

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 22 MARCH 2021**

**AGRICULTURE, WATER AND THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO**

<b>QoN No.</b>	<b>Department /Agency</b>	<b>Senator</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Transcript Page</b>
1	Bureau of Meteorology	Nita Green	Cairns Airport meteorological office	<p>Senator GREEN: When was the decision made that the Cairns Airport meteorological office would be closed?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I have to take the actual date on notice.</p>	82
2	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Data homogenisation - Marble Bar	<p>Senator RENNICK: Sorry to interrupt you. That relates to the moves. That has been documented. That is the move. I'm speaking about the statistical changes. You've made 13 changes, and seven of them have been statistical that aren't related to any moves or changes in equipment. So that's what I'm trying to get to. How come you can go back to 1916 and change data without any documentary evidence?</p> <p>Dr Stone: That is the point. There's actually seven different categories of a trigger for homogenisation. Each of them is valid. No matter which trigger occurs, it's always a statistical analysis that determines whether or not homogenisation occurs and, if it does, the scale and direction.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Sure. I am happy to look at the statistical if you can give me some justification. But whenever I ask for the back-up, I get links to one-pagers that give me summarised data. Can I get the detail behind the statistical moves so that I can satisfy myself that the changes are validated?</p> <p>Dr Stone: Would you like that? We can take that on notice.</p>	84
3	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	Qualified analysis and independent peer review of Townsville, Rockhampton, Cairns and Charleville sites	<p>Senator ROBERTS: Yes. I have a couple more questions, Chair. You said you've been able to analyse these past records. Could you please provide for each of the four sites that I've mentioned-that is, Townsville, Rockhampton, Cairns and Charleville-the quantified analysis that the Bureau of Meteorology has done and document the independent peer review process used just on notice?</p> <p>Dr Stone: Absolutely. That's all on the website. No problem.</p>	88
4	Bureau of Meteorology	Larissa Waters	Engagement with the Reserve Bank of Australia	<p>Senator WATERS: We've been asking the Reserve Bank what scenarios the Council of Financial Regulators is using for its climate vulnerability assessment. I understand that BoM is involved in working on that climate vulnerability assessment. The RBA, in a response to a question on notice, said that they are not modelling the scenario of 3.4 to 4.4 degrees of warming. What has been your involvement? Have you suggested that they should in fact model that scenario? Do you know why they have not?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'm aware that we've been in discussions with a range of actors in the financial services space, including the RBA, and others in industry. I can't give you specific</p>	86

				<p>details of what has or hasn't been said there. Myself personally, I haven't engaged with the RBA on that, but I know officers of the bureau are engaged with colleagues at the RBA and those discussions.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps you could take it on notice, unless the officers are in the room.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Dr Stone may have some line of sight on that. I'm happy to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. It's my understanding that it's been described as the most likely scenario, I thought, by the BoM. It seems odd that the group you're collaborating with isn't modelling that most likely scenario. Thank you for taking that on notice.</p>	
5	Bureau of Meteorology	Larissa Waters	Briefings requested regarding 3.4 to 4.4 degrees of warming	<p>Senator WATERS: This is my last question, Chair. Given that 3.4 to 4.4 degrees of warming is pretty much civilisational collapse, have any departments or agencies sought briefings from you or the BoM about what this might mean for their responsibilities?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: If you want the specific itemised ones, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, please.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The bureau engages extensively right across the government-not just the Australian government but state and local government as well. Again, I don't have that level of detail in front of me. But we are engaged with colleagues right across government on these matters.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I'm not seeking to impugn you. I'm interested in whether they've asked you for specific information about the impacts of 3.4 to 4.4 degrees on their areas of responsibility.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The short answer is that we get a lot of requests right across government for our expertise to contribute to their policy making processes. Again, I wouldn't want to speculate. I will give you the detail on notice.</p>	86
6	Bureau of Meteorology	Katy Gallagher	Working from home requests - Bureau of Meteorology	<p>1. How many requests to work from home on an ongoing basis has your agency received from staff since the Australian Public Service Commission published 'Circular 2020/9: Returning to Usual Workplaces' on 29 September 2020?</p> <p>2. How many of these requests have been rejected and approved? Please outline the reasons that requests were rejected.</p>	Written
7	Bureau of Meteorology	Katy Gallagher	Staffing - Bureau of Meteorology	<p>1. Please provide a staffing profile for the agency as at 1 January 2021 and 01 April 2021 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. APS ongoing: headcount and ASL;</li> <li>b. APS non-ongoing: headcount and ASL;</li> <li>c. Labour hire staff; headcount and FTE; and</li> <li>d. Other contractors.; headcount and FTE</li> </ul> <p>2. Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount.</p> <p>3. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2020.</p>	Written

8	Bureau of Meteorology	Bridget McKenzie	Follow-up questions to question on notice Q30 (SQ20-000445) - BoM staffing and working from home	<p>1. How many staff does BOM have working in capital cities, including Canberra?</p> <p>2. Are any BOM staff based in rural or regional locations?</p> <p>a. How many?</p> <p>b. What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff?</p> <p>3. How many staff worked-from-home each month from BOM for the period October 2020 to March 2021?</p> <p>4. In response to question 2, BOM has provided information on activities that were delivered during the COVID-19 lockdown period. Can BOM confirm that productivity remained static or increased compared to the pre-COVID period?</p> <p>a. How will BOM maintain or increase productivity when staff return to work in their office?</p> <p>b. What opportunity exists for BOM to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID?</p> <p>5. For question 3, BOM data shows a 49.4 per cent decrease in the number of sick days of taken between March to October 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave?</p> <p>a. How will BOM work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?</p> <p>b. If BOM has staff based in rural/regional areas, is there a comparison of sick leave taken for these staff compared to city-based staff?</p>	Written
9	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Written questions from Senator Rennick to the Bureau of Meteorology	<p>I note that there are ten principles for long term sustainable climate monitoring and the first three are 1) The impact of new systems or changes to existing systems should be assessed prior to implementation and 2) a suitable period overlap for new and old observing systems is required and 3) the details and history of local conditions, instruments, operating procedures, data processing algorithms etc should be documented. With these principles in mind, could you please answer the following questions:</p> <p>1. In my last set of Questions on Notice, I asked why the BOM ignored the findings of the Spanish parallel run and the Bureau that every location is different. If that's the case, why has the BOM only done parallel runs at five locations out of the 112 sites for the homogenised data set for the change from large to small Stevenson screens? How can you possible justify homogenising data when you haven't done parallel runs at the other 107 stations given your comments about the Spanish Study?</p> <p>2. I have previously asked the Bureau to detail the justification for the changes to Marble Bar. I have attached the Bureau's reply via the link <a href="http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/acorn-sat/#tabs=Dataand-networks">http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/acorn-sat/#tabs=Dataand-networks</a> which is effectively one word descriptions for the changes made: (see response document for table)</p>	Written

			<p>I note that 7 of the thirteen changes to Marble Bar are due to statistical causes. The Bureau says a statistical cause of temperature adjustments is “A change found by statistical methods without specific documentary support.”</p> <p>Given this directly contravenes the one of the ten principles for long term sustainable development the details of data processing etc be documented how can the Bureau justify making changes without documentary support?</p> <p>3. I note that the Acorn-2 data set homogenised temperature observations between 31 October 1923 to 7th April 2024 from 160 consecutive days above 37.8 degrees Celsius in the raw data to 128 days. I also note that these changes were not consistent in that some changes increased the temperature and others decreased the temperature. I also note that these changes are not listed as adjustments to Acorn 2 in the link provided in the Bureau’s last answer to my last question on notice about Marble Bar. I note that I did ask for an explanation of these changes in the last set of QoNs and the answer provided was unsatisfactory. On what basis were these adjustments made in the Acorn data set and can workings be provided? Can the Bureau ensure that this question is answered fully with supporting evidence of why the changes were made?</p> <p>4. The second Technical Advisory Forum said the Bureau need to engage a statistician in 2017, so who was doing the statistical changes prior to employing a statistician and what were their qualifications?</p> <p>5. The Bureau still haven’t answered my prior question as to how can you justify homogenising data at Marble Bar back in the early 1900’s – the Bureau has given an answer for 2015 and 1997 but no changes prior to that – does the Bureau have details for the changes for the other 11 times records were homogenised?</p> <p>6. In the 2011 Observations documents, the Bureau noted a significant number of records were destroyed in the move to the Head Office in 2003. It has since been confirmed these related to procedures and processes rather than observations. In light of the third principle of climate monitoring which says that details of procedures should be documented, why did the Bureau destroy such records?</p> <p>7. Why hasn’t the Bureau digitalised the heat record from Wilcannia – given it’s a record heat temperature for NSW from 1939, surely you would digitalise temperature records given their importance?</p> <p>8. When does the Bureau expect to have digitised the Wilcannia heat record?</p> <p>9. How many temperature observations are yet to be digitalised?</p> <p>10. When does the Bureau expect to complete digitalisation of Australia’s temperature observations and if an exact date can’t be given, how many observations are digitalised each year?</p> <p>11. Has the tender and procurement process—to acquire the equipment required to reduce the tolerance of the inspection and increase confidence in the uncertainty of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>observations at ACORN-SAT sites—been completed? The Bureau has previously indicated this would be completed by January 2021.</p> <p>12. Can the BOM please provide workings on all prior parallel runs between small and large Stevenson Screens at the five locations where they did take place? Over how many months were these runs conducted? What was the monthly temperature and variance of these tests? Note: this question has been asked previously but the link provided did not provide detailed workings of the parallel runs. Could the actual observations and detailed processes please be provided?</p> <p>13. I note that recommendation D4 of the Independent Peer Review relating to Statistical uncertainty estimates for the national-mean temperature is not yet completed. Is there an expected completion date for that?</p> <p>14. I have previously asked “Have parallel runs between mercury thermometers and PRT thermometers been carried out? If so, at which weather stations and how long was the length of each test. Was there any systemic difference between the two?” While the Bureau referred to a paper could it please provide reference to the issue and volume of the paper for us to find this in future rather than simply provide the name of the journal. Furthermore, if the paper doesn’t contain workings, could workings please be provided?</p> <p>15. I note affordability was noted as reason spatial density of the observations network has not been increased as per recommendation B2 of the Independent Peer Review. How much funding does the Bureau need to improve the spatial density of the grid?</p> <p>16. How are Reference stations used to detect inhomogeneities (artificial discontinuities) in a station record? Please provide a detailed written answer and do not provide a link.</p> <p>17. Has the analysis promised in the response to the recommendation D3 in the Peer Review 2012 been published? If so, could a link please be supplied?</p> <p>18. Could the BOM please provide the evaluative scores applied by the International Peer Review on the page 17 of their report? The link provided previously did not exist.</p> <p>19. Could the Bureau please advise what statisticians its uses to advise on its practices?</p> <p>20. How long has the Bureau been advised by statisticians in regard to its practices?</p> <p>21. What is the formula applied to statistical changes that don’t have documentary evidence?</p> <p>22. I note adjustments to the ACORN data set involving Marble Bar as provided by the Bureau did not include the 1923/24 adjustments. Why is that?</p> <p>23. In regard to the BOM's homogenisation of temperature records at Marble Bar in 1923/1924, on what basis did it change these records and why are the changes so inconsistent given weather conditions were consistent? If it's due to equipment, then why were the changes to daily records so inconsistent? i.e. some were homogenised upwards and some downwards? Why would a change in equipment produce such a large amount of volatility? Can the Bureau please detail the justification for the ACORN adjustments?</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>24. Given the Bureau has destroyed the records relating to processes and procedures then how can it homogenise observations relating to those records, if the process and procedures are not known?</p> <p>25. At what sites and what times were processes and procedures relating to observational records destroyed?</p>	
10	Bureau of Meteorology	Anne Urquhart	Marine heatwaves off the coast of WA	<p>1. What is the Bureau's assessment of the La Nina event that is contributing to marine heatwaves off the Western Australian coast?</p> <p>2. Is it likely to impact Shark Bay and the Ningaloo Reef?</p> <p>3. On your website you state that a spike in sea temperatures at this level hasn't occurred off the coast of WA since 2011. What is your assessment of the increasing frequency and severity of these events?</p> <p>4. Is there consistent and sufficient ocean temperature monitoring infrastructure in place across the country? Do we need more?</p>	Written
11	Bureau of Meteorology	Anne Urquhart	Automation of 24 regional stations	<p>BoM's 2015-20 strategic plan determined that 24 regional stations across Australia would be automated. The plan estimated 30 staff would be either be redeployed or made redundant.</p> <p>1. Can you please confirm whether all 24 stations have now been automated?</p> <p>2. Please provide:</p> <p>a. The locations of each regional station and date of automation?</p> <p>b. How many staff were redeployed and to where, broken down by regional station and city they were deployed to?</p> <p>c. How many staff were made redundant, broken down by regional station?</p> <p>3. When was the decision made that the Cairns Airport Meteorological Office would be closed? Was this closure part of the Bureau of Meteorology's 2015-20 strategic plan?</p> <p>4. What were the practical, on the ground roles regional forecasters played? Did they measure rainfall, observe cloud cover, track weather patterns, meet with local emergency services, etc?</p> <p>5. Has there been any consideration of re-instating local forecasters in regional Queensland?</p>	Written
12	Bureau of Meteorology	Kristina Keneally	Contract notice CN3757963	<p>With reference to contract notice CN3757963 published on Austender on 31 March 2021: In relation to which transaction/s is Major Yacht Services contracted to be paid \$22,000 for customs brokerage.</p>	Written
13	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Matthew Canavan	EPBC Act offsets - five properties awaiting approval	<p>Mr Knudson: There were 59 properties. Of those, we've effectively said that 54 of those are fine to go ahead with no requirement for an assessment under the EPBC Act. So those 54 have already gotten every approval they've required in terms of land clearing impacts from both the state and the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth saying it didn't need an assessment and didn't need an approval. On the residual five, three of them have been approved with conditions with offsets, all agreed to with the proponents. We have</p>	67-68

another one of those five, which is proceeding through. It has been a controlled action. We're waiting for the assessment documentation from the proponent. So that also is proceeding through the assessment process. And we have one project which has not been approved.

Senator CANAVAN: Can you go through the five for me?

Mr Knudson: Sure.

CHAIR: In view of time, how many more questions do you have?

Senator CANAVAN: I have only a couple more, but I know that my colleague Senator McKenzie has others.

Mr Knudson: The upshot of that is that-

CHAIR: Would you be happy with that information on notice?

Senator CANAVAN: It's only five, with your indulgence. I probably would have had the five without the interruption.

Mr Knudson: I will do this very quickly. Kingvale Station is the one that has not been approved. It's been refused approval by the minister. Wombinoo Station is the one that is a controlled action currently proceeding through the assessment process. The three have been that approved with conditions, including offsets, are Meadowbank Station, Myall College and Byrne Valley.

Senator CANAVAN: How many hectares are those three?

Mr Knudson: I'll just check with my colleagues.

Senator CANAVAN: Take that on notice. Have you ever had a look at this offsets policy to determine whether it is systemically racist, because that is what it seems to me to be? You are denying Indigenous people or making it harder for Indigenous people on their lands to develop than non-Indigenous people.

Mr Knudson: The offsets policy is designed not around race. It is designed around environmental outcomes.

Senator CANAVAN: There is obviously unconscious bias sometimes. We've got to be mindful of these things. Have you ever looked at whether you have unconscious bias? Have you had unconscious bias training?

Mr Knudson: I actually have gone through unconscious bias training, yes.

Senator CANAVAN: Mr Metcalfe, is that done in your department?

Mr Metcalfe: No. We believe that our decision-making should be based upon the legislation.

Senator CANAVAN: Do you have unconscious bias training?

Mr Metcalfe: Based on science, law, economics and based on good stakeholder engagement. I'm not familiar with whether unconscious bias training has been undertaken. I do reject any assertions that there is systemic racism exhibited by officers of my department or my department. We seek to act within the law and to do our jobs as

				<p>well as we possibly can.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: This is the last thing I have to say on this: if you have 58 of the 59 properties either approved or that last one, the 58th, waiting for an approval decision, out of 59 projects in that area, I think there's lots of evidence exactly to the contrary-that development is occurring in the area.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: It depends on the size of those, I must say, with all respect, Mr Knudson, because some of them might be very small. But we'll wait for that. If I could get on notice the proposed size in hectares of development of all 59.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice.</p>	
14	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Service arrangement between Tasmanian Fire Service and AAD	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I would like to table, Chairman, a copy of a statement issued by the Tasmanian Fire Service. The Tasmanian Fire Service has announced a review of the service delivery, including what's offered by Tas fire training and the TFC commercial training division and so on. As I understand it, that means that the Tasmanian government is not providing training to a number of private sector agencies. Does that include the Antarctic Division?</p> <p>Mr Clark: As Mr Ellis has just outlined, we conduct a range of training for the expeditioners. In relation to services and training provided by external third-party providers, we've recently undertaken a tender process for the renewal of those services. As part of that, we've gone out to the market to seek commercial providers to provide things like fire training and search and rescue training-that is, technical training that we don't provide in-house. We're currently assessing those bids for training. As a result of that assessment process, we'll be notifying who the next tranche of commercial providers will be.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you confirm the Tasmanian government, through Tasmanian Fire Service, has provided that service for some time?</p> <p>Mr Clark: They are the current contracted service provider.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How long has that been the case?</p> <p>Mr Clark: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You don't have any indication of the number of years?</p> <p>Mr Clark: A decade or more.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If you could take the detail on it. Thank you. Who has ended the contract? Have you or has the Tasmanian government?</p> <p>Mr Clark: Those contracts were part of an end of cycle for a range of contracts. That was a cycle that we routinely seek to go back to the market to test who is available, the services we require and what presents the best value for money.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. So the 10 years is a rotation. So you've entered, as a matter of course, an automatic ending of the contract?</p> <p>Mr Clark: The current arrangements may not have been one single 10-year contract.</p>	48-49

