

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

<b>QoN 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 Written</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Waters, Larissa</b>	<b>Secondment arrangements</b>	Please provide a list of any organisations with whom the Department (or its predecessors) has undertaken a secondment arrangement in the past 3 years. For each secondment, please provide the following details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisation involved</li> <li>• Length of secondment</li> <li>• Staffing level of person undertaking the secondment</li> <li>• Payment arrangements during the secondment</li> <li>• Any safeguards / protocols in place to manage confidentiality issues during and after the secondment</li> </ul>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000195</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>Rice, Janet</b>	<b>Electric vehicles strategy</b>	<b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to put to you some things that the government said during the last election to see whether you still agree given the work that is now underway with the electric vehicles strategy. Firstly, EVs can't charge in eight to 10 minutes? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I will hand to anybody who has particular expertise to comment if they want. Otherwise we might take it on notice. <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> We'll take it on notice. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> On what public interest grounds are you taking it on notice? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Current scenarios for charging and under what conditions. <b>Senator RICE:</b> On what basis are you taking it on notice? It was a statement that the government made during the election campaign. Does the government stand by that statement? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> You are asking for an update in terms of capabilities in the industry. I am happy to take that on notice. <b>Senator RICE:</b> EVs will not be able to tow trailers or boats or get to remote camping sites. Is this going to be reflected in the strategy or is there a change of mind on that one? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I don't know whether these are— <b>Senator RICE:</b> These are statements made during the election campaign by members of your government. <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> So you are saying, Senator Rice. I am not seeing these as direct and attributable quotes. In any event, if there's anything to be added from the same question, we'll take it on notice. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> A comment for your review, Minister. <b>Senator RICE:</b> That's right. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Your own people are commenting. <b>Senator RICE:</b> This is for anybody at the table. Is it true that EVs will not be able to tow trailers or boats or get to remote camping sites? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> You're asking about the technical specifications of electric vehicles that currently or may in the future be on the market. If there's anything to say about that, we can do that on notice. <b>Senator RICE:</b> There will be no electric utes suitable for tradies? Is that going to be reflected in the strategy? Do you stand by that? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Once again, Senator, you're giving an unattributed comment. <b>Senator RICE:</b> I think Senator Cash— <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Your colleagues said it. <b>Senator RICE:</b> That's right. We very much heard it over and over again. <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I'm happy to treat it on the same terms as the other ones. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> So all of this is going on notice? <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Why are you taking it on notice? What is the public interest reason? <b>Senator RICE:</b> Why can't you just say no, you disagree with this statement now? It's totally obvious. <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Because I don't hold myself out to be an expert in the technical specifications of electric vehicles. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Well, how about the people at the table? <b>Senator WATERS:</b> This is why we have estimates. <b>CHAIR:</b> Order! Senator Rice has the call. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Do any of the other people at the table agree with the statement that there will be no electric utes suitable for tradies, given that you're doing work on the strategy? <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> The reference used to tradies is of such generality that that is asking for an opinion. <b>Senator RICE:</b> I think people know what tradies are. Is it accurate? <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> I'm not prepared to give evidence on the basis of that lack of definition.	<b>02/03/2020 Page 102</b>	<b>SQ20-000114</b>

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

## Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

3	Climate Change	Rice, Janet	Electric vehicles strategy - consulted stakeholders	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to talk about the electric vehicles strategy. The office of former environment minister Melissa Price said that the electric vehicles strategy would be released around mid-2020. Is that still the expected release date? <b>Ms Evans:</b> It is still the expected timing. <b>Senator RICE:</b> I'm interested in the process that is underway to develop the strategy. In answer to a previous question on notice, the department noted that it had engaged with representatives of car manufacturers, charging infrastructure providers and the energy supply industry. Has any consultation taken place since then with electric vehicle users or the general public? <b>Ms Lello:</b> The department has spoken to more than 60 stakeholders at this stage. That does include representatives of, for example, electric vehicle user groups. We've also spoken, as we've said previously, to car manufacturers, state and local governments and a whole range of different stakeholders. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you table or take on notice whether all of the stakeholders have been consulted? <b>Ms Lello:</b> Yes. We certainly can. I have a list here, but we might take on notice providing a specific list of everyone we have spoken to.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 100-101	SQ20-000112
4	Climate Change	Rice, Janet	Emissions from imported second-hand vehicles	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> No. I want to move to emissions from imported second-hand vehicles. There was a Cold Hard Facts report done for the department which highlighted significant concerns about the emissions impacts of imported vehicles. What has the department done to address these issues? <b>Ms Evans:</b> The Cold Hard Facts report relates to emissions associated with air-conditioning and other cooling equipment. I'm assuming that that is what this is referring to. The fact is that second-hand vehicles sometimes may not have had their air-conditioning systems and so on properly maintained. That is the crux of the issue. We would have to take it on notice for me to find out exactly what is being done. To be clear, that's another area where the responsibility for that area—ozone and the actions to manage synthetic greenhouse gases—sits with the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment. We will take it on notice to work with them to get an answer to your question. <b>Senator RICE:</b> So you don't have any information about what the department has done so far to address these issues? <b>Ms Evans:</b> You ask what the department has done. The department responsible is the other department, not the department of industry. <b>Senator RICE:</b> But it was a report done for your department. <b>Ms Evans:</b> When we were the department of environment and energy, it was done in my group. But the people who work on those issues are now employees of the Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment and they have taken those responsibilities with them. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take on notice whether the department has provided briefings to either minister or met with the relevant agencies for reports on this issue? <b>Ms Evans:</b> The synthetic greenhouse gases have a very high global warming potential so we look at them very closely when we're looking at our ability to produce abatement. We're happy to have a look at what is happening on that front.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 103	SQ20-000115
5	Climate Change	McAllister, Jenny	Economic impact of net zero emissions	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> I am asking because the government doesn't appear to accept that analysis. I'm wondering if the government is relying on any alternative analysis that has been generated by your department about actual costs of achieving such a transition. Has that work been done within your department? <b>Ms Evans:</b> What work are you asking about? <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Has your department done any qualitative or quantitative work of any kind assessing whatever the economic impact would be of Australia reaching net zero emissions by 2050? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I will have to take it on notice to check historically. My understanding is that, no, we haven't done that. Part of the reason is that 2050 is a long time away, so it's difficult to have any robust assumptions about exactly what would be happening out that far.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 99	SQ20-000111

