up”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which adviser/s were involved in the catch up, and whose office did they work for?</li> <li>• The note refers to “Monaro grasslands listing: discussion on a range of technical details”. Given the time spent, and number</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				of emails exchanged prior to that date, what technical details remained to discuss?		
99.	1.5: CD	Senator Hanson-Young	Land clearing on King Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the Department aware of any current or proposed land clearing on King Island? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How many open compliance cases does the Department have relating to clearing on King Island?</li> <li>○ How many referrals has the Department received for proposed land clearing on King Island?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is the Department engaging with the Tasmanian Government regarding land clearing pressures on King Island?</li> <li>• What is the Department doing to engage with landholders on King Island about land clearing pressures?</li> <li>• What educational material has been used in engaging with landholders? Please provide if available.</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000071
100.	1.5: EAD	Senator McKim	Application from Riley Creek mine to vary conditions	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> When did that application to vary the conditions arrive with the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> In July 2019.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Before or after the 17th?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> I only have July. I will have to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Could you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> I don't have the specific dates for that.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Could you please provide a copy of that application to the committee?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> The variation request?</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> We can take that on notice.</p>	Page 61 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000040
101.	1.5: EAD	Senator McKim	Proposals being considered by the department	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Apart from Lake Malbena, are any of the other proposals currently being considered formally by the department?</p> <p><b>Mr McNee:</b> As far as I am aware, I'm not aware of any in that particular area at this stage.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Perhaps can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr McNee:</b> Indeed.</p>	Page 60 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000038
102.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	Request for permission from Waratah Coal mine to	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you very much. I will move quickly to the Waratah coalmine. In response to the last questions that I asked when we were here last, you confirmed that because Waratah Coal, which is Clive Palmer's proposal, had not substantially commenced within five</p>	Page 81 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000055

			<b>commence mining</b>	<p>years it requires written permission from the minister to commence. Has any request for that permission been received?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> I don't recall.</p> <p><b>Ms Croker:</b> Sorry, Senator. Could you repeat your question?</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Have Waratah Coal asked for permission, given that they haven't substantially commenced in five years?</p> <p><b>Ms Croker:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p>		
103.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	<b>Factors to be considered in decision to grant permission to Waratah Coal mine</b>	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> What factors will the minister consider in deciding whether to grant that permission, given that five years has elapsed and Clive Palmer hasn't yet started to build his mine?</p> <p><b>Ms Croker:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 82 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000056
104.	1.5: EAD	Senator Canavan	<b>Western Sydney International Airport's indirect impact on scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions</b>	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> I've only got a short time. What about the Western Sydney airport? Has it been asked to look at scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions in its indirect impact?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> I'm not aware of the details of any referral for the Western Sydney airport.</p> <p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Can you take that on notice? You might be aware that Heathrow Airport last week was knocked back in the UK. I would have thought that if an oil and gas project is potentially affected—</p>	Page 71 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000046
105.	1.5: EAD	Senator Canavan	<b>Carbon emissions and scope 3 emissions of Browse project</b>	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> I want to quickly go back to the Browse. Did the department seek any legal advice on whether or not the Browse project would need to consider its carbon emissions and all scope 3 emissions?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> When was that legal advice first sought?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> I am trying to think. I would probably have to take on notice exactly when we got it. We would have initially sought legal advice around the time of making the referral decision in relation to the project.</p> <p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> When was the referral decision made?</p> <p><b>Ms Croker:</b> It was made on 22 February 2019.</p> <p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Could you take on notice—I think you already have—when the legal advice was sought? I have a more general question. Do all major projects now need to consider their greenhouse gas emissions?</p>	Page 87 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000061

106.	1.5: EAD	Senator Canavan	Western Sydney International Airport on Commonwealth land	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> You talked earlier about Western Sydney Airport. Could you clarify on notice whether Western Sydney Airport is a project on Commonwealth land?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> Most airports are on Commonwealth land. It's not my jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Can you take on notice whether it is as well? I would have thought it is the whole environment and therefore should be subject to the same tests as an oil and gas project. Which path has the Browse project gone down? You have all these different paths—EPBC, EIS?</p>	Page 87 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000062
107.	1.5: EAD	Senator Canavan	Percentage of approval decisions made within the timeframes of the environmental impact statement for the last 10 years	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Could you take on notice what percentage you've achieved under that metric for the last 10 years? Presumably it wouldn't be too difficult if it's in annual reports every year. It would help if you could take that on notice. Is that a yes?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> We can do that.</p>	Page 88 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000063
108.	1.5: EAD	Senator Canavan	Projects exempt from the EPBC Act	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> This is the only other question I have: could I also have, presumably on notice, a list of projects that have been exempt from the EPBC Act? I think it is what is broadly termed a national interest exemption under section 158.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> There are not that many. That should be relatively easy for us to supply.</p>	Page 88 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000064
109.	1.5: EAD	Senator McKim	Storm Bay EPBC approval process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The delegate of the Minister decided that the proposed expansion of Tasmanian salmon farms into Storm Bay are not controlled actions. No particular manner requirements were imposed on the notices of decision. There have been no limits on the biomass or Total Permissible Dissolved Nitrogen Output in either the Marine Farming Development Plans for Storm Bay or the separate environmental licences issued to the companies by the Tasmanian EPA. Can the Department please advise how it will ensure that the farms will not exceed the 40,000 TPA of salmon that was the subject of all of the environmental impact assessment documentation submitted as part of the companies' referrals?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000100

				<p>a. What action will the Department take to ensure these amounts are not exceeded?</p> <p>2. Will it be up to members of the community to notify the Department or Minister when or if these amounts have been exceeded, or will the Department be undertaking active monitoring?</p> <p>a. If the Department will be undertaking active monitoring, please provide details of how monitoring will be conducted.</p> <p>3. When Tassal referred its Okehampton Bay marine farm to the Minister under the EPBC Act, particular manner requirements were imposed on that project to ensure that it would not have impacts on threatened or migratory species, such as the endangered Southern Right Whale. Given the Southern Right Whale also is known to inhabit the waters of Storm Bay, why did the Minister's delegate see fit not to impose similar particular manner requirements on the Storm Bay referrals? Please provide a detailed response.</p> <p>4. The emissions modelling that was undertaken for the expansion of salmon farming in Storm Bay did not take account of changes in environmental/oceanic conditions resulting from climate change. In light of the fact that Tasmania's eastern coastal waters are warming four times faster than other parts of the ocean, and this may have dramatic impacts on ocean currents and the habitats of threatened species, how could the Minister's delegate have been satisfied that the emissions from these farms would not have a significant impact on matters of national environmental significance, such as the critically endangered Red and Spotted Handfish, and the endangered vegetation community of the Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia? Please provide a detailed response.</p>		
<b>110.</b>	<b>1.4: EAD</b>	<b>Senator Hanson-Young</b>	<b>Tracking of threatened species impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to the habitats for the Koala, White Box-Yellow Box Grassy Woodlands EEC and Carnaby's Black Cockatoo: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How much habitat has been approved to be cleared since each species or community was listed?</li> <li>○ How much has been set aside as a biodiversity offsets?</li> <li>○ What is compliance monitoring is conducted to check whether</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000066

				<p>an actual benefit to the impacted species has been achieved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How much habitat has been allowed to be cleared under part 3 as part of determination that the impacts were not significant (Non-controlled Action) or not significant in conducted in a particular manner (NCA-PM)?</li> <li>○ How long it is likely to take to determine these values as well as clarification as how overall impact to a species can be considered without consideration of recent impacts and changes to its distribution?</li> <li>○ Does the Department’s Assessment and Approvals Branch (or equivalent) provide any reporting to the Threatened Species Consultative Committee to assist with determinations on whether a species should be de-listed or up-listed?</li> </ul>		
<b>111.</b>	<b>1.4: EAD</b>	<b>Senator Hanson-Young</b>	<b>Bushfire impacts on offsets and areas with existing impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does the Department have any data on how many offsets related to EPBC Act approvals have been impacted by the recent bushfires? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, please provide.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Why has the Department not created a national register of offsets, despite that being committed to nearly 8 years ago?</li> <li>● What are the consequences for proponents who may have lost their offsets to the recent bushfires? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are they required to secure a new offset?</li> <li>○ How will the Department ensure that the environmental outcomes of approvals are still met?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Does the Department consider the risks of climate change to the long-term security of offsets when writing conditions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Given recent predictions suggest a likely 4 degree warming scenario, how will the Department ensure offsets are not wiped out by fire, floods and drought?</li> <li>○ Is climate risk something that might have been considered in the 2017 review of the Government’s offsets policy that did not eventuate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● In February 2020, when the Department released a list of priority species for urgent management intervention, did that factor in data on habitat loss prior to the fires? Could habitat loss data have had consequences for the species on the list?</li> <li>● What will “urgent management intervention” entail?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000069

