

Budget Estimates 2019–20

Environment and Energy Portfolio – Thursday, 4 April and Monday, 8 April 2019

Question No.	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	Comment
1.	Corporate: CSD	Senator Keneally	Communities Environment Program funding in the electorate of Dunkley	<p>Senator KENEALLY: My point is, Mr Costello has given us evidence that the funding has not yet been allocated and the grant process is not yet open.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: It's in the budget. It will be appropriated in the normal ways.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: But somehow we have Mr Crewther, the member for Dunkley, posting on his Facebook, 'It has been great to be involved with Susie Webster and the Friends of Langwarrin Outdoors and Waterways,' and he is very happy to announce with the environment minister, Melissa Price, that FLOW, the acronym for this group, 'would be receiving \$7,500 as part of the federal Liberal government's Communities Environment Program'. Has the department awarded \$7,500 to FLOW in the electorate of Dunkley, under the Communities Environment Program?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: No, we haven't.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Has the parliament met with any of these groups—</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: No.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: in Dunkley or in Canberra?</p> <p>Mr Costello: No.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Not to my knowledge. We can check, but I'm pretty confident.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Does the department send an official with the minister when she travels?</p>	Page 15 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000308

				<p>Ms Jonasson: Not in every case, no. It's only at the request of the minister or the office.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Has the department gone with the minister to the electorate of Dunkley?</p> <p>Mr Costello: Not in relation to this program at all.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Can I put on notice whether they have gone with her at all to the electorate of Dunkley?</p> <p>Mr Costello: We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Yes, we can check that.</p>		
2.	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Waters	Wet tropics – funding	<p>Senator WATERS: My question was really about what modelling had been done to determine the effectiveness of that level of commitment from the Commonwealth to meet the task required, which is obviously to protect the Wet Tropics and the surrounding agricultural areas from an incredibly invasive and damaging ant species. Are you saying there, in fact, was no modelling done for whether the money can meet the task?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I am reminded that the size of the proposal, or the need that has been identified by the Wet Tropics Management Authority, on my understanding is a program that has been validated or analysed by Biosecurity Australia. In terms of the size of the task, I think those are questions that could be appropriately asked in the estimates hearing for the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources. Because we're in a partnership with Queensland, the reality is that the Commonwealth resources matched by the Queensland resources, on our understanding, would fully meet the need for the program that the wet tropics has set out for the next three years. And we are in a budget cycle, so, as we come to the end of that budget cycle, as we have just done this time around, we would be back considering what next is needed as part of a review of the program at that time.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Senator, if I can restate that: essentially,</p>	Page 23 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000334

				<p>they asked for \$6 million per year for seven years. On the assumption that the Queensland government co-funds with the Australian government, they will get \$6 million a year for three years. As Mr Oxley points out, it is of course open to the government to then re-fund later on in the cycle if it chooses to do so, as it has done in this budget.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Why was there no funding allocated for that fourth year?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: That's a budgetary decision by government.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Minister, do you have any explanation for that?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I can take that on notice. It obviously was a budget decision. Significant funding has been allocated, and clearly there are always opportunities to review the progress of a program and to reinvest more or other amounts into the future.</p>		
3.	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Hanson-Young	Breakdown of funding	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Cahill, would you be able to take on notice a detailed breakdown of where funding has been reduced in the different outcome areas over the last six years?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We can take that on notice.</p>	Page 30 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000306
4.	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Storer	List of lobbyists	<p>Senator STORER: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that. I take it that you as Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, are happy to take that on notice to provide me with the list of lobbyists, both in-house and third-party, you've met with since the start of the year.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: For the formality of things, I can't from the Foreign Affairs and Trade portfolio provide a portfolio response to this estimates committee. So, although it's a little bureaucratic, I encourage you to place that on notice to the Foreign Affairs and Trade portfolio in the relevant estimates committee. I can in this committee take it on notice in relation to the Environment and Energy portfolios.</p> <p>Senator STORER: Yes, that was my point. Can you provide the same information from Minister Price and</p>	Page 23 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000391