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

6	Climate Change	Waters, Larissa	Beetaloo's emissions	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Yes. So what would be your assessment of the Beetaloo's emissions potential year on year, then? That is what I seek to understand. <b>Ms Evans:</b> We would draw on that report to say, at the point once it's operating, we think there is the possibility that it might get as high as 39 million tonnes per year. But there's still a long time to go to work that out. And it's possible that it may only be as small as five. <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> I think the evidence in the report was that it was a range, which you would expect in an issue like this. At this stage, that is obviously quite speculative. I think the range that was provided was five to 39. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> That is scope 1 and 2 using the 100 years, not the 20 years. Is that correct? <b>Ms Evans:</b> Yes. That's right. I beg your pardon. I have to check. Even that figure includes, I think, some scope 3 emissions. We might have to double-check that last part, sorry. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Come back to me on what your assessment is so I can cite with confidence the emissions projections. <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> We'll take that on notice and come back with an assessment that obviously will provide you with all the relevant qualifications to assessment.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 96	SQ20-000109
7	Climate Change	Waters, Larissa	Woodside's Browse Basin and Burrup Hub project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent are the emissions from Browse Basin and Burrup Hub elements being considered as part of emissions estimates going forward?</li> <li>2. What levels of emissions are being assumed from these developments? What impact will these developments have on the Ability for Australia to meet its current targets?</li> <li>3. What impact will they have on future targets or the potential to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 as required under the Paris Agreement?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000192
8	Climate Change	Waters, Larissa	Abatement levels	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Great. The figures that I have from the Clean Energy Regulator, or CER, website show that the most abatement that we've managed to secure in any one year is 20 million tonnes, which is to be delivered in 2021-22. Do you think it's possible to double those abatement levels? <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> I think that's asking for an opinion. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Well, it's based on technological capacity and policy settings. The most we've been able to abate so far is 20 million. Is it theoretically possible to do better than that? <b>Ms Evans:</b> Absolutely. We think it's theoretically possible to do better than that. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Do you think getting to 120 million tonnes a year would be feasible? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> You're not really putting any parameters around your questions, aside from the theoretically possible. I'm not sure that that is a reasonable grounds to expect officials to respond to questions on. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> On the abatement options available to us at the minute, is 120 million possible? <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> I don't think that's a question we can answer. I'm happy to take it on notice so we can give it consideration.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 95	SQ20-000108
9	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	Waters, Larissa	Carryover credits	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> As a lead-on from that, if your monitoring shows that the forest is not regrowing as you had modelled and projected, how do you factor that in? Does that have any implication for the carryover credits that the government is seeking to use against the 2030 targets? How do you account for a shortfall if it transpires that there is a shortfall? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I might need to take it on notice to make sure I get this exactly right. In essence, by the end of 2020, we will know what the carryover amount is. I don't think that will be affected. The monitoring process will occur after that, if you like. I will need to come back. I guess what we're saying is that we know this is assumption based, but it's based on good scientific assumptions. We will keep a close eye on that to make sure it's right over time. We haven't figured out over time what we will do if it turns out to be incorrect. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> I'm interested in how you factor it in if it's not right.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 106	SQ20-000116

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

10	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	Waters, Larissa	Per capita emissions	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> I have a general question. My recollection—I can't recall the source—is that Australia is the highest per capita emitter in the world. Yes? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I will have to check if I have that. We are certainly among them. I'm not sure that we are the highest. Ms Munro knows. <b>Ms Munro:</b> I think we are among the highest, from memory, although, to correct the record, I think Saudi Arabia is the highest. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> So we're the second highest after Saudi Arabia? <b>Ms Munro:</b> Yes. I don't have the lead table in front of me. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> I remember Saudi, the US and us. I had always thought that we were the highest per capita. But I acknowledge now that Saudi and the US are in the mix as well. Will we still retain that dubious honour if the government's 2030 targets are met? My understanding is we would still be the world's largest per capita emitter even if this government's woeful 2030 targets were met. I would like to know if that's correct. <b>Ms Evans:</b> It's a very difficult question to answer because it involves looking at what every other country is also doing over the same period and then trying to make a comparison about what it looks like once we get to 2030. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Well, assuming they met their targets, just like our government has been heroically assuming we would meet ours. <b>Ms Evans:</b> Your question is even if they meet their targets. Making that comparison is difficult because the targets are expressed in very different ways. Some are intensity targets. China, for example, has an intensity target rather than an absolute reduction target and so on. It is actually quite difficult, but we can take it on notice to see what we can do to compare it. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you. I think it would be useful.</p>	<p>02/03/2020 Page 94</p>	SQ20-000106
----	--	-----------------	----------------------	--	-------------------------------	-------------

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

11	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	Waters, Larissa	Liquefied Natural Gas contribution to global emissions	<p>The Department website when the Quarterly accounts were published stated:</p> <p><i>"Australia's total LNG exports are estimated to have the potential to lower emissions in importing countries by around 148 Mt CO2-e in 2018, if they displace coal consumption in those countries."</i></p> <p>Minister Taylor's statement that accompanied the release of the data also states:</p> <p><i>"Australia's total LNG exports have the potential to lower emissions in importing countries by around 148 Mt CO2-e in 2018 by displacing coal consumption in those countries. This is a substantial global contribution to be proud of. The government is not going to trash successful Australian export industries that are reducing global emissions, in order to reduce Australian emissions."</i></p> <p>During an interview with the ABC's RN Breakfast on 7 June 2019) the Minister described the figure of 148Mt as an <u>actual</u> saving:</p> <p><i>"There were 148m tonnes of lower emissions as a result of our exports. That is something to be proud of."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please outline and table all research and evidence showing that Australian gas exports have displaced <u>any</u> coal fired power generation overseas.</li> <li>2. Please provide the evidence relied on for the claim that Australian gas displaces a mix of energy sources, including gas from other exporters.</li> <li>3. In 2010, the Department of Climate and Energy rejected the argument that Shell's Prelude FLNG facility would displace carbon intensive fuels: <i>Shell notes in the EIS that when the CO2 emissions intensity of the FLNG facility are compared with like for like other fossil fuels (e.g. coal) on a well to wheels basis, the FLNG facility could potentially have a net positive impact, but only if the export of Prelude LNG displaces more carbon intensive fuels in power stations. The Department notes that Shell has not proposed to replace any emitters currently using more carbon intensive fuels, and as such, operation of the FLNG facility will add to Australia's total GHG emissions.</i></li> <li>4. Why has the Department's approach to displacement arguments changed?</li> <li>5. Do you agree that, even if the displacement argument were true, the methane content from gas negates the benefits of gas, as it traps 86 times more heat than carbon?</li> <li>5. Will the Department remove unfounded statements regarding displacement potential from its website?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000193
----	--	-----------------	--	--	---------	-------------