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does the Department intend to review the listing status of these species?</li> <li>○ Will the Department prioritise compliance cases involving these species?</li> <li>○ How will the Department ensure priority species are not further impacted by habitat loss through land clearing?</li> <li>○ Will the Department undertake targeted engagement or compliance monitoring in areas containing critical habitat to the species?</li> </ul>		
112.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	Woodside's North West Shelf Project Extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What evidence has Woodside submitted to the Department to support their claim that the LNG will be displacing coal and providing a net benefit? Does the Department regard that as accurate? Will this be included in the Department's assessment of Scope 3 emissions?</li> <li>• Woodside has made various commitments to shareholders and investors about carbon mitigation strategies for the Browse Basin and Burrup Hub development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commitment to 'carbon neutrality' by 2050</li> <li>• commitment to offsetting 'equity' reservoir gas emissions</li> <li>• commitment to planting trees with Greening Australia to offset some emissions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Is the Department satisfied that these commitments are reflected in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documents for the extension or the Browse to NWS projects?  How will the approval conditions require Woodside to deliver on those commitments?  Are Woodside's commitments being factored in to the Government's forward projections for CO2 emissions from the Burrup Hub? If not, what assumptions are the department making about the future CO2 from these developments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department has requested that Woodside provide information regarding Scope 3 emissions from the Browse Basin project. Is the Department also looking at Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the North West Shelf LNG plant extension?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000114

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Scarborough and Pluto LNG plant extension?</li> </ul> <p>If not, why not?</p>		
113.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	Offsets - approval conditions	<p>Many approvals granted for resource projects under the EPBC Act require biodiversity offsets to be secured to compensate for impacts of the mines, gas fields, and associated infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Department undertaken any analysis of the impact on the summer bushfires on offsets areas maintained under approval conditions? If so, please provide details.</li> <li>Where offsets areas are burned, what responsibilities do permit holders have to remediate those areas or secure additional habitat? What monitoring is done by the Department regarding the progress of remediation efforts?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000115
114.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	Turtle Cove Retirement Village	<p>The Turtle Cove Retirement Village near the Great Sandy Strait (EPBC 2013/7038) is currently under assessment, with a decision expected 6 months ago. The project will impact on a significant roosting site for Eastern Curlew.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide an update on the assessment of this project and estimated timing for a decision.</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000116
115.	1.5: EAD	Senator Waters	Mount Lofty Defence Housing	<p>Defence Housing Australia lodged an application for residential development on Rifle Range Road, Toowoomba. The application was determined to need approval under the EPBC Act, with assessment by preliminary documentation (see EPBC 2018/8198).</p> <p>At Senate estimates on 4 March 2020, Defence Housing Australia confirmed that a decision was made on 6 February 2020 to amend the proposal to be “a far less substantive development”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Department received any correspondence or notification from Defence Housing Australia regarding the proposed modification?</li> <li>Does the Department intend to re-advertise the amended proposal?</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000117
116.	1.5: EPRT	Senator Hanson-Young	EPBC Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to \$150,000 grant given to assist the NFF’s involvement in the EPBC Act review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was this funded through the Natural Resources Trust</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000072

				<p>Fund? What other programs does this fund support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why are taxpayers footing the bill for the NFF to consult its members on the independent review?</li> <li>• Have any other landholder groups, like native title holders, been given similar support?</li> <li>• What is the Reviewer's program of engagement and consultation with stakeholders? How many meetings have been held? In which locations and with whom?</li> <li>• Will the review still report in October, given that the submission deadline was extended due to the bushfires which has impacted on the resourcing of many NGOs?</li> <li>• How will the review enact genuine consultation when the timeframe has been truncated?</li> <li>• What interactions have you had with the ANAO on its current performance audit on the Referrals, assessments and approvals of controlled actions under the EPBC Act?</li> </ul>		
117.	1.5: EPRT	Senator Green	EPBC Act review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Will the expert panel take into consideration expert advice in relation to the national bushfire crisis?</li> <li>2 How many individuals and groups have been consulted as part of the review process?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000143
118.	1.6: EPD	Senator Patrick	Review of the Product Stewardship (Oil) Act 2000	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I'm trying to get to the reason. I understand you acknowledge it. I'm trying to understand the reason why the department failed to comply with the law. I accept if you said, 'Hey, this is a review due a year and a half ago and we got hit by something that was totally unexpected.' Three years ago when this review was required, what took place that caused you not to conduct this review?</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> I suspect because none of my colleagues were involved with that at the time. So I think we'd have to come back on notice. I'm very happy to explain how we got from when the review was due and what actions were taken subsequently. With your indulgence, I think it would be reasonable for us also to talk about beyond the review and give you a sense of what has been going on in that area that is responsible for that review. So we have tried to balance a number of key priorities. I would like to lay out the product stewardship for oil element as well as those other elements.</p> <p><b>Mr Metcalfe:</b> I hear you clearly. Why is it that three years ago</p>	Page 79 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000052

				<p>someone didn't initiate a review?  <b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Yes. That's what I'm trying to get to. I understand that you're trying to deal with the fact now. I'm trying to understand how a department three years ago failed to comply with a legal obligation.  <b>Mr Metcalfe:</b> We'll need to go back and check and provide you with the best answer we can.</p>		
119.	1.6: EPD	Senator Waters	Potential impact on smaller recycling companies of the ban on the export of waste paper	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I have one last question that I would like them to take on notice.  <b>CHAIR:</b> Senator Waters, you've now had 13 of that 15 minutes. If your colleague is happy with that, that's fine. I ask you to consider her need to ask a question as well.  <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thanks for the tip. Can you please take on notice whether you've considered the potential for this policy to drive smaller recyclers to the wall?  <b>Ms Burgess:</b> Okay.</p>	Page 82 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000057
120.	1.6: EPD	Senator Green	National Television and Computer Recycling Scheme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the total number of full time equivalent staff who was responsible for administering and enforcing the National Television and Computer Recycling Scheme (NCRS) for the financial years 13-14, 14-15, 15-16, 16-17, 17-18, 18-19 &amp; 19-20?</li> <li>2. Have the cuts to resourcing of the NCRS over the last five years impacted its ability to service and enforce the scheme?</li> <li>3. Has the Department received any feedback from stakeholders in the last five years that reflects such concern?</li> <li>4. At a time when it is acknowledged that Australia faces a waste crisis, why are resources being cut in this area?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000144
121.	1.6: EPD	Senator Green	Waste exports	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following the November Meeting of Environment Ministers where agreement was made on the waste export ban timeline what work has the Department progressed in relation to the export bans for each category of waste?</li> <li>2. What was the rationale behind each of the selected dates?</li> <li>3. Has any state or territory raised issues that may impact on the ability for these dates to be adhered to?</li> <li>4. Why did the government commission the 'recycling market situation' report?</li> <li>5. Does the department have any comment in relation to the findings</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000145