				Minister Taylor? Senator Birmingham: I can take those on notice. Senator STORER: Thank you.		
5.	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Urquhart	Election commitments	<p>Senator URQUHART: Does the Department keep a list of the government's election commitments?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: In terms of where there is a policy that was from an election—so from the last election in 2016, I've got to get my elections right—we keep a list of election commitments that we're implementing as part of listing and tracking anything we're implementing for the government of the day.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me what they are for 2013 and for 2016?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't have that with me.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you get it during the course of—</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I'll see what I can do, Senator. You've got them?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: Yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Thank you. Do you report progress to the minister?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: We have reported recently to the minister progress on the election commitment, which is one of the reasons—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Does the minister ask or do you, as a matter of course, report that progress?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I'll take that on notice. I can't recall.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I can answer that question. We do it on a regular basis.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me what election commitments are outstanding?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: Not now. I'll have a look on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That would be in that list.</p> <p>Ms Campbell: Yes.</p>	Page 52 and 53 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000345
6.	1.1: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Programs funded by the Landcare and	Senator URQUHART: Can I get a detailed year-by-year breakdown on committed and uncommitted	Page 7 Thursday	SQ19-000307

			<p>the Natural Heritage Trust accounts</p>	<p>funding in all programs funded by the Landcare and the Natural Heritage Trust accounts—funding over the forward estimates and over the medium term?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: As we prepare to provide that information—and I know that this is potentially slightly gratuitous—I appreciate getting your letter, identifying things that you're interested in. I would encourage that more generally if at all possible!</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: We'll see what we can do, Mr Pratt! I'm not sure that I can do that for every estimates, but we'll see. I'm pleased it was helpful.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Thank you.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Thank you for the question. I can give you some, but not all, of the information I'm afraid. I can certainly give you the allocated funds from this year through to the out years, and I can give you some of the committed funding.</p> <p>Just to explain for you: this funding is provided across three different portfolios. Prime Minister and Cabinet administers the Indigenous protected areas and the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources administers a couple of programs under it as well. In the time that we had we weren't able to do the coordination process overnight, unfortunately. But I can give you some information and perhaps take the rest on notice, if that would help.</p> <p>I'll start with the Natural Heritage Trust, with 2018-19—the current financial year—and the allocated funding. The 20 Million Trees Program has allocated funding in 2018 of 9.7, and in 2019-20 it has allocated funding of 5.3. Essentially, that's the remaining funds to close out the program. As I understand it, almost all of that funding is committed. There might be some bits and bobs waiting around, but the majority of that funding is committed. BushBlitz had \$1.7 million in 2018-19, and in 2019-20 it's \$3.1 million. Again, that's the remainder of the \$5 million that was allocated to</p>	4 April	
--	--	--	---	---	---------	--

				<p>BushBlitz, which started last year.</p> <p>The Threatened Species Recovery Fund: in 2018-19 it had \$1.1 million. Again, that's the remainder of the Threatened Species Recovery Fund. It finishes this year. And there is a collection of election commitments that were made in 2016 which included things like funding for yellow crazy ants and the Tamar River Recovery Plan. There is funding for those in 2018-19 of \$4.4 million, and then the tail of that funding in 2019-20 is \$0.5 million. That's the remainder of those.</p> <p>The Reef 2050 Implementation Strategy: in 2018-19 that was \$8.9 million and in 2019-20 it's \$8.9 million.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So it's the same for both years?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Yes. And in 2020-21 it's \$7.1 million; in 2021-22 it's \$7.7 million—sorry, it's \$7.7 million in the previous year as well.</p>		
7.	1.1: BCD	Senator Keneally	Communities Environment Program – committed funding	<p>Senator KENEALLY: All right. We perhaps can take your explanation that Minister Price could have perhaps been more precise with her language in the way that Mr Porter, Mr Ramsey and Ms Henderson had been. But if we go back to Mr Crewther and his announcements, which we spoke about earlier, there was a question from Senator Martin earlier, Minister Birmingham, where he noted and asked you whether Minister Price made any announcements in the videos that had been posted on Mr Crewther's Facebook page, and you said that no, she hadn't. That suggests that you either have seen the videos or have a transcript of them.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I said that I was advised that Minister Price had not announced or committed funding in those videos.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: So, somebody either has seen those videos or has a transcript of them, in order to provide you with that advice for you to provide here at Senate estimates without misleading us. So, are you able to table a transcript of those videos or the videos</p>	Page 53 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000309