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

12	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	McAllister, Jenny	UNFCCC net zero emissions by 2050	<p><b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> So should the globe reach global net zero emissions in 2050, what is the best and latest scientific information about the likely average global temperature increase? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I'm not aware of any. I will take it on notice. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Doesn't the UNFCCC present evidence that net zero by 2050 is generally seen as consistent with 1.5 to 2 degree warming? <b>Ms Evans:</b> As I've said, under the Paris agreement, the globally agreed—<b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> I'm not asking about the Paris agreement. I'm, sorry, Ms Evans. <b>Ms Evans:</b> That is the UNFCCC. It's that same framework. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Well, the science has been presented and the political community globally makes a decision about how it's going to respond to that. That's encapsulated in an agreement around emissions reduction. I'm asking about the science that has been presented. What does the science say about achieving net zero by 2050? What does it suggest about warming under that scenario? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I'll take that on notice. I would have to check whether there is any such reference in any of the IPCC reports and so on. What I know is that those reports which have informed the Paris agreement have led to a global agreement about the net zero point coming at some time in the second half of the century for the globe. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Are you telling me that the department has no information at hand with its key officials about the consequences of net zero by 2050 as compared to net zero by 2100? Are you saying that that 50-year period is not something that the department is able to provide advice about? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I have offered to take it on notice. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> It's core business, surely, if you're a department responsible for climate change, I would have thought. <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> You did ask for the latest scientific analysis or similar. Ms Evans has taken it on notice to ascertain that. That's a reasonable position for Ms Evans to take. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Have you read the latest UNFCCC report on 1.5 to 2 degrees? <b>Ms Evans:</b> Yes. Several times. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> What does it say, Ms Evans? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I'm not going to quote anything without going back and specifically checking it. I will take it on notice if you need me to go and find information for you that is in a public report. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> Well, I guess it's because we're trying to have a discussion about government policy and the way that it interacts with the science that is generally accepted in the global community. That's hard to do if officials won't engage with the science as generally accepted in the global community or even be willing to brief the parliament about that matter. <b>Ms Evans:</b> I disagree with the intent of what you are saying because the Paris agreement is already based on globally agreed science. That agreement, which is the government's policy and the government is committed to it, sets out that the goal is to reach net zero in the second half of the century. That is consistent with the temperature goals included in that agreement based on the science. <b>Senator McALLISTER:</b> I'm really struggling to deal with a department that is responsible for climate change but not able to report to the parliament about the content of UNFCCC material. <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> That's not fair. You asked a precise question. Ms Evans has taken it on notice. You will no doubt get an appropriate answer.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 93-94	SQ20-000105
13	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	McMahon, Sam	Greenhouse gas inventory report	<p><b>Senator McMAHON:</b> The latest national greenhouse gas inventory report shows emissions down by 0.3 per cent in the year ending September 2019. This represents a total drop of 13.1 per cent since 2005, our baseline levels for the Paris agreement. How do these achievements compare to those of central Western Europe? <b>Ms Evans:</b> I might see whether Ms Munro is able to assist. <b>Ms Munro:</b> I don't actually have those figures for central Europe with me. I'll have to take that on notice. <b>Senator McMAHON:</b> Do you have any sense of how we compare to Europe? <b>Ms Munro:</b> It does depend on which part of Europe. For the EU as a whole, as an example, their 2015 emissions were 4,092 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent. In 2016, that was 4,072 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent, so it was a decrease. Again, we have seen those overall decreases happening in Europe. <b>Senator McMAHON:</b> Several countries in Europe make claims of significant reductions in emissions due to renewable energy sources. In fact, several countries, such as Germany and England, have had periods where they claim not to have used any fossil fuels for periods of time exceeding a day. Do countries like Germany and England rank highly for their adoption of renewable energy sources? How do they rank in comparison to Australia in this regard? <b>Ms Munro:</b> Again, I don't actually have a lead table in terms of renewable energy proportions for Germany and the UK with me. I am happy to take that on notice. In a general sense, though, we have seen significant increases, for example, in the UK. But that's a mixture in terms of what has happened in the offshore wind industry in particular. There is the transition from coal to gas, and they've already got the existing nuclear energy. There is also a connection, even though it's partial, to Europe.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 97	SQ20-000110

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

14	International Climate Change & Energy Innovation	Patrick, Rex	SolarReserve	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I won't be very long. I probably need to ask Mr Sullivan this question. You might recall back in the 2017-18 budget there was a line item allocated for a \$110 million equity investment. I think one of the candidates for that investment for Port Augusta was SolarReserve. Do you recall that? <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> I do recall it. It wasn't within my work area. It was within the climate change and innovation group. <b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Okay. I thought it might have been Energy. You might still be able to help me. That was a line item and I know the government was working with SolarReserve in good faith, and then SolarReserve pulled out for corporate reasons. I'm just wondering whether or not that allocation of funding is still available. The money wasn't being appropriated for any particular corporation; it was for a project of a particular type. I'm just wondering whether or not that money is still a line item in the budget or if it's disappeared. <b>Mr Fredericks:</b> Senator, that question, as you'd now appreciate, was in outcome 2. I'm very happy to take that on notice and get back to you. <b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Alright, that would be appreciated. Thank you very much.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 117-118	SQ20-000126
15	Energy	Waters, Larissa	Parts for Liddell coal plant	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> No, I understand that. Can I just confirm that the coal plant at Liddell is so old that this type of power plant actually doesn't exist anywhere else so for any repairs or maintenance you would have to have bespoke components made? <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> The analysis of the impacts of Liddell and its operating parameters is included in the task force report. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Sorry, I really can't hear you very well. <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> Sorry. The elements around Liddell's reliability and infrastructure needs are addressed in the report. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> In the report? <b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> That's not what the senator asked you. She asked you whether there are any other power stations of that age class operating? <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> That wasn't the question I heard. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> The question was: isn't it so old that you can't actually get any parts, so they'd have to be made specially? I'm asking for confirmation of that. <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> I'm not aware of that detail about bespoke parts, but I'm happy to take it on notice. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Okay, but aren't you doing a report into it?</p>	02/03/2020 Page 112-113	SQ20-000124
16	Energy	Van, David	Solar transmission services	<p><b>Senator VAN:</b> Given that the government has announced that they are spending \$1 billion, I think it is, partly on transmission services, I understand that there are some priorities or some standards that need to be met about reliability before any of that money is invested. Could you talk to what those standards the government has set are going to be? <b>Ms Parry:</b> I might have to take that question on notice, unless Mr O'Toole is able to take that question. <b>Senator VAN:</b> My understanding of them is—and I'm putting this as a question, not as a statement—that there can only be four interstate interconnects or connections to large projects like Snowy Hydro 2.0, and/or it has to have a high level of despatchable energy. Does that sound correct? Is that your understanding? And please take it on notice if you would like to check. <b>Ms Parry:</b> I'd like to take it on notice and then we can come back to you with a more thorough and considered answer. <b>Senator VAN:</b> That would be appreciated. <b>Mr O'Toole:</b> There are a couple of processes going on. One, the Commonwealth government has obviously underwritten or signalled underwriting a couple of large transmission projects, the interconnectors that you were referring to. Subsequent to that, they've also announced the Grid Reliability Fund, which captures a number of issues. So I think that might be where you are heading. <b>Senator VAN:</b> Yes. <b>Mr O'Toole:</b> We'll take it on notice. <b>Ms Parry:</b> And then there's the overlap with the states. So it's a complicated space. <b>Senator VAN:</b> It is indeed.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 121	SQ20-000132