				<p>of the report? I'm particularly interested in comments that Australia may need to increase its local recycling processing capabilities by up to 400% in order to meet demand.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. What level is the department's confidence that Australia can reprocess all mixed plastics by 1 July 2021 without the need to redirect it to landfill?</li> <li>7. Outside of measures previously announced, has the department provided the Minister with options in relation to Commonwealth budgetary measures to support the expansion of Australia's domestic recycling infrastructure in the 2020-21 financial year? If so, what are these measures?</li> <li>8. In relation to waste that is being returned by overseas countries, have any of these returned containers been rejected on arrival into Australia?</li> <li>9. How many waste export containers in total have been returned to Australia in the last 18 months?</li> <li>10. How much plastic waste is exported annually? What proportion of that plastic waste is collected for recycling?</li> <li>11. What tonnage and proportion of plastic waste is currently reprocessed and recycled in Australia?</li> </ol>		
<b>122.</b>	<b>1.6: EPD</b>	<b>Senator Green</b>	<b>Product Stewardship</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total departmental and administrative expenses pertaining to the voluntary product stewardship arrangement with MobileMuster for the financial years 13-14, 14-15, 15-16, 16-17, 17-18, 18-19 &amp; 19-20.</li> <li>2. What is the status of the review into the <i>Product Stewardship Act</i> which was announced in March 2017 and due to be completed in June 2018?</li> <li>3. What is the status of the Government's \$20 million Product Stewardship Investment Fund?</li> <li>4. When do you expect that applications for this fund will open?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000146
<b>123.</b>	<b>1.6: EPD</b>	<b>Senator Green</b>	<b>Australian Recycling Investment Fund</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What role does the Department play in the ongoing operations of the fund?</li> <li>2. How are the funds linked to and measured against, the 2018 National Waste Strategy and the 2019 National Waste Action Plan?</li> <li>3. When can we expect the next iteration of the National Waste Report to be published?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000147

				4. When can we expect the results of the 2018-19 Australian Plastics Recycling Survey to be published?		
124.	1.6: HRMD	Senator Green	Pacific Ocean Litter project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the current status of the Pacific Ocean Litter Project?</li> <li>2. What specific actions and outcomes has the Department set for this project?</li> <li>3. Are there contributions from other nations being used to support this project? If yes, what is the proportion of Australia's contribution to total project funding?</li> <li>4. Was the Minister or the asked to provide funding at a level higher than what was announced on 3 May 2019?</li> <li>5. Was the department asked to provide advice on this project prior to the 3 May 2019 announcement? If so, when?</li> <li>6. Given the magnitude of the waste problem in the Pacific and its correlation to plastic in Australia's oceans, will more investment be needed in the long term?</li> <li>7. This funding is derived from the Pacific Regional funding envelope within Australia's development assistance budget, correct?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000148
125.	2.1: AAD	Senator Brown	Measures ensuring continued support and service to Antarctica	Can you advise the Committee what measures are in place to ensure continued support and service to Antarctica given the delay in the delivery of the new ice breaker?	Written	SQ20-000160
126.	2.1: AAD	Senator Brown	Extending contract of P&O vessel Aurora Australis	Was consideration given to extending the contract of the P&O vessel "Aurora Australis" given the delay? If not, why not?	Written	SQ20-000161
127.	2.1: AAD	Senator Brown	Short-term replacement vessel crew	Will the short-term replacement vessel be crewed by Australians? If not, why not?	Written	SQ20-000162
128.	2.1: AAD	Senator Brown	Replacement for the Aurora Australis	When will the replacement for the "Aurora Australis" be available to supply and service our research bases in Antarctica?	Written	SQ20-000163
129.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Smith	Australia's last five warmest and driest years on record	<p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Can you please advise us when Australia's last five warmest years on record were?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I'd have to take that one on notice, but most of them have been since the year 2000. For the sake of accuracy I'll take that on</p>	Page 15 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000009

				<p>notice. I haven't committed it to memory.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> I am also interested in the last five warmest years on record and also our last five driest years on record. So, you will have to take both of those on notice? Would the bureau say there is a trend to warmer and drier years?</p>		
130.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Smith	Special climate statement on bushfires	<p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Was there a spike in activity on the Bureau of Meteorology's app during the bushfire crisis?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I'm not sure about a spike of activity on the app, but certainly there was a very significant spike in terms of the engagement of the bureau with the community during the bushfire crisis. We received nearly 4,500 media requests and did many radio crosses and other engagement with the community. It wouldn't surprise me at all that our statistics with the app increased. I know as of last week nearly 6.75 million Australians had the app on their mobile device. In the last seven months or so we've had nearly 900,000 new users. One could extrapolate that that was driven by the severe weather at the back end of 2019.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Do you collect data on the use of the app?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> We do.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Is that something you could take on notice? Is the bureau working on any reports or further statements on the severity of the bushfire season and/or the drought?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I'm not aware of us working on any additional reports, but clearly we are mobilising our capability to support the various inquiries that have been announced by both state and federal governments. Our expertise will contribute to those processes.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> But you're not aware of anything?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I will double-check with my colleagues. We issued a special climate statement in January, but I don't believe we have anything in the works in the next little while. There is a special climate statement that is in draft form that we're working on around the bushfires, but I don't have a time for when it will be completed.</p> <p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> Could you take that on notice for me please? I'm interested in when that will be issued.</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> Sure.</p>	Page 16 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000010

131.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Waters	Timeline of warming as outlined in <i>United in Science</i> report	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Can you talk me through the time lines as outlined in that report? We're at 1.1 degrees now. How many degrees will we be at by 2030, 2040 and 2050 under the pathway we are currently on?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I would have to take that on notice. Again, I haven't committed that to memory.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Are you able to come back to us in the course of the day with that information?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I will do my best. I think that should be possible.</p>	Page 17-18 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000011
132.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Waters	Australia's average land temperatures compared to the global average	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> The evidence shows that Australia's average heating over land will be much higher than the global average. How much hotter are we compared to the current 1.1 degrees and how much hotter will the 3.4 degree average be for us here?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> That's a very specific question. I'd prefer to take it on notice. I'll just check with my colleague who is present whether we can answer that now.</p> <p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> Could you please repeat the question?</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> The average land temperatures here are hotter than the global average. What does that mean under 1.1 and 3.4 for us in Australia?</p> <p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> Australia warmed slightly more than the global average. At 3.4 degrees, I'd have to take on notice to get you an exact number. Australia would be closer to four degrees.</p>	Page 18 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000012
133.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Waters	Global temperature predictions and modelling	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Is there some kind of multiplier effect? Obviously it's not linear. It's not going to be three times as bad, but do we know how many times as bad it will be?</p> <p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> That really depends on the application and on the region. That requires quite a lot of high-precision modelling depending on what impact you're looking at. Even if you're looking at thresholds of above 40, that's quite different to thresholds above 35 degrees, for example. We would have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 18 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000204
134.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Roberts	Length of time Rob Vertessy worked at BOM	<p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> How long did Rob Vertessy work at BOM?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I have no idea. I don't know.</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Could I get that on notice?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> Yes.</p>	Page 21 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000014
135.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Waters	Resilience of the National Electricity Grid	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> The Reserve Bank stated that they're working on trying to understand the economy-wide risks of climate change using the analysis of the BOM. Has that work begun? Can you tell us about it?</p>	Page 22-23 Monday	SQ20-000015

			with 3.4 degrees of warming	<p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> We have been undertaking some work on risk based scenarios for the National Electricity Market in the energy sector for high-impact weather events in the future. That's the bureau's contribution to this kind of work. We have been undertaking a project with AEMO and the National Electricity Market. That's the work that financial services sector and the RBA are interested in. Yes, we have started on that work scientifically.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> And risk based scenarios to the network supply? What is the focus?</p> <p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> That's a complicated question. Basically to the resilience of the National Electricity Grid.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Is there anything that you can tell us about the resilience or presumably the challenge to that resilience of the 3.4 degrees scenario, which we are on track for?</p> <p><b>Dr Braganza:</b> That's a really complicated question.</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> Clearly, as our climate continues to warm and dry, and other meteorological phenomena continue to evolve, that will have significant implications both from a supply side and a demand side in terms of the National Electricity Market. We're working closely with a range of players in the national electricity sector to look at possible scenarios there, from both demand and supply side points of view, and we'll continue to do so.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> So, it's not about transmission risks?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> It includes transmission risks, but it includes, as I said before, both demand and supply side dimensions. Obviously transmission risks form part of the supply side risk.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Would you be able to provide on notice a little more detail about the timeframes that you are working to on that analysis and any conclusions you might have so far?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> Yes.</p>	2 March	
136.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	ACORN datasets	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BOM has three datasets – the original data, ACORN 1 and ACORN 2. The mean difference in temperature between ACORN 1 and ACORN 2 is .23 degrees and the mean difference between ACORN 2 and the original data is .43 degrees– in other words homogenisation has increased the amount of warming since 1910 by over 50% from the 0.8 degrees warming in the original data - is that correct. (page 29</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000073