				<p>They're quite often on a three to five year time horizon. Each of the contracts came to an end and need to be reset for the provision of those services from the middle of this year onwards. I'll just add, through that contract arrangement we often establish a pool of service providers. In the case of firefighting or other technical skills there may be more than one service provider who provides those services to the AAD. At each stage in the process we'll have a number of contractors to draw on to provide those services.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But am I correct, at the moment it's provided by the Tasmanian Fire Service?</p> <p>Mr Clark: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The Tasmanian government has announced that it is closing its service- not that you're closing the service. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Clark: If you're reading from a statement they've made-</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That's why I've tabled the document. I've tabled the document to establish that point. I want to be clear here, given that this contract has been in place for over 10 years, and given the importance of this service to the operations of emergency procedures for our basis in the Antarctic, I would have thought this would be an important matter that would have been discussed with you prior to the closure of this service. Were there any discussions between the Tasmanian government and AAD before this announcement?</p> <p>Mr Clark: I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And, if so, when would those discussions have taken place? What was the advice that was provided to you? Can you provide me with that information as well, please?</p> <p>Mr Clark: Yes.</p>	
15	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Detailed summary of environment budget	<p>Senator GREEN: I want to ask some questions in relation to the letter I sent to you. We might just have to go through the exercise, unfortunately. I've asked for a detailed summary of the environment budget, including allocation of funding across programs, measures et cetera. Is that something that you can take on notice?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I can certainly take it on notice.</p>	11
16	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Breakdown of programs funded by the National Heritage Trust special account	<p>Senator GREEN: In terms of some other questions I asked in my letter on the budget, can you provide a breakdown of all the programs that are funded by the National Heritage Trust special account?</p> <p>Mr Pak Poy: Sorry, which are you referring to?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: It's not a page.</p> <p>Mr Pak Poy: Sorry. I don't have the breakdown of the trust's special account.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I'm not asking you to provide that. If the department wants to take that on notice-</p>	12

				<p>Mr Pak Poy: Program 1.1 is coming up next. We'll be able to talk to that for you, Senator.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Again, we'll have people here soon, Senator.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can we do the exercise of taking that on notice, in case we don't get to those? We have lots of questions in the next section.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Particularly the funding breakdown of that account as it relates to Landcare.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Indigenous rangers and Landcare, yes. We have had people working on this over the weekend, so we should be able to have some information when the relevant people can be in the room. I think that this should be under the next outcome, so once we get to the outcome, hopefully we'll be able to provide you with a fair degree of information.</p>	
17	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Bushfire Recovery for Species and Landscapes - Date final contract was executed	<p>Senator GREEN: In terms of waiting on invoices from organisations receiving funding, what are we talking about there? If \$27.6 million has been spent, you're waiting to receive invoices for the remaining funding?</p> <p>Dr Fraser: Correct.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: And you're expecting to receive those between now and June?</p> <p>Dr Fraser: We're expecting to receive those between now and June. We would have a small number of projects that have been granted variations and extensions because of COVID or other delays in administration, and may be extended beyond that-I don't have all of those details in front of me-but for the vast majority of them we expect to be invoiced for and to be paid before June. The program is on track to be fully expensed.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay. You might need to take this on notice, but do you have an idea of when the full amount was contracted? Do we have a date? Was that last week or a few months ago?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I think we'll need to take that on notice, Senator. We'll get back to you on that.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: A date would be really helpful.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Yes, we'll get that to you.</p> <p>Dr Fraser: The final contract executed was in February this year. I can get an exact date if that is required.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, an exact date would be helpful.</p>	15
18	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Koala Census - tracking of \$28 million	<p>Senator GREEN: There's another portion of that funding that was allocated to further scientific assessment. It was \$28 million, so that makes up almost \$150 million. How much of that money has been contracted?</p> <p>Dr Fraser: The \$27.7 million, or \$28 million, is departmental funds. So, unlike the \$50 million package, the departmental funds were described as part of the \$150 million envelope for the second phase of bushfire recovery.</p>	17-18

That includes funds for scientific assessment and expert advice. It also includes funds for the department to deliver on the package.

Senator GREEN: So we get an idea of what that funding is for, is it for on-the-ground monitoring of species?

I think there's been talk about a koala census. Is that the sort of thing that money is meant to cover?

Dr Fraser: Yes, those funds are marked for koala monitoring, monitoring of other species and also listing assessments and advice. If you'd like to explore that in more detail, I'd ask my colleague Dr Stobutzki to come to the table. But I'm happy to answer general questions on the \$28 million.

Senator GREEN: I think you might need to stay, Dr Fraser. That contracted funding is administered by the department. So is there an understanding of how much has been spent and how the programs are progressing under that amount of funding?

Dr Fraser: The \$27.7 million has been incorporated into the department's budget, and we're on track to spend those budgets.

Senator GREEN: Does that mean you are keeping track of how they're being spent?

Dr Fraser: Yes, we are.

Ms Kennedy: Yes. That is funding over two years. This financial year, I think, there's \$15.5 million, and we're on track to have that all spent this year. The funding for next year is earmarked as well. Going back to your earlier question, it would be completely possible for us, on notice, to get more information for you on exactly what on-the-ground work has been done under the \$110 million. It's just that under current contractual arrangements we're not required to have a milestone report with that level of detail at this stage, but we can certainly provide that.

Senator GREEN: I'm asking about the funding that would cover the koala census.

Ms Kennedy: Sorry, I was referring to the previous question.

Senator GREEN: We've established that not a lot has been spent through there. I'm wondering about the \$28 million. Is it on track to be spent? How much has been spent? If you're keeping track of it, what's been delivered?

Ms Kennedy: We'll take that on notice, and we can come back later in the session with a breakdown of what's been spent this year. But, as I said, it is money across two years for funding that is being administered in the department. So it won't all be spent this financial year.

Senator GREEN: That's okay. It's important to understand when it's a fund that might cover two years. Are you going to spend \$0.4 million this year and the rest next year?

Ms Kennedy: The plan is for \$15.5 million to be spent this year. I'm not sure as of this month, right now, exactly where we're up to, but, as I said, I can take on notice how much has been delivered so far.

19	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	National Environmental Science Program - agreements/programs for the research four hubs	<p>Senator GREEN: Ms Stuart-Fox, you've used the word 'potentially' a few times. What is there to ensure that this research money or some of the research funding will contribute to the work that the Threatened Species Recovery Hub in the first phase was doing?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: You're asking how we direct those research hubs?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I guess the concern is that the Threatened Species Recovery Hub under phase 1 is coming to an end, so that work is no longer being done by that research hub. Now we're moving to a phase where there are four hubs, and three of them may potentially deal with threatened species research. I'm wondering how the department is satisfying itself that the important work started in phase 1 isn't just coming to a complete stop when we know that we're in an extinction crisis in terms of threatened species.</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: These things are managed through the terms of the funding contract through the funding agreement. When organisations—research bodies—apply for the hubs, they understand what it is that the government is seeking to fund, and then we ensure delivery of those outcomes through the funding agreements.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I know there might be some parts of the contracts or the agreements that we might need to maintain as commercial in confidence, but can you provide copies of those agreements for the hubs so that we can see what is in the detail of them?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator Hume: Can I just clarify, too, that there are two new cross-cutting missions that apply to the four hubs. One of those cross-cutting missions is on threatened and migratory species and ecological communities. That means that there's actually a stronger focus on threatened species research because, for the first time, it needs to be considered by all hubs.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Senator, just in terms of the earlier question, are you interested in the kind of work program when you ask for this sort of contract with the hubs? Is it more the work program that's being commissioned that's the area of interest?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: If you've got a hub called climate adaptation, we want to understand what work will be done under that research hub.</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: We can provide you with all the programs for those hubs.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay—not the work that you hope will be done but the work where there's some sort of direction or instruction that the investment is being used in a way that will deliver certain research outcomes.</p>	35-36
20	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	National Climate Resilience Card Adaptation Strategy - climate studies being used to inform the strategy	<p>Senator GREEN: There's a National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy due this year. Do we know when that will be released? It says 'in the later half of 2021'.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Are we targeting to a month there?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Minister Ley announced that we would be doing a refreshed National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy. She announced that in late January this year.</p>	37-38

				<p>The expectation is that it will be complete later on this calendar year. I will just see whether my colleague has a specific date.</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: It will be launched ahead of COP26.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: So by November.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay. Are there specific climate studies that are being used to inform the strategy? You can take that on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: Take it on notice. We are well behind schedule at the moment.</p>	
21	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Conflict of interest register - number of staff declarations prior to November	<p>Senator GREEN: I'll just ask one more question on this matter. Ms Brown, how many staff members who declared a conflict of interest were employed with the department or as a contractor prior to November, when the register was introduced?</p> <p>Ms Brown: Sorry, prior to?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: November, when the register was introduced.</p> <p>Ms Brown: I would need to take that on notice. I don't have that information in front of me.</p>	61
22	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Contracts for staff employed under congestion busting funding	<p>Senator GREEN: So the 86 staff members are only employed until the end of the year? Christmas time?</p> <p>Ms Brown: I will get my colleague Andrew McNee to cover off on the intimate details of the contracts.</p> <p>Mr McNee: I think as Mel said, for the 86 contractors, we have two tranches of funding. One tranche expires at the end of 2021. There is a second tranche, which expires in December 2022.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Are the 86 contractors contracted until the end of 2021?</p> <p>Mr McNee: As Ms Brown said, we don't have the specifics for each of the contracts, but we could draw that together for you, if required.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: That would be good. Thank you.</p>	59
23	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Waste infrastructure investment program	<p>Senator GREEN: Under each initiative, can you let me know either now or during the hearing today, hopefully by the end of the day, how much has been expended under those programs? That would be helpful. You have the details there; it's a matter of pulling them out. I won't ask you to do that now because we are running late. Can you get those figures together? I'm not so much interested in what contracts have been signed. I'm interested in what has been rolling out and what has hit the ground. That's what we refer to as being spent or expended. That's the figure that we're interested in. I've asked some questions about jobs in waste and recycling. We are talking about the \$190 million Recycling Modernisation Fund. The media statement when that was announced said that more than 10,000 jobs would be created and over 10 million tonnes of waste would be diverted. We've scrutinised that figure before. Is that a figure that the department still stands by- 10,000 jobs being created under that fund?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That's correct.</p>	78-79

Senator GREEN: And how is that being measured?

Mr Knudson: I think we talked about this a fair amount in terms of where the estimate was derived from and what ends up happening. Obviously we've got to have the projects go ahead and find out what jobs are created at the end of the day. It was based upon an economic analysis of the likely impact.

Senator GREEN: It's difficult, though, because the methodology that you explained is essentially an estimate.

So it's 9.4 jobs recycling. That methodology also includes, does it, 2.8 jobs in landfill being lost, essentially?

Mr Knudson: That's right. Effectively, if you're diverting waste from landfill to recycling, you gain 9.4, but presumably you lose the 2.8 on the other side. That's correct. It is the net of the two.

Senator GREEN: Is the net 6.4?

Mr Knudson: That's right.

Senator GREEN: So actually the figure is 6,400 jobs created? It's great to talk about created jobs, but if the effect of the package is that you will lose some jobs, we want to get a more accurate understanding of the impact of the program.

Mr Knudson: I think what your line of questioning is obviously pointing out, as with any economic model, is that it's based on a lot of assumptions. Part of this will be wanting to make sure that we've got a good read on how the industry progresses. Indeed, in a lot of ways because there has been such focus on this issue, I expect that we're going to see almost a multiplier effect as there is also not only additional reprocessing of waste material and recycled material but also the creation of different jobs with turning that recycled product into different goods, which was not initially-

Senator GREEN: Which is just hypothetical.

Mr Knudson: But that is exactly my point. We've done the best economic modelling that we could at this point. The premise is how it plays out.

Senator GREEN: I'm asking you about that economic modelling because it is the basis for not only the program but also the ministerial press announcements.

Mr Knudson: Absolutely. I'm happy to provide the economic modelling. We went through it in a fairly detailed way last estimates. If it would be helpful to show the actual models we used-

Senator GREEN: Sure. If you could table that, that be would helpful. Can I be clear, though, it is 10,000 less landfill jobs. It is actually 6,400.

Mr Knudson: You're talking about the 6.4 per 10,000 tonnes. Mr Ryan would like to answer it in more detail.

Mr Ryan: The simple answer is no. It is not 6,400. It does take the difference between the two to get the 10,000. There are three elements to it at the very high level. The first

				<p>element is the export ban and what material is subject to the ban. That is staying onshore and being recycled. That is the first element of the jobs. We do-</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Export ban for what product?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: All four materials are banned under the waste export ban. They started with glass at the beginning of this year. It will go through to paper in July 2024. So a RIS was done and there were jobs calculated as part of that RIS. That is part of the number. Two other parts are construction. There are construction jobs as a result of the investment of \$190 million from the Commonwealth that is matched by the states and territories. The third element is the movement-</p> <p>Senator GREEN: That is like a one for one for one?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So not guaranteed. That's just an assumption that if the federal government puts in some funding, industry will match it. But there is no guarantee on that either.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We will exceed it.</p> <p>Mr Ryan: That is a minimum-one for one for one overall. In fact, in the 43 projects to date that have been announced, off the top of my head I wouldn't know, but it exceeds one for one for one. It might be even one for one for three or one for one for four. So I could take that on notice. To answer the third element about jobs, it is around moving to 80 per cent recovery through all waste material streams. Some of them are at different levels. Overall, I think it's roughly about 60. I would have to check. So it is an increase of 20 per cent towards 2030. As they go into recycled content or recycled areas, that will obviously increase the number of jobs as well. But it doesn't double count the ones that we lose through landfill.</p>	
24	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Administrative costs of the Foundation	<p>Page 94: Senator GREEN: Does the department know how much of the \$440 million grant has been spent or expended?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I will run through it. I will try to be as clear as I can about those different categories. I know it has been a subject of some discussion today. These figures are as at 31 December. I will talk about the \$420.8 million, which is for the non-administrative component. They've committed \$135 million. They've expensed, which would be spent, \$50.3 million. They have contracted but not yet expensed \$84.7 million. So that \$50.3 million and the \$84.7 million adds up to the \$135 million. I understand that is over 162 contracts. The additional amount that they have expensed is around their administrative costs. Again, as at 31 December, that was \$18.5 million, with an additional \$1.3 million, which was contracted but not yet expensed.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So they've spent \$18.5 million on administration?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Yes. At the time, it was around 42 per cent. They are about halfway through, so that's kind of tracking at about the level we would expect.</p>	94-96

				<p>Senator GREEN: Can you give a breakdown, maybe on notice, of what those administration costs are going to?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Certainly.</p> <p>Page 96: Senator GREEN: When we do get a breakdown of the administrative costs, can we include advertising in that? Thank you. I appreciate that we are running out of time.</p>	
25	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Methods of advertising of the individual giving program	<p>Senator GREEN: The advertising itself is around the individual giving program. Is that correct? Do you know how much the foundation has reportedly raised as of today with the individual giving program?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I'm happy to answer that. I don't have the figure as of today. The figure I have as of 31 January this year is \$571,730.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: How does it work? You have this ad that says, 'Click to say you're in'. You go in, and I assume you sign up to a mailing list. Do they call you? How do they ask people to donate? Is it an email? Do they send someone around to your house?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I can talk in a general sense from my understanding of how charities raise funds.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: No. The foundation they gave a million dollars to.</p> <p>Ms Callister: I know they also have a regular giving program, which is part of it. So they have part of it that provides funding to them on a regular monthly basis and so on. But around the specifics of the methods they use, we would have to take that detail on notice.</p>	94
26	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Regional forecasters	<p>Senator GREEN: Given the evidence you've given now, is there any plan to reinstate regional forecasters to have a footprint of people on the ground, or is the job being done sufficiently in Brisbane?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: As I said before, we feel we've got the best way to deliver services to the Queensland community in the context of severe weather, and that is to base our severe weather specialists in Brisbane. We are in active discussions with a range of stakeholders about how we can improve our services in North Queensland. My door remains open in terms of how we might deliver services. In terms of the delivery of forecasts and warnings, the official forecasts and warnings will continue to be taken by staff in Brisbane.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Is that the position of the government, Minister? Can the department clarify that there won't be any new regional forecasters on the ground? There are no discussions with the BoM about doing that?</p> <p>Senator Hume: That is my understanding, but I can take it on notice.</p>	83
27	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Species listed as extinct prior to and after the introduction of the EPBC Act	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How many species have gone extinct since the introduction of the EPBC legislation?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I'm not sure about that. We'd have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You must have some list of the species?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I have a list of species that are listed as extinct, but I'm not sure if they were listed after the EPBC Act came into force or if they were already listed prior to that.</p>	42

				<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take it on notice?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like to know the species that we have listed as extinct, either listed prior to EPBC or since. That would be very helpful to know.</p>	
28	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Legal advice on statutory responsibilities of the Environment minister regarding outstanding recovery plans	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could I ask about the statutory responsibilities of the minister in relation to the still outstanding recovery plan for koalas. Has the minister received any advice, or has the department sought any legal advice in relation to this?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I would have to take that on notice. I'm not aware. I know the department is working hard to make sure we return to full compliance on recovery plan measures within this year, but I'm not sure if we've had specific advice on koalas.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has the department sought any legal advice as to the statutory responsibilities of the minister in relation to the 168 species that are still awaiting recovery plans?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Again, I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Do you know, Mr Metcalfe?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I don't know, but, Senator, it's something that we should be able to check on during the course of today.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That would be helpful.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We will come back to you with an answer as to whether that advice has been sought, or indeed, whether it's needed or whether it's clearly understood.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes, wonderful. Thank you.</p>	43
29	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Threatened Species Recovery Plan timeframes	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: While we're talking about recovery plans, I'd just like to know- can we have a list of the species which still do not have a recovery plan and the time frame in which they'll get one?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: We can certainly take that on notice. I think it was provided in response to a question on notice from the last estimates.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes, but surely we need to constantly update these things, because you progress and you improve the situation, or are you saying that nothing has changed since last time?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: It would have been fairly recently that we provided that response if there was a question on notice about it, so why don't we just quickly check as to whether there's been any change since we provided that advice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Okay. I'm happy to refer to the question on notice, if indeed that's case. But, if you could reference that, that would be helpful.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I don't know if my colleague can assist.</p> <p>Ms Stobutzki: I can assist. In updating the list of species that was provided in answer to the question on notice in November, it has changed, and that is reflecting the fact that the National Recovery Plan for the Grey-headed Flying-fox has now been made and come</p>	41