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

17	Energy	Waters, Larissa	Vales Point	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you. We will await that report. Just quickly coming back to Vales Point, of the 12 that were short-listed, initially you said it was March and then you said it was February. Can I just get clarity on when the 12 short-listed— <b>Mr O'Toole:</b> Apologies if I said February, but it was March. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> And then the minister flagged on 2 December that two of the 12 had been short-listed, so there is a period between March and December when Vales Point was being progressed through the UNGI process. Is that correct? <b>Ms Parry:</b> As Mr O'Toole mentioned, we are in fairly constant communication with all 12 short-listed projects. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Still, or up until December? <b>Ms Parry:</b> Still, because they are all at various stages. Part of the reason to short-list the 12 is that they were all potentially prospective and we would continue to engage with the proponents. The two most prospective are the ones that were announced, which Mr O'Toole mentioned: the APA Group at Dandenong and the Quinbrook proposals. They were certainly the most advanced, and that's been the focus of our negotiations and discussions to date. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Can I just confirm you said you were continuing conversations with the other short-listed applicants as well, so that includes Vales Point? <b>Ms Parry:</b> That's right. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> When was the last communication had with them? <b>Ms Parry:</b> I would have to take that on notice. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> But it's been ongoing since the 12 were listed in March 2019, presumably until nowish. <b>Ms Parry:</b> I can take that question on notice, in terms of when our last contact with Vales Point in particular was— <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Yes. <b>Ms Parry:</b> but, as I mentioned, the 12 shortlisted projects were announced by the government as ones that they would continue to work with, and they are each at various stages of proposal and development. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Thank you for taking that on notice. Could you just take on notice all of the dates on which you had communications or engagement with Vales Point, once that short list of 12 was determined. <b>Ms Parry:</b> Sure.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 113	SQ20-000125
18	Energy	Green, Nita	Shine Energy election commitment	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> There is quite a lot of information to go through with this process. Can you just remind me: who proposed Shine Energy in the first place? <b>Ms Parry:</b> Shine Energy was an election commitment. The Prime Minister announced Shine Energy, as Mr Sullivan indicated, back at 26 March, 2019—the government announced the \$10 million program. A component of that was including, but not limited to, a feasibility study in Collinsville. The Prime Minister made it very clear at that time that the project would need to stack up, that it would need to be demonstrated through the strategic study that there was a need. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> But the election commitment itself didn't name Shine Energy. Or did it? <b>Ms Parry:</b> I'd have to take that on notice and go back to the original press release. I believe that it did, but I could be wrong on that. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> Maybe somebody could give you advice? <b>Ms Parry:</b> Either that, or it was described as 'a HELE plant in Collinsville', and Shine Energy is the only proponent of a HELE plant in Collinsville, but we can double-check.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 108	SQ20-000119
19	Energy	Green, Nita	Shine Energy feasibility study	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> I've done some due diligence on Shine Energy, and some members of the media have as well. From what I can tell, Shine Energy is worth about \$1,000. It does not have a physical address, short of a post office box. It is registered to the home address of the company's 'manager of community engagement'. I believe it shares a registered address with a number of other entities. Given that the department didn't propose Shine Energy, how developed are the due diligence processes that you are going through? How advanced are they? <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> The due diligence will be taken as part of Shine Energy's application for the grant. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> Do you know whether Shine Energy has actually ever been involved in an energy investment that has led to construction of an energy project? <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> I would have to take that on notice. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> I think the answer is no. I think you can find that out. Are you aware of Shine Energy being involved in any project feasibility study before, or providing any technical advice on any energy project before? <b>Ms Parry:</b> I should also point out—and we can take it on notice to get the names precisely right—that Shine Energy is also being advised by a number of advisers, so they are not working alone. I would need to get the names of the specific companies that are providing the technical, engineering and feasibility advice.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 109	SQ20-000120

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

## Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

20	Energy	Green, Nita	Underwriting New Generation Investments scheme	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> On the government's Underwriting New Generation Investments scheme, UNGI—is that what we're going to call it? Great. I was asked to stop using abbreviations today, but we'll keep going with that one. Is it correct that the program guidelines are yet to be released for that scheme? <b>Ms Parry:</b> Well, the program development was initially done as part of the release of the register of interests when the government called for expressions of a register of interest. I can bring those out for you, if you would like to see what the government was considering when it called on those, the registration of interest. The government then announced the 12 short-listed projects, and, in doing so, took consideration of the terms within the registration of interest and announced the short-list of projects. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> The short-list of projects—okay. Have contracts been signed with those projects yet? <b>Ms Parry:</b> There are two projects that are in advanced stages of negotiation, which are the two that have been referenced—the APA Group and the Quinbrook proposal. <b>Senator GREEN:</b> I don't think you actually answered my question. In terms of guidelines for the programs or how those projects will be delivered, are there guidelines being developed? Is this another circumstance where we develop the guidelines after the announcement's made? <b>Ms Parry:</b> Senator, I'm going to take that question on notice. The government, again, released its statement of criteria by which it evaluated the 12 projects through its registration of interest. So I'm going to take your question about the guidelines on notice.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 123-124	SQ20-000133
21	Energy Security & Efficiency	Carr, Kim	Fuel Security Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When will the report of the Fuel Security Review be released?</li> <li>2. When will the Government's response to the Fuel Security Review be released?</li> <li>3. Which recommendations in the unpublished Fuel Security Review support the recent actions of Hon Angus Taylor MP, Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction, to sign an Agreement with the US Government to 'lease space in the US Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to store and access Australian owned oil during a global emergency.'?</li> <li>4. When will the Agreement between Australia and the US be published?</li> <li>5. Please outline the main steps in the process from Australia's request for access to the arrival in Australia of the fuel.</li> <li>6. Does the Agreement include minimum and maximum times for the delivery of SPR fuel to Australia?</li> <li>7. Does the Australian Government pay for space in the SPR. If yes, what is the annual cost?</li> <li>8. Does the Australian government legally own the oil held in its name in the SPR?</li> <li>9. What arrangements does the Australian government have in place to guarantee timely access to appropriate shipping to bring the fuel to Australia in an emergency?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000194
22	Energy Security & Efficiency	Rice, Janet	BAEconomics Contract	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to follow up on some of your responses to questions on notice about this fuel security modelling contract. In response to a question on notice you said you won't release the contract about the liquid fuel that was issued to BAEconomics. Why is that the case? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> I'm sorry— <b>Senator RICE:</b> The question on notice asking for a copy of the contract for this liquid fuel modelling that BAEconomics has undertaken for you? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Sorry, I don't recall that question on notice. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Well, can we get a copy of that contract then, please? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Look, I will need to take advice on that. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Noting that AusTender didn't say that the contracts or their outputs were confidential, but on the question on notice it had been refused. Also, in questions on notice you say that you hadn't assessed Dr Fisher's modelling that he did on climate costs during the election campaign?</p>	02/03/2020 Page 126	SQ20-000107