				<p>2018 Trewin)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The independent peer review in 2011 recommended the margin of error for the actual recorded data i.e. observations be reduced from 0.5 degrees to 0.2 degrees (page 8 A1) and that confidence intervals for homogenised data in ACORN 1 and 2 be reported (see page 13 of review D4) – has the BOM reduced the margin of error for observational data and reported confidence levels for the ACORN data.</li> <li>3. If so what is the margin of error/confidence levels for the observational and ACORN data?</li> <li>4. If this is still +/-0.5 then why hasn't this been reduced given it was a recommendation in the 2011 Independent peer review.</li> <li>5. Does the BOM report these error levels on a regular basis – the last acknowledgment of these margins that I can find is in the 2011 Observation practices.</li> <li>6. If the BOM's Quality Assurance procedures are of a high standard why does the BOM need to amend its actual measurements? In the private sector if an accountant went back and amended prior year financial records they would be put in jail. Why do the same principals not apply to the BOM?</li> <li>7. Who authorised the ACORN process i.e. the idea of keeping more than one set of records.</li> <li>8. What was the justification for keeping multiple of sets of records when best practice would expect one record set that is audited and confidence intervals maintained and regularly reported?</li> <li>9. Is there either legislation or regulation stating that homogenisation must be performed by the BOM?</li> <li>10. When calculating margin of error does the BOM regress temperature records or quality assurance records i.e. number of days in a month temperature was recorded.</li> <li>11. Could the BOM please provide its workings and methodology on calculating its margin of error on observation data? I'm happy to discuss a process for this to happen as I imagine there is a large volume of data involved.</li> <li>12. Given the BOM said Acorn 1 was world's best practice and the BOM made another 966 adjustments to it in Acorn 2 – why</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				should we believe Acorn 2?		
137.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Independent Peer Review 2011	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The BOM reply to the 2011 independent peer review on the 15/02/2012 in response to the D4 recommendation that BOM should specify statistical uncertainty values when calculating temperature trends and make this information readily available stated and I quote “A full error analysis will not be undertaken at this stage owing to uncertainty about structural errors in the ACORN-SAT data-set which can never be fully known.” Is the BOM saying there are errors in the ACORN data set which can never be fully known and if so what do these errors relate to exactly?</li> <li>2. Is this the final homogenisation? Given the BOM have reported no confidence levels with the Acorn Data set shouldn't the media be reporting the original data.</li> <li>3. On the bottom of page 8 of its observational document the BOM states it made 6000 station history changes – can the BOM please provide documentation that validates these changes.</li> <li>4. Given that on page 7 of the Independent peer review the Panel did not rate the observing practices amongst international best practice why is the BOM spending time on rewriting old records when it should be trying to improving the quality assurance of measuring actual data?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000074
138.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Destruction of records	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 9 of its Observations practices the BOM states it destroyed a significant number of files when the BOM moved office relating to observational practices and process prior to 1973. Is the BOM aware that S24 of the 1983 Archives act prohibits the destruction of records outside the normal course of business? Section 24 of the 1983 Archives Act that says “a person must not engage in conduct that results in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the destruction or other disposal of a Commonwealth record; or</li> <li>b. the transfer of the custody or ownership of a Commonwealth record; or</li> <li>c. damage to or alteration of a Commonwealth record.”</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Did the BOM breach the law, namely the aforementioned section of the archives act when it destroyed a significant</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000075

				<p>number of files upon moving office?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Who it seek permission from to destroy these records?</li> <li>4. Given 2003 wasn't the stone ages why didn't the BOM digitalise these records before destroying them?</li> <li>5. Given the BOM has destroyed records on what basis can it justify homogenising data in the time period the data was destroyed if it doesn't have the source documents to justify its changes.</li> <li>6. In the private sector, companies are required to keep records as per the corporations act. I note that as per the <i>APS Values and code of conduct in practice</i> require employees to 'document significant decisions or actions consistent with the <i>Archives Act 1983</i> and to a standard that will withstand independent scrutiny' – as a senator how can I scrutinise the BOM's practices if the BOM have destroyed records?  <a href="https://www.naa.gov.au/information-management/information-management-standards/information-management-standard-australian-government">https://www.naa.gov.au/information-management/information-management-standards/information-management-standard-australian-government</a></li> </ol>		
139.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Auditing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the private sector companies are required to have their accounts audited annually. Does the BOM have their observational and ACORN records audited? Given Public companies are required to have their accounts audited annually. Shouldn't the BOM have their records audited annually as well? To be explicit I am not talking about financial data only.</li> <li>2. Does the BOM perform any internal audits?</li> <li>3. I note on page 26 of its Observations practices the BOM mentions that an internal or external audit framework is required to enable demonstration rather than assumption of tolerance compliance. Has anything been done about this since 2011?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000076
140.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Recorded temperatures using Stevenson screens	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the BOM got accreditation under ISO 17025 or similar?</li> <li>2. On page 9 of the 2011 Observations practices the BOM states the differences in recorded temperatures between the large and small Stevenson screen were less than 0.1 degree. I note in February 2015, the International Journal of Climatology released a research paper from Buisan and others, who conducted a test between the two screens for a year from 2011.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000077

				<p><a href="https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/joc.4287">https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/joc.4287</a>.  In Table 2 of that report the mean difference between the large and small Stevenson screen was shown to be 0.54 of degree, with a peak monthly mean difference in the summer month of July of 0.92 of a degree. The average air temperature for winter months was 11 degrees and summer months 21 degrees for an average of around 16 degrees. Australia has an average temperature of around 21 degrees so if anything the variation between screens in Australia would be higher than 0.54 degrees would it not.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Does the BOM still have the records for its instrument tests between large and small Stevenson screens, in particular ITR649 in 1998?</li> <li>4. Given the BOM claims the difference between the large and small Stevenson screen showed a difference of less than 0.1 of a degree which is significantly difference to the Spanish report should it not perform more testing on the difference between large and small Stevenson screens.</li> <li>5. Just for the record the large Stevenson screen in Australia has a volume of .23m2 and the small Stevenson screen a volume of .06m2 (per page 9) and the Spanish study large screen was .32m2 and small is 0.08m2 so the small screens in both have about 25% of the volume of the larger screens – it is not perfect comparison but very similar in terms of size reduction.</li> <li>6. As per page 11-13 the BOM stopped using the large Stevenson screen the same day it started using the small Stevenson screen at just about every station the BOM made a changeover. Should the BOM not have run parallel runs between the two Stevenson screens to ensure it has a clear record of the differences between the two at each location? (Note Charleville, Learmonth, Darwin, Cobar, Bathurst, Laverton do cross over). I note this was a recommendation (D3) of the independent peer review in 2011.</li> <li>7. RE stations that do cross over – does the BOM keep temperature records for both screen types and if so could the BOM please provide?</li> <li>8. When no parallel runs were performed were adjustments based</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				on data regressions of wind, humidity and rainfall. If not how were adjustments determined. i.e. with the example of Kerang on the BOM website how did it determine that 1 degree was the appropriate adjustment on the coldest nights and 0.2 degrees on the mildest nights?		
<b>141.</b>	<b>Bureau of Meteorology</b>	<b>Senator Rennick</b>	<b>Measurement environment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 27 of the 2011 observation practices the BOM says the only components of the measurement environment that has changed in the last century has been a move to platinum-resistance thermometry. This contradicts your statements on page 9 of the observation practices which says the BOM moved from large Stevenson screens to small Stevenson screens in 1973. Isn't this a change in the measurement environment?</li> <li>2. On page 27 of the BOM's 2011 Observation practices the BOM say that the move to automatic weather stations in the last two decades reduced the ability for daily redundancy checks and increased the likelihood of missing data. Why would the BOM initiate a process that reduced the accuracy of weather measurements?</li> <li>3. When moving to the platinum resistance thermometers was a parallel run carried out between the old mercury thermometers and the platinum resistance thermometers? I note this was a recommendation (D3) of the independent peer review in 2011.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000078
<b>142.</b>	<b>Bureau of Meteorology</b>	<b>Senator Rennick</b>	<b>Recorded data from thermometers</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 4 of the BOM's observation practices it notes that since 1996 no overwriting of the platinum thermometer is allowed if the manual thermometer is also used. If the Platinum thermometer was to break down wouldn't it make more sense to at least use the data from the mercury thermometer?</li> <li>2. On the same page the BOM says that that where manual recording take places it doesn't digitalise the data – wouldn't it make sense to do this – what's the point of recording the data if it's not kept?</li> <li>3. Furthermore isn't this an opportunity to perform a parallel run between the mercury and platinum thermometers?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000079
<b>143.</b>	<b>Bureau of Meteorology</b>	<b>Senator Rennick</b>	<b>ACORN weather stations</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In terms of temperature and rainfall data, expressed in days per month, what is the average amount of redundant data? i.e. missing data at each Acorn site?</li> <li>2. How often are ACORN weather stations inspected by BOM</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000080