				<p>into effect. It's also reflecting a change in the status of the Christmas Island forest skink, which no longer requires a recovery plan, sadly, because its status has moved to being extinct. So we've had two changes since you received the last update.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So the Christmas Island forest skink was meant to have a recovery plan; it didn't get one, and now it's extinct?</p> <p>Ms Stobutzki: Yes. But it's understood that the extinction happened in the last 12 years, so it wasn't this year.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How long had it been listed as needing a recovery plan? How long had it been waiting for that?</p> <p>Ms Stobutzki: I'm sorry, but I don't have that piece of information on me. I'm not sure when it was originally listed.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Stobutzki: Yes.</p>	
30	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Funding for Koalas - amount spent, amount allocated and amount unallocated	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How much funding was expended in the past year on koalas?</p> <p>Dr Box: I don't have the answer for exactly how much was spent over the last year. I can take that on notice. The government is investing \$24.3 million over four years from 2019-20 to 2022-23, for a range of activities to protect and restore important koala habitat, to support koala health, genetics research and veterinary support and also to establish a national koala monitoring program. So there is significant funding for koalas over the four years from 2019-20 to 2022-23. For the last 12 months-I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How much is there in total?</p> <p>Dr Box: It's \$24.3 million over four years.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So \$24.3 million over four years-how much is left?</p> <p>Dr Box: I'd have to take that on notice in terms of what's been allocated versus what's been contracted.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take on notice: how much has been spent; how much has been allocated and how much is remaining unallocated, or not committed yet?</p> <p>Dr Box: Yes. I can give you a breakdown of the types of activities now that that's supporting.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: No. I want the figures first, and then we can come back to what the money is actually paying for.</p>	42-43
31	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC Act - interim standards	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When did the department first begin working on the proposed interim standards, the ones that have now been leaked to the media that we're all aware of, which is why it is the status quo?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Are you talking about the new national standard? I would have to take it on notice to give you an exact date. But following national cabinet's conclusion, the starting point, as Mr Knudson said, would be a standard that is equivalent to the current settings of the EPBC Act. We, of course, then moved to finalise a standard that looked like that so</p>	58

				<p>that the minister could consult on that with her state and territory colleagues.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is there anybody here-we can come back to this-who was involved in the drafting of those interim standards?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I was involved in the drafting of those standards.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So you've got intimate knowledge about this, then?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Well, insofar as my colleagues and my staff and myself spent a number of weeks ensuring that there was an alignment between a set of standards that we were working on and the current settings of the EPBC Act, absolutely.</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Hanson-Young, I'm going to give the call to another senator.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes. We'll come back.</p>	
32	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Breakdown of 38 recommendations in the Samuel review	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you perhaps tell us today which of the 38 recommendations-just number them for me-the government has responded to?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As you are aware, the government has responded to recommendations around the introduction of national environmental standards. The government has responded to recommendations around the streamlining of environmental assessment and approvals processes. The government has responded to recommendations around the establishment of an environmental assurance commissioner. In addition, I think the minister has made some statements in relation to moving forward on indigenous cultural heritage considerations and, indeed, convened a roundtable on that last year. In terms of the specific numbers, I would have to take that on notice and get someone to tick off which of the recommendations those are.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Would you take on notice-</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I would like a list of the 38 recommendations. Which ones has the government responded to? What is the timeframe going to be for responding to the others?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I can certainly take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I assume it will be a simple table to pull together. Thank you.</p>	56-57
33	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Davis Aerodrome project - access to data and documents used in tender process	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Were there any tender documents in relation to seeking a business partner for the runway?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Yes. Mr Bryson will give a quick bit of background on that tender process.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: I'm assuming that you're referring to the strategic alliance expression of interest. Is that correct?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Let's go with that ...</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Who has access to the data that's used in relation to this tender process?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: Only those people involved in the tender process and their relevant technical advisers.</p>	51-52

				<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Does that include members of the Australian Antarctic Division, members of the environment department, the minister, several ministers?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: No. As per any contract evaluation, it's only those people involved in the evaluation that have access.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I would like, on notice, a list of names of the people who have access to the tender documents.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: Would you be happy with positions rather than the names of those officials?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I don't see why we could haven't names and positions, but if you feel that positions will be clear enough to show who has access to this data then I'm happy for you to do that.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If it's all too nebulous and we're not able to get to the detail, I'll be coming back and asking you to clarify.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: Okay.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The process we've gone through, particularly with that competitive alliance EOI, is very rigidly in line with the government's procurement process. We have a very strong element of internal and external legal advice to make sure that that's followed correctly. We'll provide on notice the structure and how that process worked. The number of people that have access to that tender process is very limited. It is a very small internal team that is operating that tender. But we will get you as much granularity and detail as we possibly can.</p>	
34	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Davis Aerodrome project - breakdown of consultants and amount paid	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is the engineering company AECOM the consultant for the proposed runway?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Yes. They are one of a number of consultants, yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How much has been paid to AECOM thus far?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you. Could you also take on notice a breakdown of the other consultants that you're engaged with for this project and how much each of them are being paid.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Certainly.</p>	51
35	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Davis Aerodrome project - allocated funding	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Ellis, is \$5 billion in the estimate of what this is going to cost the Australian taxpayer?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: We don't have a completed estimate of the cost of the project at this stage. We are working on one to come back to government next year, to seek approval for the runway work to proceed.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Metcalfe, have you heard the figure of \$5 billion?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Not until just now. That's the only time I've heard it.</p>	50-51

				<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: It's an extraordinary amount of money, isn't it?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Five billion is a very large amount of money.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Ellis, when you say 'next year', are you talking about the next financial year? Is there going to be money allocated in this year's budget?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The intent is that this project will continue to work through a detailed business case and a comprehensive environmental assessment. That will come back to government next year for the 2022-23 budget.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: What is allocated in the budget for this next financial year in relation to this?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The government has allocated \$58.8 million for this next phase of the analysis of the project, and that covers us through until delivery to the government in mid-2022.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: In which case, then, there'll be more money allocated for the project itself?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: If the project is approved and if it meets the environmental assessment.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is this \$58.8 million the total cost or what has been allocated prior? What's the total amount of money spent thus far?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The total amount allocated for this project is \$76.6 million. I will pass over to my colleague Mr Bryson to give a more detailed financial breakdown of what needs to be spent.</p> <p>CHAIR: Are you happy to receive that on notice?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I am happy to receive that on notice.</p>	
36	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	Advice from TSSC on 168 species with an overdue recovery plan	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Of the 914 species or communities that require a recovery plan, how many of those are overdue?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: As of the current time, there are 168 overdue for having their recovery plans made.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Does the advice contemplate repealing recovery plans for the species for which one already exists?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: The advice doesn't go to that level of detail. My understanding of the process that the department and the threatened species committee have gone through is that for species with recovery plans already in place, we would live out the natural life of those plans-so we're not likely to repeal them.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Of the 168 where a plan has been requested or required but it is overdue, what is the advice in relation to those species?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I haven't got the species-by-species level advice with me.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: As Professor Marsh said, that's initial advice from the committee to the minister. I don't think we're at that level of detail at this stage, but it's certainly something we could take on notice.</p>	39

37	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	Communication regarding Environment Restoration Fund projects	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Since the election, five grants were awarded. Two are directly to technology companies associated with feral animals and three are closed tender processes where the tenders were invited from specific organisations, each of which is in the seat of Mayo.</p> <p>Mr Costello: Closed non-competitive grant processes; that's correct. We were asked to implement those decisions of government, which we have done through a closed non-competitive grant process.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: How was this communicated to you?</p> <p>Mr Costello: They were decisions taken through budget processes, so we were asked to implement those projects, and that's what we've done.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Are you telling me that these were decisions of cabinet?</p> <p>Mr Costello: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I see. So there are decisions of cabinet. Cabinet is busying itself funding \$140,000 worth of environment decisions all in the seat of Mayo?</p> <p>Mr Costello: As I said, they are decisions of government. We were involved in the implementation part of that.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So how does this get communicated to you? Do you get a letter, a telephone call or a visit from the staffer in the minister's office? How did you find out?</p> <p>Mr Costello: I believe it would have been passed through the minister's office, yes.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Would have been passed through. So that's the ordinary process. What actually happened? It was passed through the minister's office?</p> <p>Mr Costello: I believe there would have been an email trail or similar on that asking us whether these projects could be delivered through this fund and whether they were compatible with the purposes of the fund.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I see. So the minister's office has emailed you. May I have a copy of that email?</p> <p>Mr Costello: It may not have been me personally.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I'm asking you in your capacity as a representative of the department. When did that email get sent?</p> <p>Mr Costello: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Who sent the email?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Was it a member of the minister's staff?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll need to check that.</p>	64
38	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Jenny McAllister	Western Sydney Airport - offset arrangements	<p>Mr McNee: Yes. That's correct. To undertake the establishment of the database, the first two phases of that are actually underway at the moment. We've also sought in each of the branch areas responsible for the states to draw together all of that information from each of the individual assessments and put that in our current system. But that's still not</p>	76

	the Environment			<p>particularly fit for purpose. That is why we are also undertaking the new work to develop the database and the register.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: There has recently been some media interest in the integrity of the offsets arrangements for the Western Sydney Airport, which I imagine you are aware of. I refer you to the Guardian article in February. Did the department provide any advice to either the infrastructure department or the environment minister at the time of the stage 1 approval in 2016?</p> <p>Mr McNee: I might need to pass to my colleague in the relevant area on that.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We will need to bring the correct branch head to the table. I am pretty sure we would have.</p> <p>Environmental offsets were fundamental to the Western Sydney Airport proposition.</p> <p>Ms Vickery: I understand in relation to the Colebee reserve and Shanes Park?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I don't know how you refer to it. It's in relation to the decision to use the Orchard Hills Defence establishment as the main offset for the Western Sydney Airport.</p> <p>Ms Vickery: The briefing that I have in front of me is that at the time this was going ahead, we were transitioning between the Environment Protection Act 1974 to the Commonwealth Environmental Reform (Consequential Provisions) Act 1999. The environment minister did not have an approval power over a decision to take an action at that time. So the M7 project was approved under the EPIP Act by the then federal minister for transport and regional services. The New South Wales government also provided an environmental approval for the M7 project under the Environment Planning and Assessment Act. So the material prepared by the proponent, as required by the New South Wales Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, included an assessment of the impacts of the M7 on the Cumberland Plain Woodland. Conditions around that set out requirements for habitat compensation. In essence, I guess what I'm saying is that at that point in time when this project was going ahead, it was an assessment and an offset arrangement that was effectively established under the New South Wales government.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: It's said that there is no permanent conservation covenant being put on the Orchard Hills site. Is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Vickery: Again, I would probably have to take that on notice. This is quite some time ago. I'm actually not that familiar with this project. It is a past project. It is now in post approvals.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I appreciate that.</p>	
39	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Bridget McKenzie	Samuel review - regional forestry agreements	<p>Senator McKENZIE: I have some questions about the EPBC Act and the Samuel review. I have some questions about the very unusual issues that were raised by Professor Samuel in his final report around regional forestry agreements, something we never saw coming. I note you are nodding. I don't think we're alone. I want to understand the level of</p>	69-70

<p>the Environment</p>				<p>consultation that was undertaken with the forestry industry around regional forestry agreements.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As you are aware, Professor Samuel ran quite an extensive submissions and consultation process. With regard to specifics, particularly with forestry industry actors, I would probably have to take that on notice and get back to you with what submissions we received from forestry parties and what discussions Professor Samuel had specifically with forestry.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: I'm pretty sure that in those big folders that you are all carrying around there will be a tab saying 'EPBC final report' and you'll have all the fun facts about closing dates, opening dates, who was consulted and how many things were consulted. Have we got someone with that folder today? I want to know where this came from, who raised it and when and how.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The review received almost 30,000 submissions, of which a number were form submissions, as you would expect with a review of this nature. I have detail on the submissions with me today. We received 29,295 submissions. Of those, 26,053 were largely identical campaign submissions. There were 3,242 unique submissions, and 2,563 were from individuals; 409 from non-government organisations; 126 from industry-</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: So 409 were from NGOs. State farming organisations are NGOs. State Forestry organisations are NGOs. Then you've got this swagger of environmental NGOs. Have you broken up the 409 NGOs into sector?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We did, I think; this is going on memory.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: I fully appreciate that.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As we were working through the submissions, we did, I think, work out which ones were, as you rightly point out, from the environmental sector versus community organisations versus industry organisations, which would include below that mining versus agriculture versus forestry, commercial development, residential development and that sort of thing. I don't have those details with me here today, though.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We can come back on notice with respect to it. Specifically you've asked about forestry interests. Certainly the NFF was heavily involved in the process.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: I'm less worried about the NFF.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Understood.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: More worried about the VFF, because forestry agreements are obviously between state governments and the industry at a state level. I think it is less about the NFF-</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Understood.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: And particularly from my home state of Victoria, which was actually engaged in this specifically. I'm assuming relevant state agencies were all consulted?</p>	
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Mr Tregurtha: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: I want to understand the level of engagement that occurred with the Commonwealth department responsible for forestry.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: That's us.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: It is. So what level did you have-</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: When the review started, of course, the environment and energy department was separate from the agriculture and water department. When the review finished, clearly we were together. But during the course of the review, the secretariat ran an interdepartmental committee discussion. We had regular meetings with that group. On that group I'm sure there would have been a representative from what was then the agriculture and water department, which then, of course, was brought together under the one institution.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: So does the forestry section-</p> <p>CHAIR: Do you have many more questions?</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: Yes, I do. I will put a whole swag on notice. I have two I want to ask.</p> <p>CHAIR: Go for those two.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: Who put forward the idea that the RFA regime is inconsistent with the EPBC Act and that there were fundamental shortcomings? Was that advice from the forestry area within the department to Professor Samuel?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I don't believe so. I will check, but I'm pretty much sure that it didn't come from the forestry area of our department.</p>	
40	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rex Patrick	Risk mitigation strategies relating to the Tasman Bridge	<p>Senator PATRICK: What about compatibility between the ship and the Tasman Bridge?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: That's an issue that's being risk assessed by TasPorts due to the size and complexity of the vessel. We designed the vessel and constructed it to fit under the bridge. The port parameters are based around a Panamax-size vessel, and, as you would know, Senator, this is a dramatically different vessel in waterline profile to a Panamax vessel, so we are working with TasPorts to make sure that is safe.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: But that should have been thought about even prior to contract, one would have thought.</p> <p>Don't you have to go under that bridge to refuel-is that right?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: Yes, at the moment the current practice is to go to Self's Point, but I would say that there are operational efficiencies that can be gained by looking at future options to refuel alongside. Those parameters for transiting the Tasman Bridge were built into the design criteria at the beginning of the contract.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. Perhaps you could provide on notice a description of your risk mitigation strategies in relation to the bridge.</p>	47-48
41	Department of	Rex Patrick	Modifications to Nuyina	<p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. As part of the sea trials, you've indicated that you're undergoing updating in relation to the project due to additional knowledge and technology changes.</p>	47

	Agriculture, Water and the Environment			<p>What are the modifications that are now being made to the vessel? Is it a lengthy list? Is it something short? If it's lengthy, I'd ask you to put that on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: Take that on notice please, Mr Bryson. That would be great.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: Okay.</p>	
42	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rex Patrick	Advice on the status of Nuyina	<p>Senator PATRICK: I want to go back to some statements that you made in past estimates. In October 2019 Senator Urquhart asked about the status of the vessel, and you advised, quoting from the Hansard: 'We've been formally advised that the ship was 13 weeks late'. Senator Urquhart asked some further questions in October 2020. But in the response to a question on notice from Senator Brown-question 130-you responded: 'The Australian Antarctic Division was advised of a 13-to-26-week delay due to the completion of RSV Nuyina in July 2019 by Serco Defence.' Senator Urquhart asked a question in October. You already had advice that the ship may be between 13 and 26 weeks delayed. Why did you tell Senator Urquhart that it was 13 weeks delayed when that's not what the shipbuilder had advised?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Each time we provide an update at these Senate estimates hearings, we provide the latest and most accurate information we can get from the contractor on that construction. I think the point I made to you in a previous Senate estimates is that it's the best advice we have at the time. As you'd know, often issues arise in shipbuilding that are difficult to predict each time. Of course, on top of that, the COVID-19-</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I don't want to go there. This is before COVID. The answer to the question very clearly states that the AAD was advised of a 13-to-26-week delay to completion of the vessel in July 2019. Yet in October 2019 Senator Urquhart asked the question and you said: 'We've been formally advised that the ship will be 13 weeks late.' Why were you not transparent with the committee in relation to the full extent of the delay that had been advised by the shipbuilder?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Again, the advice we provide each time is the most current advice at each of the Senate estimates hearings that we get from the contractor, Serco-</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Do you not understand what I'm saying?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I do.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I'm saying in July 2019 you were aware that there would be a 13-to-26-week delay, yet in October-that's three months later-you advised this committee: 'We've been formally advised that the ship will be 13 weeks late.' That's clearly not what was known by the department.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I have to go on my memory for this, but in July we were advised by Serco that it would be between 13 and 26 weeks. In October period my understanding is that Serco had advised us at that stage it would be 13 weeks.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can you please provide the advice that was given to the committee, in respect of the 2019 written advice, and any subsequent advice that caused you not to</p>	46-47

				then advise Senator Urquhart that it could be up to 26 weeks late. Mr Ellis: Certainly.	
43	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Protection of the greater glider	<p>Senator RICE: On the conservation advice: at the moment in East Gippsland, there is logging that's proposed on the Errinundra Plateau, an area of forest which has documented high density of greater gliders. Under that conservation advice, you would think that that should be enough to say this logging shouldn't proceed. People on the ground tell me that the Victorian department is continuing to proceed with logging. They have revised logging plans that basically did zip for protection of greater gliders Is this acceptable for a species that has now become endangered, that in the last couple of years has moved from threatened to endangered because of the fires? You are telling me that basically the department is going to take years before there is any enforceable action that would be would be in place-years, in which case it's absolutely certain that it will have shifted towards being critically endangered?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: To clarify: I don't think that we're saying that there is no enforceable action that can be taken. I think we're saying that there is comprehensive conservation advice that is in force. The action that you're talking about isn't one for the Commonwealth government. It's certainly sounds like it's one for the Victorian government. We would be happy to follow up and look at some details of that on notice, but I don't think it would be right to say that there is no enforceable conservation planning in place for the greater glider at the moment.</p>	23-24
44	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Who was involved in the Resilient Landscapes Hub	<p>Senator RICE: ... What other institutions or bid partners are involved in that consortium?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I can't tell you who else is involved in that consortium at the moment. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I thought you had all the information about the hub. It is a pretty basic question as to who the consortium is.</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I can get that information for you very quickly.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me who led the other consortiums for the other two bids?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: You are asking who the other applicants were?</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: They are the unsuccessfuls, Senator?</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I'm not sure we've made that public. I would need to check. It's not normal process to provide that information on who the unsuccessfuls were.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is there any reason why it can't be public? Is there a public interest immunity claim that you're mounting?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: No. We'll just check and see how we can assist.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Normally we would do it by consent if we're going to make it public.</p> <p>...</p>	68-69