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

23	Energy Security & Efficiency	Rice, Janet	Liquid fuel security review status	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> With regard to the liquid fuel security review, the interim report was close to a year ago. What is the status of the review? Why has it taken so long? Your website still says that we expect the liquid fuel security review will be completed in late 2019. What's causing the delay? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> The interim report was published in April. <b>Senator RICE:</b> It is now March. That was 11 months ago. <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> We have obviously been through a range of consultations. Across the period of the review we did meet with 85 different organisations. We received 29 submissions in response to the interim review and we've been working through those. <b>Senator RICE:</b> That many, really? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Beyond that, we have been working on the scenarios that we have been talking about. It is important to get the assumptions of those right when we're talking about things like what is going to happen if there is closure of shipping lanes. Actually it's quite a complex task to pull together those assumptions. The department has provided the review to government, and it's a matter for them to consider at this point in time. <b>Senator RICE:</b> So the department has completed its work? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> It's complete when the government says it's complete. I can't rule out that they'll ask us to do more work, for example, but that's where it is at the moment. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Why the delay, Minister? When did you provide the report to government? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> It was provided in December of last year. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you have an expectation of when the government is going to release it, Minister? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> No, but I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 120	SQ20-000130
24	Energy Security & Efficiency	Rice, Janet	Fuel supply model	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I will come back to the model. First of all, is there a scenario consistent with the world meeting the Paris climate agreement goals? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> As Mr Sullivan talked through, the scenarios are intended to reflect what would happen in an incident that affects fuel supply to Australia. It is not intended to understand what would happen at some future time under some other future demand. <b>Senator RICE:</b> But you are saying that you were then going to potentially use the model for a future time. Have you tested the model against real-world situations to see whether it is valid? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Yes, we have. <b>Senator RICE:</b> What testing have you done? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> I'd have to take the specifics on notice, but my recollection is that in around 2014, as an example, there was a disruption to fuel supply in Victoria. That is something that we've sought to feed into the model and essentially try and match what happened at that point in time. <b>Senator RICE:</b> In 2014? But again, in terms of other current scenarios for changing fuel use in the country? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> That's something we can do over time. We have this tool now available to us. If there is a disruption of some kind, that is something that we will be able to feed in and match the real-world experience against what the model produces. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Was the model peer reviewed by experts in economics or liquid fuel supply? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> As part of the consultancy it was tested in a range of different ways, I can't recall specifically who it was tested with. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take that on notice? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> We'll take that on notice. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Did you do any consultation about the development of the model? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Yes, we did. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Who did you consult? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> I guess I would put this together with the broad consultation that we undertook as part of the review we took of fuel security. <b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to know specifically about consultation about the validity of this model. <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> I'll take that on notice. <b>Senator RICE:</b> We all know the adage about modelling: garbage in, garbage out. What assumptions and data did you provide to Dr Fisher and BA Economics, and what assumptions did they provide themselves? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> The model itself is the product of BA Economics, but the way it's been used for particular scenarios is work that the department has done. <b>Senator RICE:</b> But in terms of development of the model, what assumptions and data did you provide to BA Economics? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> There are many data sources and assumptions. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take on notice to provide them? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> It's likely in the hundreds and thousands of different data sources and assumptions. <b>Mr Sullivan:</b> We'll do our best. <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> We can answer that in a general way, I think. <b>Senator RICE:</b> And a list of information or assumptions that have been built into the model. We all know that there is other modelling that Dr Fisher has done that has had wildly inaccurate assumptions built into those models—the economic models. ... <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Chair, if I could just make one correction from an earlier statement? <b>CHAIR:</b> Sure. <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Senator Rice asked about how that model had been tested, and I referred to a disruption in 2014 in Victoria. I actually think that's incorrect, so I'll come back on notice with a response on that.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 119-120 & 123	SQ20-000129