				themselves? Senator Birmingham: I'll take that on notice.		
8.	1.1: BCD	Senator McAllister	Communities Environment Program – information provided to parliamentarians	<p>Senator McALLISTER: A month after this program is announced—and there's some indication about the expectation that MPs will consult—you write to parliamentarians. Is there any communication in the intervening period between the announcement on 4 March and the letter on 3 April? Do some parliamentarians receive advice that this program is on foot?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: It was publicly announced, so everybody, in that sense, received advice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Right. May I ask you, Mr Costello, how many parliamentarians asked for information about this program in the window between 4 March and 3 April.</p> <p>Mr Costello: I don't have that information, but we pointed anybody who did inquire to the fact sheet that was on the website.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: That was all that was provided to parliamentarians as they undertook this process of consultation?</p> <p>Mr Costello: From the department, yes, until the letter went out, which essentially cut and paste the information from the website and put it in the form of a letter. I'm aware the minister's office promoted the opportunity to members of their party.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So the minister's office promoted the opportunity to members of their own party.</p> <p>Mr Costello: Yes, they provided the information on the fact sheet, which was on the website, proactively.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: They proactively presented the information on the fact sheet on the website to members of their own party.</p> <p>Mr Costello: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Did any of the independents</p>	Page 50 and 51 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000392

				<p>get a heads-up?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: It was on the website, and a media release was issued.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: But you didn't go to Ms McGowan, Mr Wilkie or any of the independents in the lower house?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I don't know. I'm happy to take it on notice, but it's not like information wasn't publicly available for all to see. There was no exclusive information in that sense.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It was literally linked to the Prime Minister's media release—the information that's being referred to—on 4 March.</p>		
9.	1.1: BCD	Senator Urquhart	20 Million Trees Program – survival rate	<p>Ms Jonasson: One of the things we should point out is that one of the major contractual requirements of this program is that there must be an acquittal of the plants that have survived and there is a need to make good. If there's been a significant planting and a whole heap of them died, the provider needs to make good and replant to ensure that they meet the intention of the contract.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: But you don't keep a report on the survival rate?</p> <p>Mr Costello: Not that I'm aware of or can produce here today. I can take it on notice. Certainly, the requirement is to report on the number of trees established and that met the requirement.</p>	Page 53 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000346
10.	1.1: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Threatened species strategy – funding invested	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me how much funding's been invested in the commitment?</p> <p>Dr Box: Since 2014, there's been \$425 million mobilised for projects supporting threatened species outcomes generally. That includes our priority species under the strategy but also a wide range of other species.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What about just limited to the trajectory that we're talking about, for 2020?</p> <p>Dr Box: I'd have to take that on notice on a species-by-species basis, but I'd also make the point that the</p>	Page 55 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000347