				staff? i.e. Daily, Weekly, Monthly.		
144.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Management of thermometers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 8 of the 2011 Independent peer review it was noted that In some countries (e.g. US, Canada), the Reference Climate Station Network sites used for producing data-sets similar to ACORN-SAT contain three independent temperature sensors. This provides redundancy should one sensor fail, and also allows a continuous check of whether a sensor is going out of calibration. It would be prudent for the Bureau of Meteorology to adopt a similar procedure, beginning with isolated sites in the more remote areas of Australia which carry a particularly heavy weight within the gridded analysis used to determine the national temperature trends. Does the BOM keep three independent temperature sensors and if not why not and how many thermometers do the BOM keep at each site?</li> <li>2. Has the BOM only ever kept one thermometer at each location or was there a time in the past when they kept more than one.</li> <li>3. In the past, was there ever a time when the BOM or affiliates checked the thermometers daily?</li> <li>4. Can the BOM confirm if it takes spot readings of temperature or does it average 1 second spot readings over a minute?</li> <li>5. My understanding that the WMO requires that the reading being averaged over 1 minute. Is this correct?</li> <li>6. If spot readings aren't averaged over a minute can the BOM why it doesn't do this?</li> <li>7. If a thermometer breaks down, how does the BOM detect this and how long does it take to repair?</li> <li>8. What's the longest time period a thermometer has been out of action?</li> <li>9. What does a thermometer (PRT) cost?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000081
145.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Excluded records	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why did the BOM exclude a large number of observations in La Nina weather events when the weather was cooler? Can the records that were excluded please be provided. (Page 12 Trewin 2018).</li> <li>2. Was the data referred to in the previous completely excluded or adjusted? If completely excluded isn't this inconsistent with your methods referred to on Page 13 of Trewin 2018 when a monthly adjustment method was used if insufficient reference</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000082

				sites were insufficiently correlated.		
146.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Improving quality assurance and recommendations in 2011 independent peer review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are 112 Acorn sites – given the peer review has recommended that the BOM improve your observing practices, wouldn't it make sense to invest some of the \$300 million in revenue the BOM earns from the government and customers in improving the quality assurance of your measurements? For example if the BOM paid 112 people \$100k each to inspect the sites each day that would only cost about 3.5% of your budget.</li> <li>2. Of the 31 recommendations made by the independent peer review in 2011 how many has the BOM made.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000083
147.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Changes to maximum temperature records at Marble bar	Re the BOM's recent changes to maximum temperature records at Marble bar back in 1923/1924 on what basis did it change these records and why are the changes so inconsistent given weather conditions were consistent.	Written	SQ20-000084
148.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Missing rainfall data	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Boyup Brook WA in 2019 something like 80% of their daily rainfall records were either not complete or unknown – as a result they missed out on drought relief – can the BOM explain why so much data was missing.</li> <li>2. What actions can be taken to improve reliability of rainfall measurements?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000085
149.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Management of ACORN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I also refer to the BOM adjustment in ACORN 2 on page 17 of the Trewin 2018 report, where ACORN 2 was adjusted by +.176 degrees for diurnal temperature – was that up or down? That is did it increase the temperature difference between ACORN 2 and the observational data?</li> <li>2. If the government is expected to meet its Paris commitments, then why doesn't the BOM have to meet the World Metrological Society standards?</li> <li>3. Too how many decimal places does the BOM thermometers record temperature?</li> <li>4. How much money has the BOM invested in Acorn?</li> <li>5. How many staff are employed in maintaining/adjusting the ACORN database?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000086
150.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Breakout of sales by customers	As per your Profit and Loss ending 30 June 2019, (page 148 of annual report) the BOM received \$88.9 million dollars from Sales and rendering of services. Can you please provide a breakout of Sales by	Written	SQ20-000087

				customer?		
151.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Records pre 1910	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 1 of your observation practices, the BOM quote the publication “Instructions of Country Observers” from 1907 clear states that temperature observations conform to international regulation and content from British Meteorological services. If that’s the case why does the BOM ignore records prior to 1910?</li> <li>2. Has the BOM made available its pre 1910 data on its website? The BOM has indicated this would be completed by autumn 2018. (Refer response in Oct 17 Advisory Forum paper)</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000088
152.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Automatic clocks and increase of weather stations since 1990	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 5 of the Observations practices the BOM says that when Daylight savings kicks in the Automatic clocks can be out for an hour until they are reset via manual intervention – how long does this take and why can’t they be adjusted automatically – iPhone and car clocks know when the time changes so why can’t the BOM clocks.</li> <li>2. Page 7 of the Observation practices show an increase in the number of weather stations from 80 in 1990 to almost 180 in 2010. Were these skewed towards hotter parts of the country and if so how has the BOM adjusted the weighted average of past data to reconcile with the weighted average of present data? Could workings please be provided?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000089
153.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Inspection and maintenance of weather stations and equipment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In regards to the BOMs systems that are designed to alert it to unusually high or low temperatures can the BOM please provide algorithms that underpin this procedure?</li> <li>2. Page 14 of the Observations practices state that thermometers when purchased are not calibrated. Should they be?</li> <li>3. Page 16 of the Observations practices state that the BOM inspects each site regularly to verify measurements. Regularly is defined as “typically yearly.” This should be done more frequently to ensure operational performance is consistent should it not?</li> <li>4. Page 16 of the Observations practices discusses the introduction of the platinum-resistance thermometers – the BOM says it uses 4 difference varieties of probes across the observing network. Shouldn’t it be using just one to ensure standardisation?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000090

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. On page 16 of the Observations practices the BOM says in the first two decades, a small number of probes failed the inspection tolerance criterion – are the temperatures recorded by these faulty probes included in the BOM records or have they been ignored?</li> <li>6. What does the BOM do with records when it finds out the equipment that has recorded the data is faulty? i.e. are the records excluded or manually adjusted?</li> <li>7. I note that as per page 17 of Observation data for the older stations the BOM keeps both the manual data in the A8 field book and the automatically recorded data. If so is there much variance between the two different measuring instruments?</li> <li>8. Given historical data was recorded using the mercury thermometer wouldn't it be important to understand the difference between the mercury thermometer and the PRT if the BOM was going to homogenise old data?</li> <li>9. On page 24 of Observations practices the BOM says no calibration data was used for field PRT's. Does this mean the BOM has only tested thermometers in the laboratory and not in the field? Shouldn't they be tested in the field?</li> <li>10. On page 25 of Observation practices the BOM states that stand alone automatic weather stations cannot not be cross checked for accuracy or replaced as soon as possible if a problem occurs because manual measurements don't take place. Why doesn't the BOM have someone checking the screens daily? As per my earlier question given there are only 112 weather stations in the ACORN series how hard would it be to employ someone to check these screens daily? Surely it would be better to spend money on improving the accuracy and reliability of your measurements rather than reworking old records for the ACORN data would it not. If the BOM paid 112 people \$100,000 a year to check instruments daily – it would cost around \$11 million a year. As per the 2019 Financial report the BOM expense budget was \$406 million – shouldn't it be investing some of the budget into improving the accuracy of the measurements. The Federal and state governments are investing billions into reducing the temperature of the planet so</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				shouldn't the BOM make sure we record the temperature correctly so we know whether or not the money being spent on climate change is working?		
154.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Reliability of data	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 26 of Observation practices the BOM says that “a significant shift in resource balance is needed as improved uncertainty of individual SAT measurements can only be achieved by improvements in the quality assurance and measurement processes.” Given the BOM said this in 2011 what has it done to rectify this problem since then?</li> <li>2. Given the BOM fails to meet the World Metrological Society specifications, and an independent peer review made 31 recommendations for the BOM to make in order to improve their record keeping why does the Bureau claim that methods are robust and reliable?</li> <li>3. Given the independent peer review did not rate the observing practices of the BOM, and not confidence intervals are provided for the ACORN datasets why should Australians trust the Bureau's information?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000091
155.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Recording temperature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If surface temperature of Australia was to be recorded properly then shouldn't weather stations be evenly spaced out on a grid like pattern a set number of kilometres apart rather than spaced unevenly as they are now?</li> <li>2. Does the BOM use satellites to record temperature at all – if not why not?</li> <li>3. Does the BOM compare surface data to satellite data and if so what the results.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000092
156.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Noona recordings	In January 2019 – the BOM released a tweet and held a media conference saying that Noona had recorded a new all-time record – the highest minimum ever. Given Noona has only operated since 2017, how can the BOM be sure that it was the hottest minimum ever given the BOM only had two years of data which is not statistically significant? Most people would assume the BOM was talking about the last 110 years not the last 2 years. Why didn't the BOM disclose that the figures weren't statistically significant?	Written	SQ20-000093
157.	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Rennick	Quality control of thermometer performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 8 of the 2011 Independent peer review it was noted the BOM specialists on quality control and homogenisation of temperature data advised the Review Panel that if the</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000094