				<p>Ms O'Connell: On your earlier question on who is involved in the hub with WA, the announcement that the minister made on 10 December lists that. I will specifically refer to the component. It says:</p> <p>The Hub will be hosted by the University of Western Australia and led by Professor Michael Douglas and will deliver national coverage through partnerships with the CSIRO and highly regarded research institutions such as James Cook University, Griffith University, University of Tasmania, Curtin University, Queensland University of Technology, Macquarie University, University of Newcastle, University of New England, University of Southern Queensland, Flinders University, Charles Darwin University, and La Trobe University.</p> <p>That is the 10 December announcement, if it is easier than taking notes from all of that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Who was on the selection advisory panel?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: We can provide a full list of names.</p>	
45	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Information regarding assessment of applications to the Resilient Landscapes Hub	<p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me, then, where the UWA bid excelled compared with the others? Is there anything that made them stand out?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Because these things are relative, they are comparative, so it's compared to the other applicants in the process. Certainly a rigorous selection process is undertaken. But as to providing information now about the comparative merits of one proposal relative to other proposals or other applications—</p> <p>Senator RICE: Perhaps you could take on notice what you could share with me as to why that proposal was successful.</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I'm happy to.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: Would it be possible to get a copy of the assessment against the criteria of the three bids?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I would have to take on notice whether we could provide the assessment of that application.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you confirm that the department's assessment scored that University of WA bid ahead of the other two bids?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Certainly bids are ranked as highly suitable. It was ranked highly suitable.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Did the three bids actually end up with a score?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Yes. All three bids were ranked.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Did the UWA bid score the highest?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Yes, it did.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: It also reflects a very competitive process.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could I get sent whatever information? I have been sent a copy of one of the other successful bids. I'm surprised. I think it was a very competitive process.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: It was.</p>	69

				<p>Senator RICE: But given the calibre of the researcher and the institutions involved in one of the other bids, I'm extremely surprised that the winning bid scored more highly than that bid. If you could take on notice any information, please, particularly in terms of the assessment against those selection criteria, that is what I would appreciate. Thank you.</p>	
46	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Engagement with applicants for the Resilient Landscapes Hub	<p>Senator RICE: Thank you. It is the National Environmental Science Program that I wish to follow up. How many consortiums put in a formal submission to the request for tender about the resilient landscapes?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: There were three applicants for the Resilient Landscapes Hub and 12 applicants in all across all four hubs.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Was there a process of engagement with the applicants before finalising the submission?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: There are grant opportunity guidelines published on the website and there are opportunities for potential applicants to ask questions of the department about the grant opportunities.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Were they taken up? Was there engagement with the three consortiums before their submission was put in?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I would have to take on notice whether or not the department spoke to those three applicants.</p>	68
47	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Consultation and engagement with Indigenous Australians regarding decision-making processes	<p>Senator THORPE: It's related. It's part of the education that everyone needs to learn. I want to know, does systemic racism play a part in your department's structure that does not allow for First People to be at the table to protect our totems, which have been around for thousands as generations-as we have?</p> <p>Senator Hume: I'm really not sure how to answer that Senator Thorpe. I think what I can safely say is that nowhere in the department would systemic racism play a part in the decisions that it makes.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Can I have some more detail about that, please?</p> <p>Senator Hume: No, because I don't fully understand the question. Perhaps if you could unpack the question a little more?</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Can I put that on notice for you to unpack and your department to unpack?</p> <p>CHAIR: Perhaps if you put a detailed question on notice then the department can come back to you on that.</p> <p>We are well behind here and-</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Okay, I'll ask my next question if it makes it easier. How many Aboriginal people provide their expertise and their science on the decision-making processes that your department makes?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Many do. I'd have to check because we do have extensive engagement and consultation with Indigenous Australians across the full range of programs that we</p>	45

				<p>administer, but I'm happy to provide a detailed answer to you.</p> <p>Senator Hume: Senator Thorpe, I'll just clarify that there is an Indigenous representative on the Threatened Species Scientific Committee.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Thank you, if you could provide those details, that would be great.</p> <p>Senator Hume: I think I just did.</p>	
48	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Milestone schedule for the Nuyina	<p>Senator URQUHART: I'll try to be quick, because I know we're running behind. I've got a few questions about the Nuyina. I think we've been given different advice each estimates about the delay in the completion of Nuyina. With respect to the delivery and operational commencement of the Nuyina, can you give me an update on the milestone schedule?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Certainly. I might just open with a quick background. The Nuyina project is progressing well, but it has, of course, had significant impacts from the COVID-19 outbreak in Europe. As you may be aware, a decision was made in conjunction with Serco-which is leading the design-build-operate-maintain contract-to tow the Nuyina from its port of construction, Galati, in Romania, through to the Netherlands so that final work could be completed and sea trials could commence.</p> <p>Sea and harbour trials are underway. They've been very successful and have really put the ship through its paces. It's now returned to the Netherlands for dry-docking, to undertake some essential repairs that came out of those sea trials, prior to commencing ice trials later in the year and then its delivery voyage to Australia. We're anticipating that the vessel will be delivered in late August or early September this year and will be available to participate-albeit in its early workup stages-in the 2021-22 project.</p> <p>I'll hand over to my colleague Mr Bryson, who can give you a bit more detail about the milestones work on the ship and perhaps some of the more technical details, if you'd like, on the issues to do with the repairs and development of the ship.</p> <p>CHAIR: Mr Ellis, just before we do that: do you require that detail, Senator Urquhart?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: No. I was just going to say that I'd be happy to have a more detailed explanation of the milestones taken on notice, for reasons of time.</p>	46
49	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Hopevale Mine additional cultural heritage assessments and standard process used to ensure First Nations peoples are consulted	<p>Senator WATERS: Great. Thank you. That's good news. I want to check on the status of the assessment of that project and, in particular, whether additional cultural heritage assessments will be undertaken.</p> <p>Mr McNee: It is being assessed under the bilateral agreement by the Queensland Department of Environment and Science. Because a significant proportion of the project is also within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, considerations that come with advice from that will also be considered. As to specifically the particular detail of whether the additional material will be considered, I might have to come back to you on notice on that. But I would anticipate that all of those perspectives-obviously it is a significant indigenous area-and information will be a part of the final material that will come to us from Queensland.</p>	62-63

Senator WATERS: So you are anticipating that additional cultural heritage assessments will in fact be undertaken under the state process that will then come to you?

Mr McNee: Yes. I might have to come back to you on notice in terms of additional, yes.

Senator WATERS: Thank you. Can you clarify the process that the department uses to make sure that all first nations groups affected by a development are properly consulted and heard?

Mr McNee: Obviously, there are the processes that come from the arrangements that sit under the assessment, whether it is a bilateral assessment in terms of a number of elements of public engagement, where the material is published. Relevant ministers, including the minister for indigenous affairs, are also consulted as a part of the final decision. Obviously, as happened in this case, stakeholders have also written to the minister indicating their interests.

Senator WATERS: So the process is that if someone writes to you and raises an issue, you will seek to meet with them or find out more? You won't undertake any own volition investigations to make sure that the First Nations people of the relevant bit of land have been consulted. Is that right?

Mr McNee: No. I think what I said is that obviously various issues are raised during assessment processes. To the extent that they are important in terms of resolving a final decision or position in terms of those assessments, they certainly need to be considered as a part of the assessment.

Senator WATERS: Yes. My question goes to the process the department uses to make sure it is talking to the First Nations people that speak for that relevant part of the land.

Mr McNee: Yes.

Senator WATERS: What is the answer to that question?

Mr McNee: I think in this case there is obviously a contest in terms of that because we have received some material, obviously, from the proponents, who have indicated an engagement with the Hopevale Congress. We've received other information that has come from a group that have indicated that. So, as I said, we're looking at that material now and we really will have to consider how we progress that forward and whether we talk to Queensland in particular about how that might be considered as part of the work they are doing.

Senator WATERS: I have had a noise that probably indicates some wrapping up. Could you please take on notice to answer that question a bit more fulsomely. I'm interested in whether you have a standard process where such situations arise, as they often do. If so, what is that process, or is it a purely reactive process?

Mr McNee: Yes. I do take that on notice.

50	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Engagement with landholders around water quality issues	<p>Senator WATERS: Have any additional resources been sought by the department or GBRMPA to do that additional engagement work?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Primarily as it relates to the regulations, because it is Queensland government regulations, they have received additional resources to assist them in the implementation of the regulations.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: From whom?</p> <p>Ms Callister: From within the Queensland government. There is a whole range of outreach programs and so on that they are implementing with farmers to help them understand the regulations and their reporting obligations and so on. The work that we're doing is focused on a range of other activities around working with cane farmers and with graziers in particular. The additional resources include things such as the \$201 million under the reef trust partnership for water quality improvement.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you on notice provide me with a bit more detail of those engagement activities that the department is undertaking as opposed to the Queensland government led ones? I'm across them.</p> <p>Ms Callister: We're not doing the direct engagement for the regulations.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: You said you were doing cane farmers and water quality.</p> <p>Ms Callister: Certainly in relation to individual projects, but not assisting the farmers with regulations.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Any direct engagement that your department is having with landholders around water quality issues would be tops.</p>	92
51	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Climate vulnerability assessment - CSIRO	<p>Senator WATERS: I will move now to the climate vulnerability assessment that I understand CSIRO has been working on. I'm interested in whether GBRMPA or the department-but primarily GBRMPA-has been working on that climate vulnerability assessment.</p> <p>Ms Callister: Perhaps I can explain what I think you are referring to. The department has engaged CSIRO to do some climate vulnerability work across all of our World Heritage properties.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Callister: I'm not aware of whether they would have necessarily gone to GBRMPA about that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Answer my question.</p> <p>Ms Callister: Quite possibly they may have. I will ask Dr Wachenfeld whether they've asked for any specific information as it relates to the Great Barrier Reef.</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: We've certainly shared with them and brought to their attention all of the information in the outlook report pertaining to climate change in the Great Barrier Reef. We've seen, I think, one or two drafts of some of their material, which we have commented on for them.</p>	91

				<p>Senator WATERS: Can I check that the project is still on track to be completed before we expect the World Heritage Committee meeting?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I'm not entirely sure what the timing is for the completion of it and whether it will be before the meeting. I thought it was going to be completed some time this year, but I don't know whether it was due to be completed before the meeting. So I will take that on notice. Unfortunately-perhaps someone has more information-my colleague who is responsible for that isn't in the room. We can come back to you on that one.</p>	
52	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	Fire and rescue training for AAD deployees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further to questions from Senator Carr during the recent estimates hearings, has the Tasmanian Government given a commitment to honour the remainder of the contract to provide fire and rescue services training?</li> <li>2. Has the Tasmanian Government or any of their agencies, expressed any interest in tendering or re-tendering for the provision of these training services?</li> </ol>	Written
53	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Patrick Dodson	Indigenous Protected Areas Funding	<p>With reference to the government's 2017 commitment of \$15 million for Indigenous Protected Areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total area covered by that commitment?</li> <li>2. How much has been expensed?</li> <li>3. How much has been spent?</li> <li>4. What is the total size of all Indigenous Protect Areas funded by the government?</li> <li>5. What is the total amount of funding committed to Indigenous Protected Areas?</li> <li>6. Are there any plans to increase the number of Indigenous Protected Areas?</li> <li>7. Please provide a map of all Indigenous Protect Areas funded by government?</li> </ol>	Written
54	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Katy Gallagher	Working from home requests - Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many requests to work from home on an ongoing basis has your agency received from staff since the Australian Public Service Commission published 'Circular 2020/9: Returning to Usual Workplaces' on 29 September 2020?</li> <li>2. How many of these requests have been rejected and approved? Please outline the reasons that requests were rejected.</li> </ol>	Written
55	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Katy Gallagher	Staffing - Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a staffing profile for the agency as at 1 January 2021 and 01 April 2021 by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. APS ongoing: headcount and ASL;</li> <li>b. APS non-ongoing: headcount and ASL;</li> <li>c. Labour hire staff; headcount and FTE; and</li> <li>d. Other contractors.; headcount and FTE</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount.</li> </ol>	Written

				3. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2020.	
56	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Ecosystem collapse	<p>Leading scientists working across Australia and Antarctica have described 19 ecosystems that are collapsing due to the impact of humans and warned urgent action is required to prevent their complete loss. A groundbreaking report - the result of work by 38 scientists from 29 universities and government agencies - details the degradation of coral reefs, arid outback deserts, tropical savanna, the waterways of the Murray-Darling Basin, mangroves in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and forests stretching from the rainforests of the far north to Gondwana-era conifers in Tasmania.</p> <p>1. Has the department seen the paper completed recently outlining 19 Australian ecosystems are currently collapsing?</p> <p>a. Has the department been asked to undertake any further action to address these collapsing ecosystems?</p> <p>b. Has the department analysed the findings to see how these correspond with EPBC listed ecological communities, threatened species and other matters of national environmental significance?</p> <p>c. Are any of the ecosystems identified as collapsing listed as a threatened ecological community?</p> <p>2. Can an example be provided of any Australian ecosystem that is dramatically improving due to current government expenditure?</p> <p>3. Has the Department completed or sought any assessments of the economic costs to the nation of widespread ecosystem collapse?</p>	Written
57	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Overdue recovery plans and critically endangered species	<p>1. What needs to happen to address the backlog of the 168 overdue recovery plans in order to achieve compliance with the statutory requirements?</p> <p>a. What is the holdup?</p> <p>2. What will the impact of the Snowy 2.0 major project be on the critically endangered and newly discovered fish species, Stocky Galaxias?</p> <p>a. Will the project likely cause the extinction in the wild of this species?</p> <p>b. What is being done to ensure the survival of this species in the wild?</p>	Written
58	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Convention on Biological Diversity	<p>Noting that the Government committed to the Convention on Biological Diversity target of 10% of each ecoregion in protected areas by 2020 and noting that according to Australia's 6th national report to the Convention, 27 of 89 bioregions still have less than 10 per cent protected.</p> <p>The 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 15) to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity this year is scheduled to commit to the draft protected areas target of: "Target 2. By 2030, protect and conserve through well connected and effective system of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures at least 30 per</p>	Written

				<p>cent of the planet with the focus on areas particularly important for biodiversity."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the Government commit Australia at the 15th CoP of the Convention on Biological Diversity this year to the draft protected areas target 2, to protect at least 30 per cent of each bioregion on land and sea to ensure ecologically balanced protection [as already committed to in existing National Reserve System strategies]?</li> <li>2. How does the Government propose to achieve that goal considering that there is zero federal funding presently committed to assist conservancies, private landholders, Indigenous communities and state government partners in acquisition of land, apart from a tiny \$15m investment in Indigenous Protected Areas? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the Government accept that it will not be able to make meaningful progress toward this target unless a major new injection of funding is made?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. 70 countries have signed on to a Global Nature Pledge committing to reverse biodiversity loss by 2030 for sustainable development. Why has Australia refused to sign on to this pledge?</li> <li>4. Over the next 12 months the 15th meeting of the COP 15 to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity will take place. Countries will be asked at that meeting to sign on to a 'zero extinctions' commitment, committing the necessary actions to turn the tide on global species extinctions rates which are ever-increasing. As the country with the highest rate of mammal extinctions, will we be signing on to this target?</li> </ol>	
59	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Koalas and threatened species	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What area of habitat used, or likely to have been used, by Koalas and Greater Gliders was bulldozed or logged since the species or population (for east coast koalas) was listed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. as 'vulnerable' under the EPBC Act?</li> <li>b. since the Koala was added to the priority list for assessment as endangered?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. How many species have been up-listed as endangered since the black summer bushfires (since July 2019)? Please provide a list of species and when the EPBC status was revised.</li> </ol>	Written
60	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Departmental resourcing, devolution, and accreditation	<p>The Department has said that all Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) need to be devolved through approval bilateral agreements, including international commitments e.g. Ramsar, World Heritage, Commonwealth Marine etc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will devolution include approvals for actions impacting the Commonwealth Marine Area? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Why would states take on this responsibility?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. How will approval decisions for EPBC MNES matters be funded by the States? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What additional resources will be provided to states to assist them?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. What structures will remain in place in the Department to ensure expertise for approvals is retained if matters need to be called back in e.g. cross border issues etc.?</li> </ol>	Written
61	Department of Agriculture,	Sarah Hanson-Young	Proposed runway	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the regulations under the Antarctic Treaty with regard to Wildlife Approach Distances that might impact the siting of the proposed runway? Does the proposed runway meet that regulation?</li> </ol>	Written

Water and the Environment				<p>2. How much has the AAD spent on consultancies in total and please table a breakdown of which companies and for what and how much?</p> <p>3. Is engineering company AECOM the consultant for the proposed runway/airstrip? How much has been paid and what are details of the contract time wise and costs and for what? Does it include an EIS?</p> <p>4. I refer to the tender documents that were released seeking a business partner for the runway, how many companies were quoted?</p> <p>a. Were companies paid to submit quotations and, if so, how much in total and a breakdown?</p> <p>b. Who has access to the data compiled as part of the tender process? Shouldn't the public have access to that data so as to assess what is being proposed?</p> <p>5. Current information suggests that aircraft as large as Dreamliner's will use the new runway and need to be that large to carry the fuel load required to get there, what happens to people and to wildlife if there is a crash?</p> <p>6. When will the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of the proposed airstrip be released?</p> <p>a. Will the Australian community have a chance to respond before it is submitted to the Antarctic Treaty process? If not, why not?</p> <p>b. Surely the Australian community needs to respond to Australian Government policy and proposals before it goes before the international community. Will you now revise the timeline and release it to the Australian community well in advance of anything going to the international community?</p> <p>7. When the AAD gave evidence in the most recent senate estimates it suggested that refuelling the RSV Nuyina by ground tanker was an option, if the vessel could not fit through the Tasman Bridge. The Hobart Ports Corporation (when it existed) banned that practice many years ago because of the risk of spillage. Why would the AAD look into such a risky refuelling process?</p> <p>8. Can the AAD unequivocally say that the proposed airstrip does not contravene the Wildlife Approach guidelines of 2.1kms, in both the Departments own Aviation IEE and the Antarctic Treaty System guidelines, for planes with 2 or more engines?</p> <p>9. When the AAD gave evidence in the most recent senate estimate, it was stated that another \$55 million has been allocated to the project. Is this on top of the \$76.8 million already allocated?</p> <p>10. Does the AAD have a projected carbon emission figure for the project?</p> <p>11. Given that the tender process is not complete, nor has the business case been presented but \$68 million dollars has already been spent on the project, can the AAD provide a very preliminary estimate on the total cost of the project?</p> <p>a. If a total cost cannot be provided, how much does the department estimate will be</p>	
---------------------------	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>spent before a total cost figure can be provided?</p> <p>12. Who is the final decision maker on the project, is it the Federal Environment Minister- currently Minister Ley- if not then who?</p> <p>13. Does the Minister for Defence have involvement in the project, if yes, how?</p> <p>14. Does the Minister for Foreign Affairs have any involvement in the Davis Aerodrome project?</p>	
62	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kimberley Kitching	Engagement with Services Australia	<p>1. Did the department/agency engage with Services Australia in any capacity in the 2019-20 financial year? If yes, please provide full particulars.</p> <p>2. Has the department/agency engaged with Services Australia in any capacity in the current financial year to 31 March 2021? If yes, please provide full particulars.</p> <p>3. In the 2019-20 financial year, did the department/agency supply services or information to Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars.</p> <p>4. In the current financial year to 31 March 2021, has the department/agency supplied services or information to Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars.</p> <p>5. Does the department/agency employ technology or apps for users to access its services? If yes, did/does Services Australia have any involvement in the creation, development or ongoing maintenance of that technology or those apps? Please provide full particulars.</p> <p>6. Does the department/agency receive data, statistics or research information from Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars.</p>	Written
63	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Malarndirri McCarthy	Indigenous Protected Areas	<p>1. In 2017 the Government committed to \$15m to Indigenous Protected Areas. Has that been fully spent? What's the total amount of funding committed to Indigenous Protected areas?</p>	Written
64	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Samantha McMahon	Threatened species listings	<p>1. Can you please outline how you are ensuring that state and commonwealth threatened species lists are consistent?</p> <p>2. Can you please identify how you categorise species habitat?</p> <p>a. Is methodology consistent between state and commonwealth agencies?</p> <p>3. Are the mapped areas consistent between Commonwealth and States?</p> <p>4. Can you advise who undertakes the species mapping?</p> <p>a. Is it a cost which the land holder must wear when they undertake an application?</p> <p>5. Can you please outline the timeframe for a species to be listed? I note the flow chart which outlines this process.</p> <p>6. Can you please outline which species have been recently listed?</p> <p>a. Can you identify the types of stakeholders which make these nominations?</p>	Written