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

25	Energy Security & Efficiency	Rice, Janet	Fuel security	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What precisely has Brian Fisher been doing for the department? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> It was actually BAEconomics that was contracted to do the work for the department. There were a range of services that we were seeking relating to the fuel security review. The headline really is we were seeking a fuel supply chain model—that is, a model that steps through all of the different pathways by which fuel comes into Australia and is distributed.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay, so Dr Fisher or BAEconomics have developed this model for you then? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> That's correct, yes. <b>Senator RICE:</b> What kinds of questions does it answer then? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> I guess I'd describe it as a tool that the department uses for a range of different purposes. Part of the review of fuel security that we have been working on is a set of disruption scenarios: essentially, trying to work out what happens and how we would manage in the event that there was an issue in some part of the supply chain. We've been taking those scenarios and a set of assumptions for each of those and feeding it into the model to understand exactly what that would mean for fuel like petrol and diesel, and how it's supplied within Australia. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you talk us through the scenarios that are being looked at? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Yes. We've looked at around 10 different scenarios. They include things like what happens if oil supply is cut off from the Middle East? We've looked at scenarios such as what happens if refined fuel no longer comes from North-East Asia? What happens if there are issues in shipping lanes to Australia, so that's an international dimension. Within Australia, we've looked at what happens if particular infrastructure is affected in some way. If there was a port or a terminal issue, then what is the consequence for fuel supply as a result of that. <b>Senator RICE:</b> Is there a report on this model that could be made available to us? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> There isn't a report specifically on the model. But, as part of the fuel security review, we are working through those scenarios. <b>Senator RICE:</b> You've just gone through some of those scenarios. Could you take on notice to provide the outline of all of those 10 scenarios to us? <b>Mr Wyndham:</b> Sure.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 118	SQ20-000127
26	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Green, Nita	Australian Recycling Investment Fund	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What criteria has the CEFC set in order to determine the provision of loans under the recycling investment fund, and what are the required/measured objects of these loans? Are they reportable?</li> <li>2. What criteria has the CEFC set in order to determine applicant eligibility for these loans in relation to impact?</li> <li>3. In what period will these loans be made available?</li> <li>4. Since 1 November 2019, has the CEFC had any conversations with potential fund applicants?</li> <li>5. Are there any applications that CEFC aims to finalise in 2020?</li> <li>6. Will the funds be applied according to any national strategic guidance?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000197
27	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Green, Nita	Australian Recycling Investment Fund	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the quantum of the loans approved to date?</li> <li>2. Over what time period does the fund need to be expended?</li> <li>3. How will the funds be distributed to ensure that recycling infrastructure is distributed strategically across Australia?</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000493
28	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Gallagher, Katy	Clean Energy Regulator 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> <li>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.</li> </ol>	Written	SQ20-000196

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

29	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Canavan, Matthew	Wind turbine certificates	<p><b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Great. Working that out myself. I get nearly \$2 billion worth of value for those certificates. Let's take an average wind turbine. Do you get about 3½ megawatts for a turbine these days? Is that roughly the capacity? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> They are getting much bigger than that. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> How much would you say? Four or five? What's the average? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> Six megawatts. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> If they ran all year, they would run 8,760 hours, but they only run about 30 per cent. Is it still 33 per cent capacity? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> Capacity factors for wind would be over 40 per cent on average. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Forty per cent now. Okay. If I chuck in those prices, each wind turbine is getting over \$600,000 a year in certificates. Is that about right? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> I haven't done that calculation. I will take that on notice. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Not bad work, hey—\$600,000 a year? Okay. I'm done. <b>Mr Parker:</b> Can I clarify the answer to that. It is quite an important clarification, which is that most certificates are transacted in the market not at the spot price; they are transacted at a long-term contract price, which is much lower. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Where is the data on that? Do we have any data on that, Mr Parker? <b>Mr Parker:</b> There is some data on that. We can take it on notice. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> It is a government program. It would be nice to have transparent information about something of this scale. Thank you.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 147	SQ20-000131
30	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Canavan, Matthew	Large-scale renewable energy certificates	<p><b>Mr Williamson:</b> For the 2018 assessment year, which was surrendered in February 2019, there were 24.3 million large-scale renewable energy certificates acquitted. However, there was some paid shortfall as well, on top of that. For small-technology certificates, it was 29.8 million for the 2018 assessment year surrendered in total. That would have been progressively through the 2018 year, and the final amount on 14 February 2019. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> How much did you say? <b>Mr Parker:</b> They're in the annual report. <b>Mr Williamson:</b> There were 24.3 million large-scale generation certificates and 29.8 million small-technology certificates. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> Do they both represent one megawatt hour, the small and large, or you can't quite compare them? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> Yes, both are one megawatt hour. The difference is that small-technology certificates are deemed upfront, so forward crediting. But that forward crediting is in a slow one-year decline until it winds out in 2030. <b>Senator CANAVAN:</b> You might have to take this on notice, but what is the average price or revenue that people with these certificates get? <b>Mr Williamson:</b> Probably currently the spot price for small-technology certificates hovers around \$37 a certificate. For large-technology certificates, they've come off a fair bit. I think they're about \$35 at the moment, but I'll try to check that exactly for you.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 146-147	SQ20-000128
31	Climate Change Authority (CCA)	Waters, Larissa	2019 emissions projections	<p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> The department's 2019 emissions projections, which were released in December last year, showed that 3.7 gigatonnes have already been spent between 2013 and 2019, and that same report projects that emissions for 2020-30 will be an additional 5.7 gigatonnes. That adds up to 9.4 gigatonnes by 2030 of our 10.1 gigatonne budget that's meant to take us to 2050. Does that sound right to you? <b>Dr Craik:</b> I'd have to take that one on notice. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> I'd appreciate that, and perhaps the department could take that on notice as well. It sounds to me like the budget we have calculated to last us until 2050 will in fact be all used up by about 2031, so it's a bit hard to see how Australia can play its role in keeping us to two degrees if we're not on track. Have you done any carbon budgeting work with a 1.5 degree outcome? <b>Dr Craik:</b> No. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Have you got any intention of doing that? <b>Dr Craik:</b> Not at this stage, no. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Again, is that because of resource constraints, or it's not your bag? <b>Dr Craik:</b> And because we only have a small number of staff we don't canvas a whole range of projects. We try to do things that others aren't doing, I suppose. <b>Mr Archer:</b> Just to elaborate on Dr Craik's answer, there are three main ways under our legislation that we take on tasks. We have some statutory reviews to undertake, such as the ERF and the National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting scheme. We can receive special terms of reference from either the minister responsible for climate change or the parliament, or we can undertake our own research. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Have you had any special requests from the minister in your time? <b>Dr Craik:</b> No. <b>Mr Archer:</b> Not currently at the moment, but we have in the past, yes. <b>Senator WATERS:</b> Can you take on notice to provide to me what the subject matters were of those?</p>	02/03/2020 Page 143	SQ20-000123