				performance of a thermometer at a particular measurement site strayed towards the outer bounds of the inspection tolerance limits, this would be picked up by the quality control and homogenisation analyses, and corrected through homogenisation. Has the BOM prepared documentation to support this analysis and corrections and if so can it be provided?		
<b>158.</b>	<b>Bureau of Meteorology</b>	<b>Senator Gallagher</b>	<b>Expenditure on external contractors</b>	<p>I refer to the Bureau’s answer to question on notice 28 asked in Supplementary Budget Estimates on 31 October 2019.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why did expenditure on ‘Management and Business Professionals and Administrative Services’ increase from \$28m in 2013-14 to \$111m in 2018-19.</li> <li>2. Does the figure for ‘contractors’ in the Bureau’s financial statements to the annual report refer to all external contractors, including IT contractors. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If no, how much did the Bureau spend on all external contractors in each of the financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000104
<b>159.</b>	<b>Bureau of Meteorology</b>	<b>Senator Rennick</b>	<b>Trewin Report 2018</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 21 of the Trewin 2018 report the BOM states that “an instrument with a faster response time will tend to record higher maximum and lower minimum temperatures than an instrument with a slower response time.” The BOM then states that in Summer there were increases of up to 0.4 degrees at 15:00 for variations in response time. Yet the BOM claim these differences were negligible because the BOM has a 0.3 degrees threshold for station specific adjustments. Isn’t 0.3 degrees too high as a threshold given the WMO require a +/-0.2 degree margin of error?</li> <li>2. Should not each adjustment, if it’s been subject to a parallel run with appropriate quality assurance, regardless of how large or small be recorded or taken into account in order to reduce the overall margin of error for the entire database.</li> <li>3. On page 20 of Trewin 2018, variations were recorded in the move to AWS. Why does the BOM consider variations as high as 0.22 degrees for maximum and 0.16 degrees for mean temperature as insignificant? Both these figures are greater than 10% of the change in temperature in the last century (regardless</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000105

				<p>of which database is being used) and as such should be regarded as materially significant.</p> <p>4. Re probes that failed as referred to on page 20 of Trewin 2018 i.e. Cairns, Charleville and Adelaide what exactly was wrong with them.</p> <p>5. Could the workings for calculations showing the change in temperatures as reported in bottom table on page 29 of Trewin 2018 please be provided. In particular could the workings be summarised on 3 spreadsheets showing each Stations description x3 in Column A, three rows per station showing max, min and mean in column B, whether or not it's included in the AWAP or ACORN 2 series in column C, Year commenced in column D and year finished (if applicable) in column E and temperature data for each parameter by year from 1910 in column F onwards. The three spreadsheets should be split by ACORN 2 workings, AWAP workings and all stations workings. I've attached a template to help understand my request. The totals at the bottom of column DI should agree to the data provided on page 29 for the ACORN 2 and AWAP figures. You can ignore the ACORN 1 series as I assuming that those adjustments are included within ACORN 2.</p>		
160.	Director of National Parks	Senator Green	Closure of Twin Falls for 2020	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> You said the decision was made in December. What date was it made on?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay:</b> I'd have to check the exact date for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Will you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay:</b> Sure.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> And you said you informed the tourism sector, or the stakeholders, via a newsletter?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay:</b> We communicate with the tourism industry in a range of ways, including through a regular newsletter that goes out to industry. Unfortunately, there was a timing issue when we sent this one out; I didn't realise it was going out on Christmas Eve. The timing could have been better. When we put things out on Christmas Eve, people always assume we're trying to sneak something out. That certainly wasn't our intention; it was just unfortunate. I'd rather get information out than not get it out. In this case, earlier in the month would have been better than</p>	Page 40 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000030

				<p>24 December.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> So, it's possible the decision was made on the 1st. Were you waiting to send a regular newsletter out before the decision was sent out?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay:</b> We send out newsletters routinely. I can give you the exact cycle. That was probably December's newsletter, so it was included as part of the regular update, amongst a whole bunch of other information. I would have to check the date that we actually made the decision and went ahead with that work.</p>		
161.	Director of National Parks	Senator Green	Parks Australia most recent annual report	<p>1 <i>With reference to Parks Australia's most recent annual report, 4 out of 8 non-financial performance targets were not achieved:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What reasons have been identified for this under achievement?</li> <li>b. What changes have been made to ensure these targets are achieved in the future?</li> <li>c. To what extent does the Director of National Parks or Parks Australia have over bushfire preparedness?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000152
162.	Director of National Parks	Senator Green	Hazard reduction measures	<p>1 <i>With reference to any hazard reduction measures the Director of National Parks may oversee:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the scale and location of any hazard reduction measures?</li> <li>b. What other agencies or jurisdictions does the Director of National Parks work with?</li> <li>c. What assessment, if any, has been undertaken by the Director of National Parks about the impacts of the recent national bushfire crisis, and what are the details of that assessment?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000153
163.	Director of National Parks	Senator Green	Marine Parks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much funding has been allocated in conservation resources for work in the Limmen Marine Park by the Commonwealth?</li> <li>2. How much Commonwealth funding has been spent on the Limmen Marine Park in relation to collaborative work with the Northern Territory Limmen Bight Marine Park?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000154
164.	Great Barrier Reef Marine	Senator Green	Number of meetings with the Great Barrier	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Can I just ask you about the authority's relationship with the Great Barrier Reef Foundation? How many meetings has GBRMPA had with the foundation and how regularly do those meetings</p>	Page 28 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000018

	<b>Park Authority</b>		<b>Reef Foundation</b>	take place? <b>Mr Thomas:</b> We have roughly quarterly meetings with the foundation as an executive. In terms of the precise number of meetings we've had with them at a range of levels, we'd have to take that on notice, I think, Senator. We do meet with them regularly though.		
165.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Green</b>	<b>Impact of single-use plastics on marine debris</b>	<b>Senator GREEN:</b> Thank you. I'm asking the authority about the report that refers to single-use plastics and the very small portion of plastics that make up the marine debris. I'm just wondering, Mr Thomas, why single-use plastics are something that is being discussed at a larger level if it only constitutes a small portion of the marine debris located in the Great Barrier Reef. Have you got any views on that? <b>Mr Thomas:</b> In terms of the relative impact, we'd have to take that on notice, but we would certainly argue that any efforts to reduce pollution of any kind—single use or otherwise—are important for the reef because we do know that they impact species in an adverse way. So we'd encourage ongoing action in that space.	Page 31 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000019
166.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Green</b>	<b>Proportion of single-use plastic contributing to marine debris</b>	<b>Senator GREEN:</b> Sorry—one last question. Your report says 'a small proportion' and then it says 'approximately one to two per cent' of overall marine debris. It's only one or two per cent that we're talking about. <b>Dr Wachenfeld:</b> I think it's important that those are figures from beach clean-ups. I think we're at a point where we'd have to take the rest of this on notice, because that specific statistic about what is found in beach clean-ups is not necessarily a measure of the overall risk to the park.	Page 31 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000020
167.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Modelled impact of 3.4 degrees warming on Great Barrier reef</b>	<b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you. So has GBRMPA actually modelled what impacts there would be for the reef, not just the coral reef aspects—I hear you in that regard; there are other features of the reef. Have you actually modelled what that will mean for the Great Barrier Reef given that 3.4 is what will come if everybody sticks with their Paris commitments, which you've said you'd like them to do? <b>Mr Thomas:</b> We don't do our own modelling so much as take modelling from our science partners and understand what that looks like. Again, Dr Wachenfeld will have more. <b>Dr Wachenfeld:</b> Mr Thomas's point is well made. We don't independently conduct our own science, but we look across the range of science that is conducted on the different elements of the reef. The	Page 32 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000021