65	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Helen Polley	National partnership payments for the environment	<p>1. The Government made an announcement in the 2020-21 Budget papers that they would allocate \$7.5 million for Tasmania Under National Partnerships payments for the environment, COVID-19 World and National Heritage. How much of this has been spent? Can you provide me break down of how this funding has been allocated and used?</p> <p>2. Under the COVI-19 World and National Heritage payment, \$33.5 million was announced in Budget paper 1, but only \$32.7 million was allocated in Budget paper 3. Can you explain the discrepancy? This fund allocated money to be spent in 2020-21, how much has been spent in total to date? Is the funding on track to be delivered by the end of the financial year? If not, what is the reason for the delay?</p>	Written
66	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Bushfires implementation	<p>1. The Department is identified as the responsible agency for implementation of recommendation 16.1 - has the Minister formally instructed the Department to lead this implementation?</p> <p>a. What steps, if any, has your Department taken to implement this recommendation?</p> <p>b. The Government's response to the recommendation states "The Commonwealth, with all states and territories, has agreed to establish a common method for the assessment and listing of threatened species." The recommendation itself is asking for "greater consistency and collaboration in the collation, storage, access and provision of data on the distribution and conservation status of Australian flora and fauna." Will your implementation cover this more comprehensive standard as outlined by the Royal Commission?</p> <p>c. Unlike the majority of the recommendations, the Government's implementation tracker does not offer a delivery date for this recommendation. Can you outline when the implementation of this recommendation will be completed?</p> <p>2. Has additional funding been provided or promised to implement recommendations 18.1 and 18.2?</p>	Written
67	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	National Environmental Science Program	<p>1. Please provide a copy of the contracts for the new ecology hub under the National Science Environmental Program.</p>	Written
68	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Resilient Landscapes research hub - advice or input provided to government	<p>1. Did the TSSC provide any advice or input to government on which research consortium would be funded to provide the Resilient Landscapes Research Hub?</p>	Written

69	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Malcolm Roberts	PFAS	<p>1. The minutes of your most recent 3 meetings that we obtained under document discovery indicate that the only activity of this taskforce is to co-ordinate discussion on PFAS between departments. There appears to be no discussion of compensation, remediation and like-for-like relocation. Have these matters been considered by the PFAS Taskforce?</p> <p>2. Is the Department aware of any activity by the Department of the Environment in respect of remediation, compensation and/or like for like relocation? If not then can the Department steer me to any other person within the Government that is handling these matters?</p> <p>3. I understand that there are now just under 1000 sites across Australia that are affected by PFAS. Does your department or the Taskforce maintain an accurate and current list of these contaminations, and can you make that list available to my Office?</p> <p>4. The EU has now introduced a new limit for PFAS contamination in food of 6 nanograms per kg of bodyweight per day. In the Department of Health's "Health based guidance for PFAS" the limit is set to 20 nanograms per b/w. If we accept that the Australian market will develop to accommodate the 20 ng figure, what steps is the Department of Agriculture taking to ensure our exports to the EU meet their lower 6ng figure? Is any assistance available to producers in respect of remediating or testing PFAS in their supply chain, including in their property?</p> <p>5. Is the Department conducting any public awareness campaigns amongst producers to make them aware of the PFAS danger?</p>	
70	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	Scarborough LNG development	<p>In reference to the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA) assessment and approval of the Offshore Project Proposal (OPP) for the Scarborough project:</p> <p>1. Is the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (DAWE) aware that the proponent has relied on the 2019 International Energy Agency (IEA) Stated Policies Scenario "STEPS" to support its claims about market demand for liquefied natural gas (LNG) that would be produced by the Scarborough project?</p> <p>2. What global temperature scenario does the DAWE believe the IEA STEPS scenario is aligned with?</p> <p>3. Does the Department believe that this temperature scenario is an environmentally acceptable outcome for Australia?</p> <p>4. Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement?</p> <p>5. Is DAWE concerned that NOPSEMA did not require the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to an energy scenario that is compatible with the Paris Agreement and an environmentally acceptable temperature outcome for Australia?</p> <p>6. Is DAWE concerned that NOPSEMA allowed the proponent to justify its market demand</p>	Written

				<p>for LNG in reference to a global energy market scenario that is up to date, instead allowing the proponent to rely on outdated scenarios?</p> <p>7. Was DAWE made aware of advice received by NOPSEMA from DISER which questioned the market demand projections for Scarborough, stating that: "significant uncertainty as to the scale and durability of the demand for imported LNG in developing markets around the world" "The (IEA) have noted that emerging markets in Asia face higher costs for imports than domestically produced gas and imports of coal," she wrote. "I note this uncertainty is not mentioned in the extract of the Scarborough proposal. "It is the Department's view that if anything, this uncertainty could suggest a downward influence on LNG demand from emerging Asian markets".</p> <p>a. If so, was DAWE concerned about this advice?</p> <p>8. Is the Department aware that the 2020 updated IEA scenarios that are compatible with the Paris Agreement suggest a lower utilisation of gas and a lower market demand for LNG than is suggested in the previous 2019 scenarios?</p> <p>9. Has the Department considered the Scarborough project in reference to the updated IEA scenarios or sought further advice about its compatibility with updated scenarios or projections for global LNG demand?</p> <p>10. Has the Department examined the carbon pollution for other environmental impacts from the Scarborough project?</p> <p>11. Is the Department satisfied that the assessment of the project by NOPSEMA and the resulting OPP approval meet all the requirements of environmental impact assessment under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>12. Has there been any communication between DAWE and any other party to confirm that the assessment of the project and the approved OPP satisfies all of the requirements of the EPBC Act? If so, can the Department table that correspondence and any documents relevant to this consideration?</p> <p>13. Does the Department agree with the comment made by NOPSEMA in its media release published 2 April, 2020? "Woodside's proposal positions Scarborough gas to play a key role in the future global energy mix. Woodside will be contributing to global efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas levels by actively displacing more carbon-intensive power generation with gas, as a less carbon-intensive source of fuel."</p> <p>14. Does the Department consider that this statement remains true, give the updates that have been made to IEA energy demand scenarios and other global developments?</p> <p>15. Does the Department recognise a degree of uncertainty in relation to this statement and the extent it will remain true in the future?</p>	
71	Department of Agriculture,	Rachel Siewert	Woodside Burrup Hub GHG emissions	<p>1. What are the overall estimates of carbon pollution from Woodside's proposed Burrup Bub development which is currently under assessment?</p> <p>2. What is the total carbon footprint of the project and each of its components?</p>	Written

	Water and the Environment			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Browse Basin offshore development</li> <li>- Scarborough Onshore development</li> <li>- Gas processing at Pluto LNG facility</li> <li>- Gas processing at North West Shelf LNG facility</li> <li>- Scope 3 emissions from combustion of the gas overseas</li> </ul> <p>3. What mitigation measures are Woodside Proposing for each of these components?</p> <p>4. What impact does the Department believe the emissions from this project will have on Australia's overall emissions, AND on the Government's plan to 'meet and beat' the carbon pollution reduction targets under the Paris Agreement?</p> <p>5. What impact does the Department estimate this additional pollution will have on the Great Barrier Reef, and other environmental receptors that are sensitive to global warming?</p> <p>6. What level of additional risk from wildfires and extreme weather events in Australia does the Department attribute to this project? How does the Department measure those impacts?</p> <p>7. To the extent that this project will increase pollution in Australia, what pollution savings has the Department identified in other parts of the economy to make up for this increase, to ensure the emissions reduction goals can still be met? Will Woodside be paying for these savings to be achieved? If not, why not? Who will be paying for the savings that will be required to make room for the Burrup Hub developments?</p> <p>8. What limits on carbon pollution will be imposed on the various elements of the Burrup Hub development under the Safeguard Mechanism?</p>	
72	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	CCS at the Chevron Gorgon facility	<p>1. Is the Department aware of ongoing issues with the operation of the Chevron CCS facility at the Gorgon LNG plant on Barrow Island?</p> <p>2. Does the Department receive regular updates on the functioning of the Barrow Island LNG facility? If not, why not?</p> <p>3. Is there any ongoing obligation for Chevron to report on performance or other operational details about the Barrow Island CCS facility to the Commonwealth Government? If so, is this information made public?</p> <p>4. Does the Department have any concerns regarding the reliability, enforceability or transparency of the regulatory regime that is currently in place at the state level regarding the operation of the CCS facility on Barrow Island?</p> <p>5. Is it the expectation of the Department that Chevron will meet the regulatory requirements and conditions that government the Barrow Island CCS facility, including in the Ministerial Statement that applies to the facility under the WA environmental Protection Act?</p> <p>6. If so, does the Department expect that the facility will achieve the target that is set for CO2 reinjection over a 5 year average for the first period of operation?</p>	Written

				<p>7. Does the Department expect that Chevron will provide alternative offsets for any shortfall in meeting this target? If so, is the Department aware of what alternative offsets may be provided and what standard they would meet?</p> <p>8. Is the Department aware of limits that have been placed on the operation of the CCS facility by the WA Government regulator? If so, can the department table relevant information and documents?</p> <p>9. Has the Department been advised, or made its own assessment of what impact these limits or the other operational issues with the CCS facility will have on the amount of Carbon that will be sequestered at Barrow Island? If so, what is the Department's current understanding of this?</p> <p>10. Has the Department examined the environmental risks associated with the remedies that Chevron is employing to correct the ongoing issues with the operation of the CCS facility?</p>	
73	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	Carbon Capture and Storage at the Browse Basin LNG development	<p>1. Is Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) part of the proposal currently being assessed by the Department for the Browse Basin gas development?</p> <p>2. If not, what assessment process and approvals will be required should the proponent seek to undertake CCS in the future?</p> <p>3. Is the Department aware that the proponent has told shareholders and investors via its annual reporting that CCS would be included as part of the Browse Basin development?</p> <p>4. In relation to CCS for the Browse Basin development, is the Department aware of the comment from Woodside Chief Executive Peter Coleman, quoted in the Australian that: "It doesn't affect the economics in a material way. I'd hate to say that to a regulator. But it's very important and I think the project is robust enough to handle it,"?</p> <p>5. Is the Department concerned that the proponent is saying one thing to shareholders and investors, and a different thing to regulators?</p>	Written
74	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	Scarborough Project	<p>1. Is the Department aware that Woodside has increased the size of the resource in the Scarborough field by 50% since the original offshore project proposal (OPP) was released for public consultation by NOPSEMA?</p> <p>2. Given this increase will inevitably result in significantly greater carbon pollution from the Scarborough project, does the Department believe this consultation process was adequate, and does it meet the requirements of the EPBC Act?</p> <p>3. Is the Department confident that the OPP and NOPSEMA approval meets the requirements of the EPBC Act more generally?</p> <p>4. Are there any other Commonwealth Approvals under the EPBC Act required for the processing for the Scarborough gas?</p> <p>5. Is the Department aware of the court case brought by the Conservation Council of Western Australia against the environmental approvals that have been issued by the WA EPA for processing the Scarborough gas, without environmental impact assessment?</p>	Written

				<p>6. Are the state government approvals that are being challenged in the WA Supreme Court reflected in any Commonwealth approvals under the EPBC Act? Or were these approvals made under the Bilateral Agreement?</p> <p>7. Does this court case raise any issues at all for Commonwealth Approvals?</p>	
75	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	CCS at the Barossa LNG development	<p>1. Has the Department assessed the environmental impacts of undertaking CCS at the Barossa Development?</p> <p>2. If so, how much carbon is assumed to be reinjected, how, and where?</p> <p>3. Has the Department assessed the overall carbon emissions from the Barossa LNG development? If so, what are the projected lifecycle emissions from each part of the development?</p> <p>4. What is the projected carbon intensity of the Barossa development per unit of LNG exported, and how does this compare with other LNG developments?</p>	Written
76	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	The impact of acid gas emissions from additional gas processing on Murujuga rock art	<p>1. Is the Department concerned that increased gas processing on the Burrup Peninsula, which is alleged in the WA Supreme Court to have been approved by the WA EPA without environmental impact assessment, presents any risk to the Murujuga Rock Art on the Burrup Peninsula which is proposed for World Heritage Listing?</p> <p>2. Is the Department aware of ongoing studies to examine the impact of acids gas emissions from gas processing and other gas-related industry on the Burrup on the Murujuga rock art?</p> <p>3. Given the World Heritage listing status of the Burrup, is the Department required under the EPBC Act to examine the impacts of significant increases in gas processing, both in volume and duration, on the Murujuga Rock Art? If so, when will these assessments commence and how will they occur?</p> <p>4. Is the Department / Minister satisfied that the impacts on Murujuga Rock Art from additional gas processing on the Burrup are being adequately managed by the WA Government Aboriginal Heritage Act and Environmental Protection Act?</p> <p>5. Can the Department identify exactly what protections for this heritage exist at a state level and how they satisfy the responsibilities of the Commonwealth towards the protection of National and World Heritage places under the EPBC Act, and more generally?</p>	Written
77	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rachel Siewert	Submerged Aboriginal Heritage	<p>1. Is the Department aware of concerns regarding impacts on submerged Aboriginal Heritage in relation to the Scarborough nearshore tieback project currently being assessed by the WA State Government?</p> <p>2. Is the Commonwealth Government required to assess this component of the development? If not, why not?</p> <p>3. Given this area is under assessment for World Heritage listing, does the Commonwealth have a responsibility under the EPBC Act to investigate these concerns and potential impacts?</p>	Written

				4. Given what we have seen with Rio Tinto Juukan Gorge disaster, does the Department believe that the Aboriginal heritage protection arrangements currently in place in Western Australia are adequate to manage the risks to the submerged heritage from this development?	
78	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jordon Steele-John	Rum Jungle uranium mine NT	<p>1. What is the current Australian Government process for approving the Rum Jungle Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)? When can we expect a decision or further consultation on the EIS?</p> <p>2. What is the decision-making process of the EIS with regard to the Detailed Business Case (DBC) which we understand is being developed and which may present options that are inconsistent with the EIS?</p> <p>3. Will the DBC be made public and open for consultation with stakeholders?</p> <p>4. What is the process for approving commonwealth funding for the Rum Jungle rehabilitation, would this just be for Stage 3 works or for the whole project including post closure monitoring and maintenance?</p> <p>5. I note an allocation of \$3.5 million in the recent budget - what is this funding for precisely?</p>	Written
79	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jordon Steele-John	Ranger uranium mine NT	<p>1. There are a number of closure criteria that have been put forward for Ministerial approval and others that are draft and pending further engagement. What is the formal process for feedback and stakeholder engagement on the criteria for Ministerial approval and what is the formal process for approval - what standards for closure criteria are being applied?</p> <p>2. It is increasingly apparent that the scale of the rehabilitation works at Ranger will not feasibly be achieved within the 5-year time frame legislated for rehabilitation works. There is agreement amongst all stakeholders that the period should be extended and that this requires an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act. The traditional owners requested this occur several years ago. Now that we are approaching the end of the mining period, can you confirm the act will be amended? If the period is not extended, the Commonwealth resumes all responsibility for completion of rehabilitation, has the Commonwealth made financial provision for its costs to complete rehabilitation? Can the Commonwealth guarantee that the rehabilitation is effective in that the radioactive plume under the site is remediated, that the site is restored to a point that it could be incorporated back into the national park to a world heritage standard?</p> <p>a. What is the status of engagement with the World Heritage Committee engagement on the closure criteria?</p> <p>3. Can the department explain or break down the closure costs of Ranger - in the mine closure plan (MCP) it is explained that the expected cost is \$744 million which includes a range of things outside of the actual rehabilitation works, for example redundancies, is the department able to give a clearer indication of the actual costs of the rehabilitation work</p>	Written