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

## Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

32	Climate Change Authority (CCA)	Green, Nita	Final report on Australia's future emission reduction targets: recommendations	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> I'm going to go to some numbers. We're almost at the end of the day, so bear with me while I get the numbers correct. I'm sure you're very accustomed to them. In 2015 your Final report on Australia's future emission reduction targets confirmed preliminary recommendations for a 2025 target of 30 per cent below 2000 levels and further reductions by 2030 of 40 to 60 per cent below 2000 levels. Can you explain what these targets were consistent with in a global context at the time? What was the context in 2015 for making those recommendations?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> I wasn't at the Climate Change Authority at that time.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Okay.</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> Neither was I, but my understanding of the process that the authority went through at the time is that it adopted a methodology to determine what it considered to be a fair share of Australia's contribution to the global effort, and that was on what I think was called a contract-and-converge model.</p> <p>I'll need to take the details on notice, but I think the premise was that high-emitting developed countries would reduce their emissions over time and that eventually developing countries would also do the same so that, after a period of time, basically all countries would be perceived to be making a fair contribution to the global effort.</p> <p>There were obviously some calculations underpinning that.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Okay. So, Australia's equitable contribution to global targets—</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Was economic growth taken into account—consistent economic growth—as part of those targets?</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> Sorry—I'm not sure that I understand the question.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> I was just trying to characterise some of the things that were taken into account in a global context, because where I'm getting to is that some of the context has changed since those original targets—or whether indeed it has changed.</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I think we'd really need to take the details of that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Okay. We can put some questions on notice as well, for the further detailed questions. Are you or have you considered an appropriate 2050 target for Australia which is consistent with those same factors being taken into account to deliver the goals of the Paris Agreement?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> No, we haven't. The Climate Change Authority used to have in its legislation a provision to look at targets, but that was removed some years ago, and the authority hasn't discussed targets since that period of time.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Since that legislation was amended—do you know when that was?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> We can take it on notice. I can't remember. It was before I arrived, anyway—before 2015.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 141-142	SQ20-000122
33	Climate Change Authority (CCA)	Green, Nita	Confidential submissions to CCA report	<p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Good evening. Can I ask what reports are you currently working on? Do you want to give us an update on that?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> Right now we're finalising a report which is updating the 2016 advice we gave to the government on Australia meeting its Paris targets, and that should be out in the next couple of weeks.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Great; that's what I'm going to ask you about. I was going to ask you whether you are updating that advice, so that's helpful. Is the reason for updating the advice in respect to the nationally determined contribution and meeting Australia's Paris Agreement commitments now?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> The reason we're updating it is because a fair bit's changed since 2016.</p> <p><b>Senator WATERS:</b> A fair bit's changed?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> A fair bit has changed. There's more information on what's going to happen as the climate is changing. There's a lot of new scientific information, the cost of low emissions technology has come down and industry and other countries are doing a lot, but the world has moved on a fair bit, so we're taking all those things into account and updating the report.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> The world's moved on in terms of policy settings?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> The world's moved on in terms of companies doing things and countries doing things. We have the UK and the EU, for instance, coming up with a net zero target. Some companies are coming up with a net zero target. People have discovered new ways, and costs have come down, so renewables have pervaded countries.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Good to know. Are you receiving submissions from stakeholders as part of this process?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> Yes; we have received about 65 submissions, and we had a lot of meetings with stakeholders and teleconferences.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Would you be able to take on notice who you've taken submissions from?</p> <p><b>Dr Craik:</b> They're all up on our website—all those are not confidential are up on our website.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> Does that 65 include the number of confidential submissions?</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I have 67, which I think is the total figure. I don't have the figure for the number of confidential submissions off the top of my head. I think it was maybe two, but we can take that on notice if you like.</p> <p><b>Senator GREEN:</b> That would be fantastic if you could take on notice how many are confidential so we can understand the full amount.</p>	02/03/2020 Page 141	SQ20-000121

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

34	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>External consultants - energy agencies</b>	In relation to the use of all external consultants in the Department or Agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For each of the last six financial years from 2014-15 to 2019-20 to date, the total amount spent on external consultants, including:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. contracts tagged as a “consultancy”.</li> <li>b. contracts not defined as a “consultancy”, but tagged as “business intelligence consulting services”, “information technology consultation services”, “management advisory services”, “management support services”, “organisational structure consultation”, “risk management consultation services” or “strategic planning consultation services”.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The total amount of full time equivalent hours (FTE’s) provided by external consultants in 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>3. The total amount of variances granted to external consultant contracts (including those specified in 1(a)(b) above) in 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>4. A breakdown by consultant, specifications and project completion for 2018-19.</li> </ol>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000430</b>
35	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Discretionary grant programs - energy agencies</b>	Please provide, for all administered and discretionary grant programs administered by each Department and Agency within the portfolio for FY 2019-20 to date: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the administered or discretionary grant program.</li> <li>2. The recipient of the grant.</li> <li>3. The ABN or ACN of the grant recipient.</li> <li>4. The charitable status of the grant recipient.</li> <li>5. Who authorised the grant payment?</li> <li>6. For each year of the budget and forward estimates:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the total funding budgeted for the program?</li> <li>b. How much funding has been contracted and allocated?</li> <li>c. How much funding has been contracted but not allocated?</li> <li>d. How much funding has been committed but not contracted?</li> <li>e. How much funding is uncommitted, uncontracted and unallocated?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000470</b>
36	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>External contractors - energy agencies</b>	In relation to the use of all external contractors in the Department or Agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The total amount spent on all contracts for Management and Business Professionals and Administrative Services for each of the last six financial years from 2014-15 to 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>b. The total amount spent on all contracts tagged as “Temporary Personnel Services” for each of the last six financial years from 2014-15 to 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>c. The total number of external contractors employed in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>d. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all external contractors employed in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>e. The total number of FTE hours provided by external contractors in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> </ol>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000450</b>
37	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Carr, Kim	<b>A4 copy paper - energy agencies</b>	From which country does the department and its agencies source A4 photo copy paper? • If from multiple countries please provide a breakdown of country of origin in percentage terms.	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000480</b>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

<b>38</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Information technology contractors - energy agencies</b>	In relation to the use of external information technology contractors in the Department or Agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The total amount spent on external contractors for each of the last six financial years from 2014-15 to 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>The total number of external contractors employed in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>The aggregate total remuneration payable for all external contractors employed in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>The total number of FTE hours provided by external contractors in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> </ol>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000460</b>
<b>39</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Information technology consultants - energy agencies</b>	In relation to expenditure on information technology in the Department or Agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each of the last six financial years from 2014-15 to 2019-20 to date, the total amount spent on information technology consultation services.</li> <li>The total amount of full time equivalent hours (FTE's) provided by information technology consultation services in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>The total amount contracted to information technology consultation services in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>The total amount of variances granted to information technology consultation services contracts in FY 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>A breakdown by consultant, specifications and project completion for FY 2019-20 to date.</li> </ol>	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000440</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner - energy agencies</b>	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?	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000419</b>
<b>41</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Fair Work Ombudsman - energy agencies</b>	For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency?	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000409</b>
<b>42</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Fair Work Commission - energy agencies</b>	For financial year 2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency?	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000399</b>
<b>43</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Recruitment-energy agencies</b>	1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in financial year 2019-20 to date? 2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided?	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000387</b>
<b>44</b>	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	<b>Kitching, Kimberley</b>	<b>Congestion busting - energy agencies</b>	1. Can the Department/agency provide an update on how it is “congestion busting” in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks. 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.	<b>Written</b>	<b>SQ20-000377</b>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