				<p><i>Outlook report 2019</i> does repeat an analysis from 2007, I think originally, that is looking at the vulnerability of all of the elements of the Great Barrier Reef at different levels of future climate change. Whether it specifically goes up to three degrees I can't remember, but we could get the reference for that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> If you could, because I'm interested in whether anyone is looking at what the government's policies will deliver for the reef given that we've just had this assessment that says globally the Paris commitments get us to 3.4 degrees. Surely GBRMPA or one of the science agencies is working out what that actually means for the Great Barrier Reef. Is anybody doing that work?</p>		
168.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Proposal for modelling tools to assess impacts on the Reef	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Okay, so you are now doing that work in-house—projecting that—</p> <p><b>Ms Johnson:</b> No, it will be with our partners. We will not be doing it. We are coordinating with our partners—our science partners—on this.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Who are your partners on this?</p> <p><b>Ms Johnson:</b> The key ones at the moment are the CSIRO, the Australian Institute of Marine Science, the Queensland government, the department and IMOS. I'm sorry, I don't know what IMOS stands for.</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> Integrated Marine Observing System.</p> <p><b>Ms Johnson:</b> Thank you.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Do they have additional resourcing to undertake that work or do you?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> We had \$8 million through the Reef Trust to design that program and develop a roadmap for its implementation. We are currently working within the existing resources of all of those partner organisations now to give life to that program.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Okay—so the design of the program was funded but not the implementation of it?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> Not yet. We're developing with our partners a proposal for how it should best be implemented. That will contain considerations around what appropriate resourcing looks like.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Given that my time's up, could you take on notice to give me a bit more information about that proposal, because I'm still not quite certain that we're talking about the same thing.</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> Yes.</p>	Page 33 Monday 2 March	SQ20-00022
169.	Great	Senator	Resources for the	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I do have some more questions. You've already</p>	Page 35	SQ20-000202

	<b>Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Waters</b>	<b>management of the marine park</b>	<p>touched on the NOAA forecast that we're going to have yet another bleaching event and I was going to ask what you are doing about it, but you've sort of touched upon that already—namely, all of the plans that are in place. Presumably you haven't been allocated any additional resources to do any of that work beyond what you already had prior to the NOAA forecast. If that's not the case, can you let me know on notice if you've had any more resources—</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> Can I also make one point there, Senator? The authority says the ongoing management of the region against the zoning plan is critically important for the reef's long-term resilience and the field management program is actually expanding quite significantly with the Queensland government. We think that's quite an important endeavour as well.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Okay. Could you provide me with some more details of that? I'm not across that. Thank you.</p>	Monday 2 March	
170.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Tracking data for tourism impacts on the Reef</b>	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Okay. Could you provide me with some more details of that? I'm not across that. Thank you. Just on tourism numbers, the Centre for Tourism and Regional Opportunities reported a dramatic decline in domestic tourism since the first mass bleaching event in 2016, which was then, of course, backed up with a second one the next year. Has GBRMPA done any analysis or been made aware of any analysis of long-term tourism impacts for the reef?</p> <p><b>Mr Thomas:</b> I might throw to one of our regional managers on this, but we are aware of that decline since the 2016 bleaching and the impacts that had on the foreign markets for tourism especially. With other events, such as the bushfires this year and the coronavirus limiting travel, that should also have been an impact. So, yes, we are looking at these things internally and discussing them with our board. Is there anything you'd like to add, Mr Elliot?</p> <p><b>Mr Elliot:</b> Thank you. Yes, Senator, we've been tracking tourism visitation to the Great Barrier Reef since the late 1990s, so we do have trend information. It's based on the environmental management charge figures, which is a charge that tourists pay to visit the reef. That gives us the information we need to track tourism visitation. It has been affected by numerous things over that period of time and certainly in more recent—in the last decade there's been a number of impacts, including cyclones, bleaching events, the global financial crisis just over a decade</p>	Page 35-36 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000025

				ago et cetera. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Great. Would you mind providing that tracking data on notice, including what events that matched up with? <b>Mr Elliot:</b> I believe we publish it to our website, Senator, but I'll provide it.		
171.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Senate inquiry into science of water quality science – cost of participation to GBRMPA</b>	<b>Senator WATERS:</b> Perhaps you could send us a link. That would be great. The outlook report identified water quality impacts of agricultural run-off as an ongoing threat—of course, in addition to climate being the main threat. Last year the Independent Expert Panel for the reef plan expressed their unequivocal support for the rigour of the science underpinning water quality controls, but we've got a Senate inquiry into the rigour of that science. How much cost to GBRMPA is participation in that inquiry into water quality science, including staff time in preparing submissions to people who don't accept science? <b>Mr Thomas:</b> To quantify our staff time, Senator, we'd have to take that on notice. We did put in a submission to that inquiry and we'll appear at the coming hearings, but we'd have to take on notice the actual staff time.	Page 36 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000026
172.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Timeline of tenders for remediation work for the <i>Shen Neng</i></b>	<b>Senator WATERS:</b> Why has it taken that long to get that specificity? <b>Mr Elliot:</b> Senator, I'd need to take on notice the timeline to be able to give you, but essentially it's been because we've been going through a very deliberate process to do that work ahead of going to market. That particular report—the options analysis summary—is on our website, so it's available to anybody who wishes to look at it.	Page 36- 37 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000027
173.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator Waters</b>	<b>Specific decline in tourism visitation following loss of 50 percent of coral cover of the reef</b>	<b>Senator WATERS:</b> Just in relation to the tracking of the tourism demand and visitation numbers, with those 2016 and 2017 bleaching events which accumulated to see 50 per cent of the coral cover of the reef die, what was the specific decline in tourism visitation following that loss of 50 per cent of the coral cover of the reef and how did that drop compare to the other reductions in visitations? <b>Mr Elliot:</b> I would have to take that question on notice, Senator. I would note, though, that bleaching events were not the only impact on tourism visitation at that time in 2017. Tropical Cyclone Debbie also had an impact. So we would not be able to isolate just the—you would not be able to say that all decline was because of the coral bleaching. There is also a lag time from tourism bookings, particularly overseas bookings. But, certainly, I could take the question on notice.	Page 37- 38 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000028

174.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Delay in findings of remediation work needed for the <i>Shen Neng</i>	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you. And just on the <i>Shen Neng</i>, my question, which we didn't quite get to finish, was: you say that you've just now got a handle on the parameters of the damage and therefore what needs to be remediated and so you're confident that the \$35 million will cover that. But it was 10 years ago. Why has it taken 10 years to get a handle on the true scope of the damage? I thought you visited the site previously. Why has it so radically shrunk? Why didn't you know that 10 years ago?</p> <p><b>Mr Elliot:</b> We did do surveys after the incident and in several years that followed that. They were tracking the area that was directly impacted by the <i>Shen Neng</i>. What the difference between the latest surveys has identified in terms of—from the point of view of remediation is what are the areas that need to be remediated to set the scene for natural recovery of Douglas Shoal. So there is a difference between everywhere the ship may have touched and where the rubble that needs to be dealt with and contamination that needs to be dealt with are located.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Yes, but why didn't you know that 10 years ago when you first looked? Why has it taken you 10 years to work that out?</p> <p><b>Mr Elliot:</b> It hasn't taken us 10 years. It's taken—since the project and since we had the successful 'for' case for the funding to do remediation, these final level surveys have been part of our preparations for that remediation.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> So have you just shrunk the remediation to fit the money available to do the work?</p> <p><b>Mr Elliot:</b> No, the work we've done is completely independent in that sense and has been looking specifically at exactly where we need to remediate, what we need to remediate and what the options for that remediation are.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I still don't understand the 10-year delay. Could you provide me with some more information about that, because it doesn't seem to make sense to me?</p>	Page 38 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000029
175.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Gallagher	External Contractors	<p>I refer to Question on Notice No. 28 from Supplementary Budget Estimates 2019 on external contractors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the figures provided for management and business professionals and administrative services the same as the figures for all external contractors?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000112