				<p>it-self?</p> <p>a. What protections are there in place for post closure rehabilitation failure - are there any financial provision requirements from ERA/ Rio Tinto to protect against post closure failure of the rehabilitation works?</p> <p>4. Specifically on the existing pollution from the site - Following the 2009 (i.e. year 30) revelation that 100,000 litres were leaking every day from the tailings dam the CSIRO revised this up to 150,000 litres (we expect this may be greater - but don't have an update since 2010). That tailings seepage has now resulted in a contaminated plume of groundwater of 1GL (1 billion litres) under the tailings dam. Could you explain the plan and prioritisation of the remediation and ongoing management and monitoring of this plume?</p> <p>5. The current proposal to collapse the walls of the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) into the dam site once it is emptied presents a long-term monitoring requirement. What would you consider adequate monitoring for this location particularly given the history of Electrical Conductivity (EC) spikes downstream of the TSF? Will you be requiring any kind of intercept in the vicinity of the TSF site? How long can we expect monitoring to continue after 2026?</p> <p>6. I understand that Jacobs was contracted to undertake a Social Impact Statement, will that be made publicly available? Given that the very nature of that report discusses communities and has a high level of public interest we are eager to understand the process and requirements for ERA/ Rio Tinto to release and consult on that report and its outcomes. What government agency is responsible for regulating this aspect of the project?</p>	
80	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Conflict of interest register - compliance division	<p>1. With reference to the compliance division within the department:</p> <p>a. Has a conflict of interest register been established? If not, why not?</p> <p>b. When will a register be established?</p> <p>c. When was the decision made to establish a conflict of interest register?</p> <p>d. Who would be required to complete a declaration should a register be established?</p>	Written
81	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Auditor General reports from 2014 - recommendation progress	<p>1. Please provide an update on the department's progress on each of the recommendations from Auditor General reports from 2014.</p>	Written
82	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Anne Urquhart	Environment budget	<p>1. Please table a detailed summary of the environment budget including the allocation of funding across all programs, measures, announcements made by the Minister, and grants as well as an outline of the funding as expended, committed, or unallocated including a breakdown by state and territory.</p>	Written

	the Environment				
83	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Programs	<p>1. With respect to all measures and programs announced since 2018, can you please provide details of:</p> <p>a. all programs that have changed names</p> <p>b. all programs that have changed funding arrangements</p> <p>2. Please provide a list of all programs, including grants programs, that have been underspent since 2019.</p>	Written
84	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Budgets	<p>1. What is the Department's environment budget (Departmental funding as separate from Administered funding)?</p> <p>a. Is that a change from last year? What was the budget last year?</p> <p>b. If so, why? What program areas have decreased? What program areas have increased? (Departmental funding).</p> <p>2. What about administered funding? What is the department's budget?</p> <p>a. Is that a change from last year? What was the budget last year?</p> <p>b. If so, why? What programs have decreased? What programs have increased?</p> <p>3. Please provide the total spend on all environmental programs each year since 2013.</p>	Written
85	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Marketing and consultants	<p>1. How much did the government spend in the last financial year on marketing?</p> <p>2. How much did the government spend in the last financial year on consultants?</p> <p>3. Can you provide a list of each contract, including the amount, the company and the purpose?</p>	Written
86	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Grants	<p>1. Does your department administer any grants programs or funds? If so, what are they?</p> <p>2. Do all of the grants programs have grant guidelines that are readily available to the public?</p> <p>3. Who is the decision-maker for these grants or funds? How is the decision-maker assisted in making their decisions - departmental advice, an advisory group, some other independent body?</p> <p>4. Were there any new grants programs or funds established in the 2020-21 MYEFO that your department is responsible for? If so, what are they, and how much funding was provided?</p> <p>5. For the new grants programs, have grant guidelines been developed? Where are they up to at the moment? Will you be consulting with the Department of Finance on these guidelines?</p> <p>6. For the new grants programs, who will be the decision-maker for the grants? How will the decision-maker be assisted in making their decisions, will it be departmental advice? An advisory group? Some other independent body?</p>	Written

				<p>7. For the new funds, how will funding be distributed?</p> <p>8. For the new funds, who will be the decision-maker for the funding? How will the decision-maker be assisted in making their decisions, will it be departmental advice? An advisory group? Some other independent body?</p> <p>9. How will the decision-making process ensure grants go to projects based on merit, and not whether they are in a marginal or target Liberal seat?</p> <p>10. Will the Department be having regard to the sports rorts scandal to ensure that is not repeated?</p> <p>11. What assurance can you give that this will not be another sports rorts scandal - and that projects will be funded based on their merit and not where they fall on a Prime Minister's colour coded spreadsheet?</p> <p>12. Were there any grants programs or funds that you administer that were provided with additional funding in the 2020-21 MYEFO? If so, what were they, and how much funding was provided?</p>	
87	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Roundtables hosted by the Minister for the Environment	<p>1. How many roundtables has the Minister hosted since May 2019?</p> <p>2. How much has been spent on roundtables hosted by the Minister for the Environment since May 2019?</p> <p>3. Please provide a list of all roundtables the Minister for the Environment has participated in or hosted since she came to the role, including associated costs.</p>	Written
88	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Staffing	<p>1. What is the total staffing of the Department of Environment/ Environment area of the new department?</p> <p>2. Can you detail staff in each area/division?</p> <p>3. Have there been any areas where staff numbers have decreased from last year? If yes, why and by what amount?</p> <p>4. What is the number of FTE staff that answer to Minister Ley? What is the number of FTE staff that answer to the other Ministers?</p>	Written
89	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Emergency response funding allocated	<p>1. With reference to the \$28 million allocated to further scientific assessment:</p> <p>a. How much of that is spent on existing arrangements within the department?</p> <p>b. Is any of these funds being used to hire more staff in the department?</p> <p>c. Has this been fully expensed?</p> <p>d. To what extent does this funding involve on-ground monitoring of species?</p> <p>e. Is the \$2 million koala census included in this funding amount?</p> <p>f. What activities will be funded within the department with this money, and who will be responsible for them?</p> <p>2. With reference to the \$2 million allocated to supporting knowledge exchange on Indigenous fire land management:</p> <p>a. How much has been expensed?</p>	Written

				<p>b. How much has been spent?</p> <p>c. Who are the recipients of this funding?</p> <p>3. With reference to the \$12 million allocated to grants:</p> <p>a. How are these funds administered?</p> <p>b. Have guidelines been developed?</p> <p>c. Which organisations are likely to receive these funds?</p>	
90	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Koala protection	<p>1. Does the government have any plans to renew the National Koala Conservation Strategy?</p> <p>2. I note that \$2 million will go towards a koala census, has that commenced? Who or which organisations are carrying out that census? Does the government plan to carry out a census for any other animal, especially after the bushfires?</p> <p>3. I note that part of this package includes \$14 million to restore impacted koala habitat in both bushfire and non-bushfire-affected areas. Which organisations are receiving these funds? Where have these funds come from? Are all of these funds going towards northern NSW and southern QLD? Does this include the \$6 million announced prior to the 2019 election?</p> <p>4. Where is the koala's recovery plan up to? How many years late is the recovery plan for the koala?</p> <p>5. When was the statutory deadline for the release of the Koala recovery plan?</p> <p>6. Does the Department have a timeframe for the finalisation of the plan?</p> <p>7. Is this development of the threatened species recovery plan for the Koala a government priority?</p> <p>8. It has been 9 years since a decision to make a plan was made - an exceptionally long time - what is the cause of the blockage?</p> <p>9. Has the Department analysed the recently announced changes in NSW planning laws in regard to the level of protection they afford Koalas?</p>	Written
91	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recovery plans	<p>1. How many species require a recovery plan? Please table a list.</p> <p>2. How many recovery plans are overdue? Please table a list, including species, when recovery plan was due and when it is expected to be complete.</p> <p>3. When can we expect the Tasmanian Devil recovery plan to be complete, when was it due, when will it be complete?</p> <p>a. What about the Southern Brown Bandicoot, or the Golden Bandicoot?</p> <p>b. What about the sea lion?</p> <p>c. What about the Northern Hairy-nosed wombat?</p> <p>d. What about the Whale Shark?</p> <p>4. What percentage of recovery plans are being implemented?</p> <p>5. What percentage of recovery plans are being monitored?</p> <p>6. How many staff are working on recovery plans in the department?</p>	Written

				<p>7. What percentage of recovery plans are reversing decline in species?</p> <p>8. How much money is allocated to recovery plans? Also, what is the average expenditure on each plan?</p> <p>9. Can you confirm that it is the law for recovery plans to be implemented should the TSSC determine one is required?</p>	
92	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Key threatening processes and threat abatement plans	<p>1. Since 2013, how many Key Threatening Processes have been listed? How many applications have been made? Please provide details of these.</p> <p>2. Since 2013, how many Threat Abatement Plans have been implemented? How many are currently being considered? Please provide details of these.</p> <p>3. There was no threat abatement plan for the bushfire crisis, is that correct? Would that have helped?</p> <p>4. Why haven't bushfires been listed as a threat under the Act?</p> <p>5. What has been listed under the Act since 2013?</p> <p>6. Where is the bushfire key threatening process listing up to?</p>	Written
93	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National Heritage Trust Special Account - breakdown of programs	<p>1. Please provide a break-down of all programs in the National Heritage Trust Special Account, including details of funding for Indigenous Rangers and Landcare.</p>	Written
94	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Species extinction	<p>1. 13 more species were recently added to the extinction list. We are considered the extinction capital of the world. Has the government reversed any species decline? If so, how and where?</p> <p>2. Did any of these species NOT have a recovery plan? What about conservation advice?</p> <p>3. What specific activities, if any, did the government undertake to attempt to save these species from extinction in the last 8 years?</p>	Written
95	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened species - recovery plans	<p>1. Please provide a detailed summary of threatened species requiring recovery plans and associated timelines including when each recovery plan was due, when work on the recovery plan commenced within the department, and expected completion dates.</p>	Written
96	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Ministerial Forums	<p>1. With the disbanding of the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Forum, the Lake Eyre Basin Ministerial Forum, the Wet Tropics Ministerial Council and the National Environment Protection Council - how will the government ensure the issues normally addressed in this meetings will remain an agenda item?</p>	Written

97	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Indigenous Protected Areas	<p>1. With reference to the government's 2017 commitment of \$15 million for Indigenous Protected Areas:</p> <p>a. What is the total area covered by that commitment?</p> <p>b. How much has been expensed?</p> <p>c. How much has been spent?</p> <p>d. What is the total size of all Indigenous Protect Areas funded by the government?</p> <p>e. What is the total amount of funding committed to Indigenous Protected Areas?</p> <p>f. Are there any plans to increase the number of Indigenous Protected Areas?</p> <p>g. Please provide a map of all Indigenous Protect Areas funded by government?</p>	Written
98	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Natural Heritage Trust Special Account	<p>1. With respect to the Natural Heritage Trust Special Account:</p> <p>a. What is the total amount allocated to that account?</p> <p>b. What is the breakdown of funding for all programs from 2017?</p> <p>c. What is the breakdown of funding for all programs over the forward estimates?</p> <p>d. Why has funding reduced?</p> <p>e. How much funding is provided to Landcare?</p> <p>f. How much funding is provided to Indigenous Rangers?</p> <p>g. How much funding is provided to Indigenous Protected Areas?</p>	Written
99	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National Reserves System grants program	<p>1. Does the government have any plans to revive the National Reserve System grants program?</p>	Written
100	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened Species Strategy - finalisation	<p>1. With respect to the Threatened Species Strategy:</p> <p>a. When will it be finalised?</p> <p>b. When will it be made public?</p>	Written
101	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened Species Strategy	<p>1. Please provide timelines for completion of the recently announced Threatened Species Strategy.</p>	Written
102	Department of Agriculture,	Anne Urquhart	Landcare - funding	<p>1. How is Landcare funded? Can you provide a breakdown of all funding streams for the last financial year?</p> <p>2. How much funding for Landcare comes from the:</p>	Written

	Water and the Environment			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Natural Heritage Trust</li> <li>b. Environmental Stewardship Program</li> <li>c. National Resources Management Account</li> <li>d. Pest and Disease Preparedness and Response Program</li> </ul> <p>3. The report on the review of the National Landcare Program said that "budget reductions in 2014 led to a 20 percent reduction in ongoing funding for regional bodies from 2013-14 levels" (2017, p.39). Is that still the case? Has the government restored this funding completely?</p> <p>4. I refer to the 25th anniversary Landcare grants program of which the successful projects are published online. Can you please provide a list of all successful grant recipients, including grant amount, location, and electorate?</p> <p>5. I note that there are a number of ad-hoc grants programs within the Landcare program, including the 25th anniversary grants and the Building Landcare Community and Capacity. Are there any others? How are these programs advertised? How are recipients selected?</p>	
103	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Communities Environment program - funding and review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much was allocated to the Communities Environment Program? How much was spent?</li> <li>2. Was there an underspend? If so, how much?</li> <li>3. Were there any discussions about continuing this program for more than one year?</li> <li>4. Has there been a review into this program? If not, why not? If there has been, can you please table it?</li> <li>5. What did the review find?</li> </ul>	Written
104	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Communities Environment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to the Communities Environment Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much was expended?</li> <li>b. How much was unspent?</li> <li>c. How much was reallocated to another program?</li> <li>d. Has that reallocated amount been expensed or spent?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. With reference to the department's evidence that \$2 million was unspent from the Communities Environment Program and reallocated elsewhere: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Did that bring the total Environment Restoration Fund to \$132 million? If not, why not?</li> <li>b. Before it was reallocated to the Environment Restoration Fund, did that bring the total bushfire wildlife recovery funding to a total of \$202 million? If not, why not?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written
105	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	\$200 million allocated to nature-based bushfire response - recipients of funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Of the \$200 million allocated the nature-based response to the bushfires, what portion of funding has been directed to government entities vs community led initiatives and environmental NGOs?</li> <li>2. Can you please provide a list of the projects, the intended outcomes and the funding recipients (differentiating between government and non-government e.g., community, Traditional Owners, and environmental non-government organisations)?</li> </ul>	Written

106	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Funding allocated for wildlife	<p>1. With reference to the \$50 million allocated to emergency funding for wildlife after the bushfires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much has been contracted?</li> <li>b. How much has been expensed?</li> <li>c. How much has been spent?</li> <li>d. When are the funds expected to be fully spent (not expensed)?</li> </ul> <p>2. With reference to the \$149.7 million allocated to bushfire recovery for native wildlife and habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much of the \$110 million allocated to on ground support has been: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Committed</li> <li>ii. Contracted</li> <li>iii. Spent</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. How much is allocated to state and territory governments?</li> <li>c. How much has been expensed to state and territory governments?</li> <li>d. What "on ground" projects are being funded under the \$110 million allocated?</li> <li>e. How is the funding administered?</li> <li>f. How are projects selected?</li> </ul>	Written
107	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environment Restoration Fund	<p>1. With reference to the Environment Restoration Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How much has been allocated to the fund since it was established?</li> <li>b. What is the total amount allocated to the fund currently?</li> <li>c. How much of the fund has been expensed?</li> <li>d. How much of the fund has been spent?</li> <li>e. When does the government expect to expense all of the funding?</li> <li>f. When does the government expect to spend all of the funding?</li> <li>g. How many projects have been announced since the 2019 election? Please provide details. How were those projects selected?</li> <li>h. Who can currently access the fund?</li> <li>i. Has there been any adjustments made to expected yearly spending since its establishment? If yes, what are those adjustments?</li> </ul>	Written
108	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Climate Adaptation Summit January 2021	<p>At the Climate Adaptation Summit on 25 January 2021, Minister Ley announced that Australia will join the Coalition for Climate Resilient Investment and pledged an initial \$12.9 million to establishing Climate and Resilience Services Australia. The 'new capability' will apparently rely on "extensive climate and natural disaster risk information."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What information is being referred to?</li> <li>2. Who will make up Climate and Resilience Services Australia? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How will this body be formed?</li> <li>b. What will its purpose be?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In the same speech, Minister Ley said that Australia is "joining global partnerships and</p>	Written

				<p>taking the lead in building resilient communities."</p> <p>3. Which 'global partnerships' is Australia joining? When will this occur?</p> <p>4. What is Australia actually leading on?</p>	
109	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	2021 National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy	<p>Australia has announced a 2021 National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy update for the latter half of 2021.</p> <p>1. What date will the strategy be released?</p> <p>2. What specific climate risk studies are being used to inform the strategy?</p> <p>3. Has Australia ever conducted a comprehensive national climate risk assessment?</p> <p>a. If yes, what climate disasters were assessed? Who conducted the assessment? Where can the report be accessed? What are the top climate risks for Australia? Do you know? How often is the assessment updated?</p> <p>4. Has the government reviewed progress on the previous National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy as part of developing the 2021 review?</p> <p>a. If yes, what progress has been made?</p> <p>b. If not, does the government intend to do so?</p> <p>5. Does Australia plan to prepare a National Adaptation Plan? If yes, when?</p> <p>6. Does Australia fund National Adaptation Plans overseas as part of its Overseas Development Assistance?</p>	Written
110	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National Environmental Science Program	<p>1. Will the department have any role in communications and/or media statements from the new hubs, and if so what role will it have?</p> <p>2. Will researchers be required to communicate with the department prior to speaking publicly on their research under the hubs?</p> <p>3. Can the department please provide:</p> <p>a. The three bid applications for the Resilient Landscapes Hub tender?</p> <p>b. The assessment of each of the bid submissions for NESP against the criteria used by the Department selection panel.</p> <p>c. Any correspondence between the three consortiums that submitted bids to the NESP 2 tender and the Department prior to bid submission.</p> <p>4. What were the guidelines when the department was first seeing NESP 2 applications?</p> <p>5. Were any changes made to the guidelines? If so, what were the changes and why were they made?</p>	Written
111	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Natural Capital Fund	<p>The Minister said in an interview with Fran Kelly on 21 July 2020 in response to the Samuel review interim report, that the government was making two early moves, one of them being a "Natural Capital Fund", which she said would "bring serious money to the table".</p> <p>1. Has this been established?</p> <p>2. When is it expected to be established?</p> <p>3. How is this being funded?</p> <p>4. How much is being allocated to this fund?</p>	Written