45	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Communications staff - energy agencies</b>	<p>1. For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following:</p> <p>2. By Department or agency:</p> <ul 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> </ul> <p>3. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios?</p> <ul 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> </ul>	Written	<b>SQ20-000365</b>
46	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Social media influencers - energy agencies</b>	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for financial year 2019-20 to date?</p> <p>2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote?</p> <p>3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided?</p> <p>4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided?</p>	Written	<b>SQ20-000350</b>
47	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Promotional merchandise - energy agencies</b>	<p>1. What is the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for the financial year 2019-20 to date?</p> <p>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided?</p> <p>3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided?</p>	Written	<b>SQ20-000339</b>
48	<b>Corporate and Digital</b>	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Advertising and information campaigns - energy agencies</b>	<p>1. What is the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for the financial year 2019-20 to date?</p> <p>2. What advertising and information campaigns has the Department/agency run in this time? For each campaign, please provide:</p> <ul 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> </ul> <p>3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided?</p>	Written	<b>SQ20-000329</b>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020**

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources**

49	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Market research - energy agencies</b>	<p>1. Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies?</p> <p>2. If so, can the Department provide an itemised list for financial year 2019-20 to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Subject matter</li> <li>b. Company</li> <li>c. Costs</li> <li>d. Contract date period</li> </ul> <p>3. 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.</p>	Written	SQ20-000319
50	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Briefings to independents and minor parties - Energy Agencies</b>	<p>Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives since the date of the last answer for Supplementary Estimates 2019-20? If so, can the following be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The subject matter of the briefing.</li> <li>b. The location and date of the briefing.</li> <li>c. Who proposed the briefing?</li> <li>d. Attendees of the briefing by level/position.</li> </ul>	Written	SQ20-000308
51	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Legal costs - Energy Agencies</b>	What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for FY 2019-20 to date?	Written	SQ20-000296
52	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Facilities upgrades - Energy Agencies</b>	<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 (<b>GST inclusive</b>)?</p> <p>3. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided?</p>	Written	SQ20-000276
53	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	<b>Departmental functions - Energy Agencies</b>	<p>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> <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 (<b>GST 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>	Written	SQ20-000265

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

54	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	Executive Management - Energy Agencies	In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for financial year 2019-20 to date: a. The total number of executive management positions. b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. c. The change in the number of executive manager positions. d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.	Written	SQ20-000254
55	Corporate and Digital	Kitching, Kimberley	Staff Travel - Energy Agencies	What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for FY 2019-20 to date.	Written	SQ20-000286
56	Snowy Hydro Limited	Roberts, Malcolm	Snowy 2.0 Construction	<b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Thank you. It has been reported, Minister, that Snowy 2.0 will have a construction project area of 250,000 hectares that encompasses one third of the Kosciuszko National Park, four high-voltage transmission circuits on twin towers with a 120-metre-wide easement for 10 kilometres, 100 kilometres of new or widened roads and tracks and the destruction of 1,000 hectares of habitat for 14 threatened species. Snowy 2.0 is considered a renewable project. It would claim it is better for the environment than a hydrocarbon generation project. Has there been any assessment on the project environmental benefits versus the environmental degradation that will happen during construction, as outlined above? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Mr Broad and co may wish to add to this, but Mr Broad was talking about concluding the environmental impact study process with the New South Wales government. Also, previously, in response to Senator Carr, he detailed some of the misrepresentations or mistruths that exist and the facts that exist on the Snowy website and did volunteer, in relation to at least some of those that have been published recently, to provide to the committee detailed rebuttal of them. I'm sure he can provide detailed rebuttal of those you've just cited, but, again, in terms of the headline points, Mr Broad or Mr Whitby might wish to quickly refute them so that we have it on the record, at least for tonight. <b>Mr Broad:</b> A general point is that we've heard those sorts of wild misrepresentations from the national parks people, who are passionate. You respect their positions, but they're so far off the money. Our impact on the park during construction is 0.1 per cent, and, in operations, it's 0.01 per cent. So that's just a starter. The other points I think we'll take on notice and we'll give you an answer.	02/03/2020 Page 131	SQ20-000118
57	Snowy Hydro Limited	Roberts, Malcolm	Snowy 2.0 Business Code	<b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Thank you all for coming. My questions are to the minister representing the minister. Under Malcolm Turnbull's prime ministership, we saw no business plan or business case put forward other than one heavily redacted one, which was useless. We saw no cost-benefit analysis. Mr Broad talks about the banks approving the project. On what basis did they approve the project, Minister, without a business case? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I reject a number of those assertions, and I'll happily invite the officials to talk you through the work that has been done. <b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Could we see the business case, then? <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Yes. Much has been published already. <b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> So we can take that on notice, that we can get a copy— <b>Mr Broad:</b> I will certainly send you the—it may have missed you, but there has been a very detailed case put in the public domain.	02/03/2020 Page 131	SQ20-000117

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 2 MARCH 2020

## Industry, Science, Energy and Resources portfolio, excluding Industry, Science and Resources

58	Snowy Hydro Limited	Carr, Kim	Ted Woodley in the Australian	<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> I have a number of issues, but I begin by drawing your attention to an article that was published recently in The Australian, authored by Ted Woodley, who is the former chief executive of Energy Australia, PowerNet, GasNet and CLP Power Systems in Hong Kong and is the honorary treasurer of the National Parks Association of New South Wales. That article makes a series of propositions. Mr Broad, given the time is so limited, I would like, if it's possible, Snowy Hydro Limited to give us on notice a detailed rebuttal of each of the points made in that article. For the purposes of that, the article makes these claims about Snowy 2.0: The hydro project is overpriced, inefficient and extremely harmful to the environment ... rather than generate low-emission energy, Snowy 2.0 will incur tens of millions of tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions and will have a devastating impact on Kosciuszko National Park ... It will push up prices ... It is a series of allegations of that type. Given the time is so short, I'm wondering if you could give us, on notice, a response, in detail, to each of the allegations that have been made. <b>Mr Broad:</b> Yes, we will. If you look on our website, those issues have come up many times over the last 12 months— <b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Yes, I am aware of that. <b>Mr Broad:</b> and we have dealt with those. But I will certainly provide senators with a detailed response to every point raised.</p>	<p>02/03/2020 Page 127</p>	SQ20-000113
----	---------------------	-----------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------