				2. If no to (1), please provide the figures for all external contractors for each of the financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19.		
176.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Jobs	In answer to questions at the previous estimates (QON 198), GBRMPA said that it has 220 FTE staff. 1. Does this include recruitment agency staff? If not, how many staff does GBRMPA have, including temporary, casual and recruitment agency staff? 2. What are the programs that have recruitment agency staff? 3. What is the breakdown between permanent and non-permanent staff in each of the GBRMPA programs?	Written	SQ20-000118
177.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	COTS Control	GBRMPA got \$1.4m to top up its COTS program this current F/Y. It now runs five COTS control boats. The GBRF has \$39 m left for COTS control. 1. How are negotiations going with the GBR Foundation for next F/Y funding? Is it looking likely that GBRMPA will receive funds from the Foundation to maintain the 5 boats and continue to undertake its COTS control work?	Written	SQ20-000119
178.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Green	Economic impacts of mass bleaching events on the Reef – cost analysis	Has the Minister engaged the environment Department or any other department to undertake a cost analysis of the economic impacts of a mass bleaching events of the Great Barrier Reef?	Written	SQ20-000155
179.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator McMahon	Drumlines in the Marine Park	Has the reintroduction of drumlines in the Marine Park taken place?  If so do you have any figures on the number of sharks caught, how many were released and where, how many were killed?	Written	SQ20-000164
180.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator McMahon	Shark control program operating in the Marine Park	Given the status of depleting or depleted of some species such as Hammerhead and Tiger and the comment by Associate Professor Daryl McPhee that cows were responsible for more deaths per annum than sharks, how do you justify the decision to allow the shark control program to operate within the Marine Park?	Written	SQ20-000165
181.	Great Barrier	Senator McMahon	Use of drumlines in shark control	Given that the program is meant to be non-lethal, how do you achieve that using drumlines? What is the percentage of sharks released alive	Written	SQ20-000201

	<b>Reef Marine Park Authority</b>		<b>program</b>	from drumlines around Australia?		
182.	<b>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</b>	<b>Senator McMahon</b>	<b>Catch and release</b>	How does catching and releasing sharks lead to controlling their numbers or reducing human interactions in the Marine Park?	Written	SQ20-000166
183.	<b>Sydney Harbour Federation Trust</b>	<b>Senator McAllister</b>	<b>2015 JLL report on asset replacement values</b>	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Was the JLL report made public?</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. I'm not sure.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Could you please table the JLL report?</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> The work taken by Deloitte to update the JLL report, as you've just described—can you table that report, please.</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> Yes, I will. The Deloitte report dealt with the broad business analysis of the Harbour Trust and drew upon the JLL report.</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Can you table that report please.</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> Yes, but not—</p> <p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Not immediately, but on notice, perhaps. You're willing to do so? There's no impediment to making it public?</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> No.</p>	Page 24 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000016
184.	<b>Sydney Harbour Federation Trust</b>	<b>Senator Van</b>	<b>Contact with the member for Grayndler about Sydney Harbour Federation Trust review</b>	<p><b>Senator VAN:</b> Just clarifying on matters raised earlier, has there been any contact with the member for Grayndler about the review?</p> <p><b>Ms Darwell:</b> In relation to contact with the member for Grayndler, as a local member on trust sites he is invited to join our community advisory committee. An invitation was issued to him in about June of last year. The harbour trust has also been engaging with the community on a Cockatoo Island dialogue, so it has been engaging more generally with the community about aspirations for Cockatoo Island. My recollection is that we asked the consultant who was working with us to reach out to Mr Albanese's office. I'll have to confirm whether that occurred.</p> <p><b>Senator VAN:</b> If you could confirm it—</p>	Page 27 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000017
185.	<b>Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)</b>	<b>Senator Smith</b>	<b>Number of threatened species listings since 2019-20 bushfires</b>	<p><b>Senator MARIELLE SMITH:</b> To start, how many listings have there been since the bushfire crisis?</p> <p><b>Prof. Marsh:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. The committee met last week and made several recommendations to the minister, but they were recommendations that, I guess, were on the priority assessment list prior</p>	Page 44 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000033

				<p>to the fires. We are still working out how to respond for additional species and ecological communities to be put on that list.</p> <p>We have agreed, contrary to past practice, to accept nominations at any time. So far we haven't received any. You'll appreciate that it's very early days and that in some cases it has still been unsafe for people to go to the bushfire affected areas and determine the status of species and ecological communities on the ground.</p>		
186.	Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)	Senator Rice	Greater Glider Recovery Plan	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I'm going to be asking questions. I just wanted to confirm that the committee hasn't looked at it since then. What work has the committee done on the greater glider recovery plan?</p> <p><b>Prof. Marsh:</b> The committee has done some work on that plan. I'm sorry—I'll have to take on notice exactly where that's up to, but I will give you that information.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And the expected time of completion of your recommendations.</p> <p><b>Prof. Marsh:</b> Yes, I'll give you that information.</p>	Page 47 Monday 2 March	SQ20-000034
187.	Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)	Senator Green	Interaction with other committees	How does the Threatened Species Scientific Committee interact with state and/or territory Threatened Species Scientific Committees or like committees.	Written	SQ20-000156
188.	Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)	Senator Green	Wildlife affected by bushfires recovery plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many threatened species and ecological communities require a recovery plan? Of those, how many plans have been completed since 2013?</li> <li>2. <i>With reference to wildlife affected by the recent bushfire crisis:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many uplistings or changes to listings have taken place since, and in response to, the recent bushfires?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. How many recovery plans will require updating as a result of the national bushfire crisis.</li> <li>4. How many recovery plans for species have been developed or implemented in the last 12 months.</li> <li>5. What funding is available to implement recovery plans for threatened species?</li> <li>6. Who in the department implements recovery plans.</li> <li>7. What are the consequences for failing to meet statutory</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000157

				<p>requirements in respect of timeframes for completion of recovery plans?</p> <p>8. Are failures to meet statutory timeframes with respect of recovery plans reported to the Minister?</p> <p>9. <i>With reference to meeting statutory time frames for developing and implementing recovery plans under section 518 of the EPBC Act:</i></p> <p>a. For how many species have statutory time frames been met for completing recovery plans, since 2013?</p>		
189.	Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)	Senator Green	Threatened species impacted by bushfires 10-point plan	<p>1 <i>With reference to evidence provided in Additional Senate Estimates Hearing in which Professor Marsh advised that a “10-point plan” for species impacted by bushfires had been devised and submitted to the Minister:</i></p> <p>a. What are the ten points in the plan?</p> <p>b. When was this plan submitted to the Minister?</p> <p>c. Has the Minister’s Office provided any feedback on the plan, what was the nature of that feedback?</p> <p>d. How does the Department intend to implement the ten points of the plan within two years?</p> <p>e. What, if any, additional resources will be required to implement the plan.</p> <p>f. What partnerships, if any, will be required to implement the ten points of the plan?</p> <p>g. What, if any, plans does the Government have to deploy resources on the ground to investigate the severity of fire damage to species after the recent crisis?</p>	Written	SQ20-000158
190.	Threatened Species Scientific Committee (BCD)	Senator Green	Wildlife and threatened species bushfire recovery expert panel	<p>1 <i>With references to the Wildlife and threatened species bushfire recovery Expert Panel:</i></p> <p>a. How often does the panel interact with the Minister’s Office and what is the nature of those interactions.</p> <p>b. How often does the panel interact with the Threatened</p>	Written	SQ20-000159

				<p>Species Scientific Committee and what is the nature of those interactions.</p> <p>c. What, if any, recommendations have been made by the panel to the Minister, and of those, how many have been implemented.</p> <p>d. How long after a meeting of the expert panel is a Communique published.</p> <p>e. How many members of the Minister's Office attend the meetings of the expert panel?</p> <p>f. Is there any overlap in the work undertaken by the expert panel and that of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee?</p> <p>g. Please provide details of each recommendation the expert panel has made in relation to actions in the wake of the national bushfire crisis.</p> <p>h. Please provide details of every recommendation made by the expert panel that the Government has implemented.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--