				<p>5. Will this be a line item in the upcoming budget?</p> <p>6. Sussan Ley also said in her interview that the Natural Capital Fund would leverage private investment. Has that happened? How will that work?</p>	
112	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	15 major projects	<p>1. With reference to the 15 infrastructure projects to be "fast tracked" as announced by the Prime Minister to the CEDA conference:</p> <p>a. Of the fifteen projects, how many have already commenced? How many will commence next year? How many will commence in five years?</p> <p>b. Are there any projects that don't have a business case?</p> <p>c. Can you please table the list of projects, including Commonwealth contribution, their expected commencement date, and what assessments they have undergone (e.g. business case, cost-benefit analysis)?</p>	Written
113	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Auditor General Report No. 47 - progress of recommendations	<p>1. Please provide a detailed summary of the department's progress against each of the recommendations from Auditor General Report No 47 of 2019-20.</p>	Written
114	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Conflicts of interest register	<p>1. With reference to the conflicts of interest register that was established in November 2020:</p> <p>a. How many conflicts of interest have been declared?</p> <p>b. How many perceived conflicts of interest have been identified?</p> <p>c. How many actual conflicts of interest have been identified?</p> <p>d. In cases where an actual or perceived conflict has been identified, what steps have been taken?</p> <p>e. Of the staff that have now declared a perceived or actual conflict, how many were employed prior to November when the register was introduced?</p>	Written
115	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	EPBC - number of projects being assessed	<p>1. With reference to the EPBC Act:</p> <p>a. Can the department provide the current number of projects being assessed under bilateral agreements or accredited processes under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>b. Can the Department provide the current number of Commonwealth agency referrals or actions on Commonwealth land or sea being assessed under EPBC?</p>	Written
116	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Auditor General Report No. 47 of 2019-20, Referrals, Assessments and Approvals of Controlled Actions	<p>1. With reference to the Auditor General Report No. 47 of 2019-20, Referrals, Assessments and Approvals of Controlled Actions under the EPBC Act 1999:</p> <p>a. The Auditor General found that 116 days was the average time that statutory timeframes were overrun for approvals. What is the average now?</p> <p>b. The Auditor General found that there were 1034 controlled action approved with conditions since the commencement of the EPBC Act. What is that figure now?</p>	Written

			under the EPBC Act 1999	<p>c. The Auditor General found that 79% of approvals contained conditions that were non-compliant with procedural guidance or contained clerical or administrative errors. What's the figure now?</p> <p>d. What's the updated figure on late decisions on referrals?</p> <p>e. What's the updated figure on late decision for controlled actions?</p> <p>f. What's the updated figure on late decisions for approvals?</p> <p>g. The Auditor General found that administration of referrals, assessments and approvals of controlled actions under the EPBC Act is not effective. Is it effective now?</p> <p>h. The Auditor General found that administration of referrals and assessments is not effective or efficient. Is it effective now? Is it efficient now?</p> <p>i. The Auditor General found that the department is not well positioned to measure its contribution to the objectives of the EPBC Act. What about now?</p> <p>j. Are there any plans to establish a conflict of interest register across the entire department?</p>	
117	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Maintaining timelines and congestion busting measures	<p>1. Of the staff members engaged to work under the "maintaining timeliness" and "congestion busting" measures:</p> <p>a. How many have made a conflict of interest declaration?</p> <p>b. How many have an actual conflict of interest?</p> <p>c. How many have a perceived conflict of interest?</p> <p>d. How many have had experience in environmental approvals and assessments?</p> <p>e. How many have resigned or discontinued work?</p> <p>f. How many have work experience as government or opposition advisers? Of those, how many have experience as Liberal party advisers?</p> <p>g. How many work remotely?</p> <p>h. How many work at the department's physical premises?</p>	Written
118	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environmental offsets	<p>1. With reference to environmental offsets:</p> <p>a. How does the department retain and update information about offsets so that:</p> <p>i. the environmental value of the offset is maintained over time, and</p> <p>ii. cumulative impacts on those environmental values are properly understood?</p> <p>b. Please provide a map of all offsets.</p> <p>c. Is there an assessment of the net loss of habitat for threatened/endangered species that has occurred in relation to approvals that were granted on condition of an offset being provided?</p> <p>d. Can you provide a summary of offsets that involved restoration of habitat as opposed to protection of existing habitat in perpetuity?</p> <p>e. Was advice provided to the Minister for the Environment on how the proposed EPBC reform legislation could respond to the Reviewer's call for national standards that ensure offsets are not used as a matter of course, but rather used in rare circumstances, and on</p>	Written

				<p>the basis that there is no net loss of habitat for threatened/endangered species?</p> <p>f. How important is it to calculate risk of loss?</p> <p>g. How does the department calculate the risk of loss, and is that consistent across the department? Can you document that agreed methodology?</p> <p>h. I note the ANAO has said that, "there is no agreed method for estimating risk of loss." Is this resolved now?</p>	
119	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Detailed summary of contracts - congestion busting	1. Please provide a detailed summary of all contracts entered into relating to the "congestion busting" and "maintaining timeliness" of environmental assessments measures, including information about related organisations and staffing.	Written
120	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recycle Product Labelling	<p>1. The National Plastics Plan includes a commitment that the Government will refer any businesses to the ACCC that aren't using appropriate recycling labelling. What processes have been put in place to do this? Will there be a monitoring program? How will the referral be made?</p> <p>2. The plan also states that the Government and the Australian Packaging Covenant will work to ensure that the take-up rate of the Australasian Recycling Label is at 80% of all relevant supermarket products. Given the recent Australian Council of Recycling survey indicated that only 28% of eligible products are currently using this label, other than through ACCC monitoring how are you expecting it will reach 80%?</p>	Written
121	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National Plastics Plan	<p>1. The National Plastics Plan contains a commitment to ban certain types of polystyrene and PVC labelling. Is there a reason this commitment didn't also include products that some states have also recommended be banned, such as plastic straws and cutlery?</p> <p>2. In terms of the phasing-out of products, was there a recommendation by the Department or any of its advisory groups that the plastic plan go further than these three materials included in the plan?</p> <p>3. When the single-use plastic ban started in South Australia in March 2021, the National Retailers Association said "Consumers might see some price increases this year and in coming years," "Alternatives like bamboo and wood and cardboard are usually about five to ten times the price (of plastics) for retailers". Does the Department hold or has it commissioned any modelling/analysis to determine if this statement is accurate? If not, does the Department have any thoughts on the validity of this statement?</p> <p>4. Of the commitments in the plan, how many of them have already been previously announced by the Government?</p> <p>5. The plan includes a commitment that "The Australian Government will work with states and territories to harmonise kerbside recycling collection"- can you explain how they will achieve this, and provide an update on progress on this commitment to date?</p>	Written

				<p>6. There is a similar statement about the various state-based container deposit schemes - how is that project progressing?</p> <p>7. The Plastics Plan timeline calls for a review of the 2025 National Packaging Targets, with that review to take place in 2022. Given the target deadline is in 2025, isn't 2022 too late to assess whether packaging manufacturers will reach these targets and, more importantly, to consider remediation action? On what basis was the year 2022 selected?</p> <p>8. The recycling of plastic packaging sits at 18%, the APCO target endorsed by the Minister is 70% by 2025. The average recycled content in packaging target is 20% for plastics, but currently it sits at 4%. Is the Department confident industry will reach the 2025 targets without any changes to the regulatory framework?</p>	
122	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Product Stewardship	<p>1. In March 2021, the Government announced two new product stewardship schemes accredited under the Recycling &amp; Waste Reduction Act-tyres and large bags. What are the agreed targets under these schemes and what is the deadline for when industry will be required to reach these targets before the Minister considers whether some form of additional regulation is needed?</p> <p>2. In January 2021, the CSIRO published a paper: 'Circular economy roadmap for plastics, glass, paper and tyres'. In that paper there was a reference to the very poor recycling rates for tyres and subsequently they are recommending a mandatory product stewardship scheme for tyres by 2022. Why did the Government choose to go forward with a voluntary instead of mandatory scheme? What was the Departments advice to the Minister?</p> <p>3. Please provide a table of all the recommendations from the 2020 statutory review of the Product Stewardship Act with an update on progress in terms of implementation for each recommendation.</p>	Written
123	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environment Assurance Commissioner	<p>1. With reference to the Environment Assurance Commissioner proposed by the government:</p> <p>a. What statutory powers would the Commissioner have?</p> <p>b. How many staff would work with the Commissioner?</p>	Written
124	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Financial statement of the EPBC Amendment (Standards and Assurance) Bill	<p>1. According to the Financial Statement of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Standards and Assurance) Bill 2021, the EAC is expected to cost no more than \$9 million over the next four years.</p> <p>a. Where is this funding coming from?</p> <p>b. Will it be a line item in the next budget?</p> <p>c. Please provide a breakdown of how the \$9 million be spent for each fiscal year.</p>	Written
125	Department of Agriculture,	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - Land and Sea Country Forum	<p>1. With reference to reports the Foundation is being sued over their cancellation of a contract for the traditional owners forum:</p> <p>a. When was it decided to delay the Land and Sea Country Forum?</p>	Written

	Water and the Environment			<p>b. How much of the grant funding have been used to engage lawyers with respect to this matter?</p> <p>c. Has any other legal advice been sought by the Foundation? How was that paid for?</p>	
126	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - Individual Giving Program	<p>1. With reference to answers to Question on Notice No 172 (18 November 2020) about advertising for the Great Barrier Reef Foundation's Individual Giving Program:</p> <p>a. Who was the third party agency?</p> <p>b. What were the instructions from the Foundation to the third party agency?</p> <p>c. Who made the decision to include political affiliations in the audience attribute?</p> <p>d. What were the other target audiences? Please provide a description of all 40 different audiences that were targeted.</p>	Written
127	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - \$444 million grant	<p>1. With reference to the \$444 million grant paid to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation:</p> <p>a. Please provide a performance statement or like for each financial year since 2018, including information about the Foundation's performance in achieving the purpose of the Great Barrier Reef 2050 Partnership Program.</p> <p>b. Please provide independent and audited financial statements for financial years since 2018 for all receipts and payments relating to the Great Barrier Reef 2050 Partnership Program funds, including any co-financed contributions.</p> <p>c. Please provide a breakdown of all funds associated with the crown-of-thorns starfish, including, but not limited to, payments made towards salaries or wages.</p> <p>d. Of the \$357 million fundraising target detailed in the Foundation's October 2018 Investment Strategy, how much has the Foundation raised?</p> <p>e. How much has been spent on wages, salaries, or payments to employees, contractors, or for any related work? Please provide a detailed list for each financial year since 2018-19.</p> <p>f. Of the \$444 million, how much has been spent by the Foundation?</p> <p>g. What steps has the department taken to follow up the actions from the Auditor General's report associated with the awarding of the 444 million grant?</p> <p>2. With reference to the Government's statement that the \$444 million grant to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation would "accelerate the delivery" of activities under the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan (Reef Plan):</p> <p>a. Which Reef Plan activities, if any, has the Foundation "accelerated the delivery" of?</p> <p>b. How is the Foundation tracking on delivering the activities under the Reef Plan? How does that compare to expected projections?</p>	Written
128	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Anne Urquhart	Marine heatwaves off the coast of WA - impact on marine environments and heritage sites	<p>1. What is the latest data in relation to the La Niña event that is contributing to marine heatwaves off the Western Australian coast?</p> <p>2. What work is being done to determine the likely damage to marine biodiversity and/ or fisheries?</p> <p>3. Do you have an assessment of any damage as yet in terms of (i) the environment; (ii)</p>	Written

	the Environment			<p>fisheries?</p> <p>4. The previous 2011 heatwave resulted in the loss of 385 square kilometres of kelp forests. I'm told that much of these forests have not grown back and their loss is impacting fisheries. What resources are currently applied to seagrass and kelp restoration and what are the result so far?</p> <p>5. Given the location of world heritage listed sites such as Ningaloo Reef and Shark Bay, what additional assessment or reporting obligations are required of the Commonwealth?</p> <p>6. The Bureau of Meteorology state that a spike in sea temperatures hasn't occurred off the coast of WA since 2011. What is the Departments assessment of the increasing frequency and severity of these events?</p> <p>7. Is there consistent and sufficient ocean temperature monitory infrastructure in place across the country?</p>	
129	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Indigenous Cultural Heritage	<p>1. In the aftermath of the Juukan Gorge tragedy the Minister for Environment said work would occur to improve Indigenous heritage protection. Recently the Minister has said that "work on Indigenous heritage protection is already under way", including consultation with state governments and Indigenous people to modernise the state and federal heritage protection laws. I'm aware this work started with a roundtable discussion of Commonwealth and State Environment Ministers that took place on 21 September 2020. Apart from that, what other work has occurred and what is the timetable for that work to result in reform?</p> <p>2. In terms of consultation, apart from speaking to the states and territories, please detail what other consultation has occurred, including the date, attendees, and relevant outcomes or summaries of all consultations that have occurred to date.</p> <p>3. In the 2015 Australian Heritage Strategy there was a commitment to review the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Heritage Protection Act by December 2017. That deadline has been missed by three years. When will it occur?</p> <p>4. Since the Juukan Gorge Tragedy has the Minister sought advice on undertaking a review of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Heritage Protection Act? If so, when? What was her decision?</p> <p>5. In relation to the Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia's inquiry into Juukan Gorge, has the Department provided the Minister with a briefing that addresses the recommendations from the interim report?</p> <p>6. Specifically, what actions are the Department and the Minister working on?</p> <p>7. What is the Department's view on moving the management and administration of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Heritage Protection Act to the Minister for Indigenous Australians and the National Indigenous Australians Agency?</p>	Written

130	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Conservation of World & National Heritage Listed Sites	<p>1. In the 2020 Budget there is \$33.5 million allocated to upgrade national and world heritage sites. Can you please provide an update as to how much has been expended from this amount and on which projects?</p> <p>2. In regard to the Australian Heritage Grant round 2020-21:</p> <p>a. On what date will the outcomes of the grant be publicly released?</p> <p>b. How many applications were submitted?</p> <p>c. How many applications were approved?</p> <p>d. What is the total value of all applications?</p> <p>e. Did the Minister approve any applications not recommended for approval by the assessment committee?</p> <p>f. Did the Minister approve any application that was not compliant with any aspect of the grant guidelines?</p>	Written
131	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	First Nations cultural heritage	<p>1. In July 2020, the Minister announced the commencement of a 'national engagement process for modernising the protection of Indigenous cultural heritage'. What is the current status of that process?</p> <p>2. What Indigenous people or organisations have been consulted as part of this process to date?</p> <p>3. What plans are there for further consultation?</p> <p>4. In September 2020, Ministers Ley and Wyatt held a Roundtable for Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers responsible for Heritage and Indigenous Affairs on the modernisation of Indigenous heritage protection. The Communique from the Roundtable stated the Ministers had agreed to reconvene "at a later date to review progress". Have the Ministers met again since the September 2020 Roundtable? When do the Ministers plan to meet again?</p> <p>5. What is the Government's response to recommendation 7 of the final report of Graeme Samuel's independent review of the EPBC Act?</p>	Written
132	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Flying fox dispersal in Cairns	<p>1. Since the EPBC unit received a communique from Cairns Council on 11 August 2020 saying that council was no longer dispersing Spectacled Flying Fox under the EPBC permit 2019/8424, how many complaints has your compliance unit received alleging that dispersal is continuing?</p> <p>2. What action has been taken in response to those complaints?</p> <p>3. We have been told that a member of the Compliance unit has said that the Cairns CBD colony is no longer a recognised colony or a matter of MNES. Can you confirm what the process would be to "de-list" the colony, including any consultation and expert evidence that would be required?</p> <p>4. An inspection was undertaken by the EPBC Compliance unit in November 2020. How was that inspection undertaken - who did they meet with, were surveys undertaken, what reports were made?</p>	Written

133	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	McArthur River mine - security bond	<p>On 12 June 2019, an EPBC Act approval* was issued for an overburden management plan (OMP) for the mine which required the open pit to remain "hydraulically isolated" from the McArthur River. The approval has effect until 3019. In August 2019, the NT Mines Minister increased the bond required for the mine to \$520M. However, in November 2020, the Minister reduced the security bond to \$400M on the basis that MRM will reduce the "thickness" of the material that will cover the waste rock dump from 8 metres to 3 metres.</p> <p>The NTEPA and the Independent Monitor for the mine have previously advised that even the \$520M security bond was insufficient to rehabilitate the site. The Environment Centre of NT is challenging the decision to reduce the bond.</p> <p>In December 2020, the EPBC Act approval was varied** to, among other things, require further studies into groundwater impacts, to "identify and characterise any hydraulic connection" between the pit and the river, and to determine the long-term stability and performance of the mine pit levee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What were the reasons for the Department's variation of the EPBC Act approval for McArthur River Mine in December 2020?</li> <li>2. Condition 5 of the approval required the mine to lodge the study into attenuation capacity of metals and acid within the groundwater system and the hydraulic connectivity by January 2021. Have these reports been lodged? When will they be published?</li> <li>3. At the time of the variation, was the Department aware that the NT Mines Minister had reduced the security bond, despite previous advice? Was that decision taken into account when approving the variation, especially given the long life of the approval?</li> <li>4. Did the Dept or the Minister receive any briefings by the Northern Territory Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism about the decision to reduce the bond?</li> <li>5. The McArthur River Mine EPBC Act approval has effect for 1000 years. Are there any other approvals given for this length of time?</li> <li>6. The EPBC Act approval requires public compliance reporting by the mine. Has the mine complied with those requirements to date? In particular, has MRM: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. published an annual compliance report on its website every 12 months?</li> <li>b. reported any incidents to the Department as required by clause 9 of the approval?</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>*<a href="http://epbcnotices.environment.gov.au/_entity/annotation/2fe7e800-c390-e911-8f1d-00505684324c/a71d58ad-4cba-48b6-8dab-f3091fc31cd5?t=1615102862637">http://epbcnotices.environment.gov.au/_entity/annotation/2fe7e800-c390-e911-8f1d-00505684324c/a71d58ad-4cba-48b6-8dab-f3091fc31cd5?t=1615102862637</a></p> <p>**<a href="http://epbcnotices.environment.gov.au/_entity/annotation/92b394e0-6e54-eb11-9650-005056842ad1/a71d58ad-4cba-48b6-8dab-f3091fc31cd5?t=1615102342073">http://epbcnotices.environment.gov.au/_entity/annotation/92b394e0-6e54-eb11-9650-005056842ad1/a71d58ad-4cba-48b6-8dab-f3091fc31cd5?t=1615102342073</a></p>	Written
134	Department of	Larissa Waters	World Heritage Forests	Following the 2019 bushfires, UNESCO asked for an update on the impacts on world heritage listed properties, including the Gondwana Rainforests. The update provided by	Written

	Agriculture, Water and the Environment			<p>the government in April 2020* said that "a post-fire recovery project is in development to support the recovery and resilience of threatened species within the Queensland section of the Gondwana Rainforests".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the current status of the recovery project?</li> <li>2. What, if any, further information has been sought by, or provided to, UNESCO regarding the Gondwana forests?</li> <li>3. Has UNESCO asked for an update on the impacts of bushfires in late 2020 on K'gari / Fraser Island? What information has been provided in response to any request?</li> </ol> <p>*link: <a href="https://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/1bb2ae15-a6bf-4c18-8b53-adfa84c26cec/files/gondwana-rainforests-state-conservation-update-april-2020.pdf">https://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/1bb2ae15-a6bf-4c18-8b53-adfa84c26cec/files/gondwana-rainforests-state-conservation-update-april-2020.pdf</a></p>	
135	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Djaki Kundu	<p>Kabi elders have requested that the Minister make an interim heritage declaration under the EPBC Act or the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Heritage Protection Act to protect Djaki Kundu from destruction as part of the Bruce highway upgrade near Gympie. Please provide an update on any assessment and consideration by the Minister of the request for protection.</p>	Written
136	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Yeelirrie mine	<p>FOI documents revealed that approval was signed for the Yeelirrie mine on 10 April 2019, just before the May 2019 election, but was not made public until much later. The FOI material includes defensive talking points prepared by staff for when the Minister was questioned about why public notification was delayed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why was the decision taken to delay public notification? Who made that decision?</li> <li>2. On 5 April 2019, a senior executive of the Department sent an email requesting the "urgent clearance" of the Yeelirrie approval. The approval had been on the books for many years and the Dept had previously advised the Minister to wait for a relevant decision of the Supreme Court before progressing it. Why did it become urgent in April 2019?</li> <li>3. The decision brief was sent to Minister Price around 9.30 pm on 10 April 2019, the day before the election was called. How many documents and pages of documents were included in that brief? Was it possible for Minister Price to review all the relevant material and make an informed decision to approve before caretaker mode kicked in the next day?</li> <li>4. Can you explain why the decision brief, signed on 10 April, was not forwarded to the Dept until 17 April 2019? What further evidence is there to confirm that the decision was, in fact, made before caretaker mode kicked in?</li> <li>5. Why was 2043 chosen at the expiry date for the approval? What legacy rehabilitation responsibilities will exist beyond that expiry date, noting Cameco's own PER states that parts of the water table will take more than 200 years to recover? Given the Ranger mine experience, what protections will be put in place for ongoing management of radioactive</li> </ol>	Written

				<p>tailings?</p> <p>6. Has Cameco made progress on any of the following requirements of the approval:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the groundwater management plan;</li> <li>expert evidence regarding impacts on troglofauna species (before clearing Area 1);</li> <li>the Malleefowl Offset Strategy; and</li> <li>the Night Parrot surveys and/or the Night Parrot Management Plan?</li> </ol>	
137	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Social media influencers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</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
138	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Stationery	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</li> </ol>	Written
139	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial overseas travel	<ol 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 for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 please be provided including: <ol 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 departmental officials.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written

140	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial domestic travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all domestic travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 please be provided including:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying 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>	Written
141	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental equipment	<p>1. What was the estimated value of all Departmental equipment that was lost, damaged, stolen or written off during each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p>	Written
142	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental staff in Minister's office	<p>1. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including:</p> <p>a. Duration of secondment.</p> <p>b. APS level.</p> <p>2. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level.</p>	Written
143	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including:</p> <p>a. Date commissioned.</p> <p>b. Date report handed to Government.</p> <p>c. Date of public release.</p> <p>d. Terms of Reference.</p> <p>e. Committee members and/or Reviewers.</p> <p>2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost.</p>	Written

				<p>3. The background and credentials of the Review personnel.</p> <p>4. The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel</p> <p>5. The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review.</p> <p>6. How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level.</p> <p>7. 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.</p>	
144	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Acting Minister Arrangements	<p>1. Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister from 24 August 2018 to date.</p> <p>2. Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period.</p>	Written
145	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of gifts and hospitality	<p>1. Please produce a copy of all relevant policies.</p> <p>2. Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of gifts as at 10 November 2020.</p>	Written
146	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Executive office upgrades	Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Written
147	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Congestion busting	<p>1. Can the Department/agency advise how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks.</p> <p>2. Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department.</p>	Written
148	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Appointments - briefs prepared	<p>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.</p> <p>2. For each brief prepared, can the Department advise:</p> <p>a. The former member.</p>	Written

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The board or entity.</li> <li>c. Whether the request originated from the Minister's office.</li> <li>d. Whether the appointment was made.</li> </ul>	
149	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Board Appointments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members.</li> <li>2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio</li> <li>3. Please detail any board appointments made from 30 June 2020 to date.</li> <li>4. What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid.</li> <li>5. What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors.</li> <li>6. What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors.</li> </ul>	Written
150	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Communications staff	<ul 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. By Department or agency: <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> </li> <li>3. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios. <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> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Written
151	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Media monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to each Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. <ul 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 2020-21.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31</li> </ul>	Written

				<p>December 2020.</p> <p>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services.</p> <p>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</p> <p>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21.</p>	
152	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Facilities upgrades	<p>1. Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 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 inclusive).</p> <p>3. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided.</p>	Written
153	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Market research	<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 of:</p> <p>a. Subject matter</p> <p>b. Company</p> <p>c. Costs each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020</p> <p>d. Contract date period</p> <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
154	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Advertising and information campaigns	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p> <p>2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide:</p> <p>a. When approval was first sought.</p> <p>b. The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process.</p> <p>c. The timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline.</p> <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

155	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial functions and meals	<p>1. In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided:</p> <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 inclusive).</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> <p>2. In relation to any breakfasts, luncheons, dinners or other meals hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of dates and types of meals.</li> <li>List of all attendees.</li> <li>Function venue.</li> <li>Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive).</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>	Written
156	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Briefings	<p>1. Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives. 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>	Written
157	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Promotional merchandise	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</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

158	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Secretarial travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.</p>	
159	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental functions	<p>1. In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided:</p> <p>a. List of functions.</p> <p>b. List of all attendees.</p> <p>c. Function venue.</p> <p>d. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive).</p> <p>e. Details of any food served.</p> <p>f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</p> <p>g. Any available photographs of the function.</p> <p>h. Details of any entertainment provided.</p>	Written
160	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Travel and expense claim policy	<p>1. Please produce a copy of all travel and expense claim policies.</p> <p>2. Please produce a copy of all claim forms. If the forms are digital, please provide a screen shot of each section, including all dropdown options.</p>	Written
161	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Staff travel	<p>1. What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p>	Written

162	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Collateral materials	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on collateral materials, including banners, publications, maps, charts and high visibility or protective clothing for events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits, including Ministerial events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p> <p>2. For each event or function where the Department/agency expended funds on collateral materials, provide details of the event, including the date and location of each event, and details of the types of materials.</p>	Written
163	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Legal costs	<p>1. What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p>	Written
164	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	FOI	<p>1. Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for the following years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2013-14;</li> <li>2014-15;</li> <li>2015-16;</li> <li>2016-17;</li> <li>2018-19; 2019-20, and;</li> <li>2020-21 to date.</li> </ol> <p>2. For each year above, please provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full;</li> <li>The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part;</li> <li>The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and</li> <li>The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under the Freedom of Information Act.</li> </ol> <p>3. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and</li> <li>The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request).</li> </ol>	Written

			<p>4. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the OIAC; and</li><li>b. The number of times has the OIAC overturned " in whole or in part " the Department's decision to refuse access to material.</li></ul> <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 each of the following years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. 2013-14;</li><li>b. 2014-15;</li><li>c. 2015-16;</li><li>d. 2016-17;</li><li>e. 2018-19;</li><li>f. 2019-20, and;</li><li>g. 2020-21 to date.</li></ul> <p>6. For each of the years above, 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and</li><li>b. Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister.</li></ul> <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>	
--	--	--	---	--

165	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	CDDA Payments	<p>1. How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020?</p> <p>2. How many claims were:</p> <p>a. Accepted.</p> <p>b. Rejected.</p> <p>c. Under consideration.</p> <p>3. Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide:</p> <p>a. Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations</p> <p>b. The date payment was made</p> <p>c. The decision maker.</p>	Written
166	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Recruitment	<p>1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p> <p>2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.</p>	Written
167	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Staffing	<p>1. How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at each of 30 June 2019 and 30 June 2020 10 November 2020.</p> <p>2. How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing.</p> <p>3. How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. How many were:</p> <p>a. voluntary</p> <p>b. involuntary.</p> <p>4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies.</p> <p>5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff.</p> <p>6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p> <p>7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 to date.</p>	Written
168	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Kristina Keneally	Departmental Staff allowances	<p>1. Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.</p>	Written

	the Environment				
169	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Comcare	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, 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.</p> <p>2. Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the each of the periods; 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p>	Written
170	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Commission	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.</p>	Written
171	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Ombudsman	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.</p>	Written
172	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.</p>	Written
173	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Public Interest Disclosures	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many public interest disclosures have been received.</p>	Written
174	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Kristina Keneally	Executive Management	<p>1. In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020:</p> <p>a. The total number of executive management positions</p> <p>b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.</p>	Written

	the Environment			c. The change in the number of executive manager positions. d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.	
175	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of interest	1. Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2. Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of interest as at 10 November 2020.	Written
176	Director of National Parks	Samantha McMahon	Kakadu board of management - meetings and projects agreed to	<p>Senator McMAHON: How many meetings has the Kakadu board of management held in the last six months?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I can try to get those figures for you. I know that they have held more than the usual number of meetings. I will confer with one of my colleagues. We do have Kate Turner on the line in our Darwin office. Kate, are you able to answer the question of how many board meetings there has been this year for the Kakadu Board of management?</p> <p>Ms Turner: Good evening, everyone. We have had a few more meetings than normal. I will have to come back with the exact number. I think it has been four meetings.</p> <p>Senator McMAHON: Have there been any works agreed to proceed out of those meetings? Are there any projects that are funded as part of this \$216 million? Have there been any further works agreed to proceed by the Kakadu board of management?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: We would probably have to take the detail of that on notice because I understand there are some minor works. The board of management has just agreed with the DNP to a Kakadu tourism master plan. We also consulted with them at the last board meeting. We took the infrastructure program to them and outlined a series of immediate works that we wanted to do, which are things like fixing sewerage issues and things that are critical that have been overdue, and the longer term trajectory of that investment under the infrastructure program. So we'll probably have to take that on notice about whether there was a formal paper on those things. Are there particular works that you are asking about that I could target the question more to?</p>	97
177	Director of National Parks	Sarah Hanson-Young	Budget allocations	<p>1. Of the total amount allocated as part of the Commonwealth's \$2 billion bushfire response funding to the nature-based response so far, what portion of that funding has been directed to government entities vs community-led initiatives and environmental NGO's?</p> <p>2. The Government has provided the "biggest single investment in Australia's Commonwealth National Parks" of \$233 million to upgrade facilities in Uluru, Kakadu, Christmas Island and Booderee National Park to "support economic recovery from COVID-19". How much is the Government investing in:</p> <p>a. measures to conserve nature and cultural heritage (asset protection / restoration and</p>	Written

				<p>threat abatement)?</p> <p>b. to support economic and environmental recovery through natural resource management job creation in these parks, especially with the downturn in tourism?</p> <p>3. Why is the Government spending more on infrastructure in just three Commonwealth National Parks (\$233 million) than it is on bushfire recovery and restoration (\$203.1 million)? Scale and timing matter with interventions in the natural environment after disasters and this is an opportunity for job creation and environmental restoration. [\$149.7 million for bushfire recovery for species and landscapes, including habitat regeneration and waterway and catchment restoration and \$53.4 million to support wildlife recovery and habitat restoration - total \$203.1 million].</p>	
178	Director of National Parks	Anne Urquhart	Parks Australia progress on ocean funding commitments	<p>1. There is \$14.8 million allocated in the 2020 Parks Budget to "tackle the marine impacts of ghost nets and plastic litter". Can you please provide an update on what the project's proposed outcomes are? Has work commenced? How much has been expended?</p> <p>2. Have Parks Australia undertaken any assessment of ocean litter in marine parks in general? Is more needed to be done then just removing ghost nets? What do you see as the key priorities?</p> <p>3. Did Parks Australia provide any input to the Nationals Plastics Plan? There is a section on plastics in our oceans and waterways.</p>	Written
179	Director of National Parks	Anne Urquhart	\$216 million for Kakadu	<p>1. Of the \$216 million that the government committed at the last election, how much has been spent? How much has been contracted to be spent? In which fiscal years will the remainder be spent?</p>	Written
180	Director of National Parks	Anne Urquhart	Norfolk Island National Park and Norfolk Island Botanic Garden Management Plan 2018-2028	<p>1. What were the factors that led to the Minister revoking the Norfolk Island National Park and Norfolk Island Botanic Garden Management Plan 2018-2028 and replacing it with a revised 2020 plan?</p> <p>2. Please outline the key differences between the 2018-2028 and the 2020 plan.</p> <p>3. Is it common for management plans associated with the EPBC Act to be revoked after just two years of being in force?</p> <p>4. Did the decision to revoke the 2018-2020 plan come at the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment?</p>	Written
181	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Nita Green	Meetings with the foundation	<p>Senator GREEN: I want to ask about the foundation. We did have some questions about this earlier. We kept them for this section, so there should be some officials available. How many times have been met with the foundation, Mr Thomas, since our last estimates? Have been able to facilitate that despite COVID?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I'm afraid I would have to take on notice the precise number of times. But I have met with them since we last spoke.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: In Brisbane, or have they come up north to see you?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I've met them via a mix-virtually in Brisbane. I'm not sure about Townsville. I would have to check.</p>	93-94

				Senator GREEN: Could you take that on notice? It would be good to know how many times they've actually come up.	
182	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Nita Green	Employment of staff at Reef HQ	<p>Senator GREEN: Don't confuse what I'm saying. I'm asking you about people who are employed at Reef HQ to do the diving. I've asked Mr Thomas about this before. There was a decision to outsource those jobs in regional Queensland. I'm asking where that is up to. Have those people lost those jobs? Is the work now being done by an outside contractor?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I might have to come back to you with the exact status of that. What we are doing for Reef HQ staff is looking at what workforce we require for the facility once it is redeveloped. So all the maintenance practices required of the facility at the moment are being done by the existing workforce there, which is primarily permanent staff. As to where that panel arrangement that we have spoken about previously is up to, I can get you an update. I might even be able to do that this session.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: It would have been good if you had come prepared with that. I did ask you at the last estimates. You know it is a topic I was going to ask you about, surely.</p> <p>Ms Conner: I could expand a little on how the facility is running at the moment. Prior to it—</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I'm interested in the panel arrangement. That will mean that people who are directly employed by Reef HQ before are now not directly employed. That work is going to be done by an outside contractor. The reason I'm asking is there really is a question about whether that is a necessary step.</p> <p>Ms Conner: So we don't have a contractor, a firm, that is doing that work any more. In fact, prior to the facility closing, we had the nine casual staff and an extra 17 labour hire staff. We don't have them any more because we don't have the work that they were doing any more. We do have some labour hire, but they are doing more construction related activities.</p> <p>Mr Thomas: It's very difficult to manage diving because of the intermittent nature of the work and the infrequency with which divers are in the tanks. Establishing rosters can be challenging for our full-time dive staff, which is why we are looking to outsource it and, again, for improved work health safety outcomes. But I appreciate your interest in it, and I have asked for an update from my team.</p>	93
183	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Katy Gallagher	Working from home - Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many requests to work from home on an ongoing basis has your agency received from staff since the Australian Public Service Commission published 'Circular 2020/9: Returning to Usual Workplaces' on 29 September 2020?</li> <li>2. How many of these requests have been rejected and approved? Please outline the reasons that requests were rejected.</li> </ol>	Written
184	Great Barrier Reef Marine	Katy Gallagher	Staffing - Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a staffing profile for the agency as at 1 January 2021 and 01 April 2021 by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. APS ongoing: headcount and ASL;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written

	Park Authority			<p>b. APS non-ongoing: headcount and ASL;</p> <p>c. Labour hire staff; headcount and FTE; and</p> <p>d. Other contractors.; headcount and FTE</p> <p>2. Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount.</p> <p>3. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2020.</p>	
185	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Bridget McKenzie	Follow-up questions to question on notice Q30 (SQ20-000445) - GBRMPA staffing and working from home	<p>1. How many staff does GBRMPA have working in capital cities, including Canberra?</p> <p>2. Are any GBRMPA staff based in rural or regional locations?</p> <p>a. How many?</p> <p>b. What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff?</p> <p>3. How many staff worked-from-home each month from GBRMPA for the period October 2020 to March 2021?</p> <p>4. In response to question 2, GBRMPA has indicated that productivity remained consisted during the work-from-home period.</p> <p>a. How will GBRMPA maintain or increase productivity when staff return to work in their office?</p> <p>b. What opportunity exists for GBRMPA to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID?</p> <p>5. For question 3, GBRMPA data shows a 21.4 per cent decrease in the number of sick days of taken between March to October 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave?</p> <p>a. How will GBRMPA work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?</p> <p>b. If GBRMPA has staff based in rural/regional areas, is there a comparison of sick leave taken for these staff compared to city-based staff?</p>	Written
186	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Kristina Keneally	Promotional merchandise	<p>1. What promotional merchandise valued at \$25,162.45 was received in the period 24 October 2017 to 30 June 2018 under the contract related to contract notice CN3760048 published on Austender on 8 April 2021?</p> <p>2. Why was the contract notice relating to this contract not published on Austender within 42 days of the contract start date?</p>	Written
187	Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Jenny McAllister	Number of species recommended for a recovery plan	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Thanks, Professor Marsh. I just have a couple of follow-on questions from your earlier evidence. You've noted your preference in certain circumstances for conservation advice over a recovery plan. What does that mean for the 171 animals presently requiring a recovery plan? Is there an intention to not proceed with those, or is the intention that all of those recovery plans will be completed?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: As part of our conservation review project, which is detailed in my tabled statement, what we have done is review all the decisions made prior to 2014, and these</p>	31

				<p>are decisions that, I guess, predated the use of modern planning tools and decision tools. We have gone through the whole lot and we have made very detailed recommendations to the minister. My understanding is that these will go out for public comment. This is going to leave a residue of listed entities where we regard recovery plans as the most relevant planning tool, for the reasons I outlined earlier. And they will proceed as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So, in your advice to the minister, how many species have you recommended for a recovery plan?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: I'll have to take the exact number on notice, but my understanding is that the total number-of 918, actually-that we've now considered is a bit over 200. But the final decisions, of course, are up to the minister.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: You're recommending a recovery plan for 200 species?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: For 200-plus, yes.</p>	
188	Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Jenny McAllister	Number of species to be uplisted and listed for the first time	<p>Senator McALLISTER: What species are you considering uplisting?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: There's a huge number. There are more than 100 species in our work plan. Some of those are for uplisting, and some of them for listing for the first time.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So is it correct to say that there are more than 100 species on your agenda? What proportion, roughly, are for uplisting, and which are being listed for the first time?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: I'm sorry. I'd have to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Is it possible to table the list?</p> <p>Prof. Marsh: Yes. We could certainly table the list and also a summary statement if you'd like.</p>	29
189	Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Sarah Hanson-Young	TSSC challenges	<p>1. What are the biggest challenges that the TSSC face in order to fulfill its obligations?</p>	Written