				<p>Threatened Species Strategy is about focusing Australian government investment, as we have through the Regional Land Partnerships Program, but it's also about mobilising partnerships and encouraging others to get involved in protecting and recovering these species. There are many partners involved in targeting investment and effort towards recovering these priority species, not just the Australian government.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes. Who is responsible, then, for delivering it?</p>		
11.	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Species covered under renewed evaluation process	<p>Ms Jonasson: This is building on the data that we already have through various databases like SPRAT and others. When we put out the request for tender last year, we provided to all potential tenderers an interactive map so that in the area they wanted to target, they could drill down and identify what were the matters of national environmental significance in their project area, in their natural resource management area and they could identify what were the threatened species they wanted to target. That link then took them through to the specific recovery plans and conservation advices and they could identify that. We had a strong expectation within the tender process that activities that they would identify, they would undertake, and that they would be consistent with the recovery plans and conservation advices. It's off the back of that that we have built this significant evaluation framework and the monitoring framework that we intend to use going forward.</p> <p>Senator RICE: In this new project, is this just setting up the framework or are you going to be rolling it out?</p> <p>Mr Costello: It is rolling out.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How many species are being covered under this renewed evaluation process?</p> <p>Mr Costello: I would have to take that on notice but it is certainly the majority of the species in the threatened species strategy, if not all of those would be covered by</p>	Page 85 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000353

				these investments and then some more species as well as the 2020 and 30 identified in the Threatened Species Strategy.		
12.	1.4: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Guardian article – third party concerns	<p>Senator URQUHART: What things have you put in place to ensure that this won't happen again?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: The first thing I would say is that, since we became aware of this, we have done this letter to Ms Cox to ensure that we are on record as correcting that. In addition to that I've put in place additional checks in my team. There have been multiple FOI requests on this particular topic, as you would be aware. I've been working with our general counsel branch to ensure that we have the appropriate checks before information is released to make sure nothing of a personal nature or something that could support corrupt or fraudulent behaviour is released. I might hand over to my colleague Ms Tregurtha.</p> <p>Ms Tregurtha: In terms of responsibility for ensuring that delegates and others processing any department requests are aware of their obligations, we take an educative role and we also provide support in processing requests. I've also been through this error with my team as to what we could do better in the future. We're making sure that we do thoroughly review and assist to review those documents and also identify where we might need to do more enhanced consultation with third parties to pick up these sorts of things.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Have either set of documents—the newly redacted or the originals—been published on the department's FOI log?</p> <p>Ms Tregurtha: No we haven't done that yet.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you going to do that?</p> <p>Ms Tregurtha: Yes, we will do that.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Who are the third parties who have raised concerns about the information being made public? It is six months after the release of that</p>	Page 34 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000311

				information. Ms Jonasson: I don't have that information available here today. I'd have to take that on notice.		
13.	1.4: BCD	Senator Siewert	Indigenous Protected Areas - funding	Is the \$12.5m for Indigenous Protected Areas announced to be administered through the government's central grants hub in the Department of Industry? How much if any administration fee will be taken from the grants total of \$12.5m by the grants hub?	Written	SQ19-000377
14.	1.4: BCD	Senator Siewert	Indigenous Protected Areas criteria and development of IPA plans	Which department has designed the criteria against which any new IPA proposals (or consultation proposals) will be assessed? Which department will decide on which new IPAs will be funded for further consultation and development of draft IPA plans?	Written	SQ19-000378
15.	1.4: BCD	Senator Siewert	Indigenous Protected Areas – National Reserve System Network	Which department will make the final decision on which new IPAs will be accepted into the National Reserve System Network? Does the Department of Environment still administer Australia's National Reserve System? Is this a high priority for the Department of Environment given our national and international obligations and targets? What percentage by area will Indigenous Protected Areas make up of Australia's National Reserve System at a) the current time, and b) after the five new IPAs currently in planning are completed satisfactorily?	Written	SQ19-000379
16.	1.4: BCD	Senator Siewert	Indigenous Protected Areas – lead Department	Why is not the Department that is most heavily engaged nationally in biodiversity and cultural heritage management, including protected areas, the lead department of assisting and working with indigenous organisations to deliver natural and cultural heritage management?	Written	SQ19-000380
17.	1.4: BCD	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kookaburras	In a media article titled 'Kookaburra found in US pet shop leaves Aussie worried about 'this little guy' reared	Written	SQ19-000382

				so far from home' published on March 26 2019, I note that the Department indicated it was seeking further information about the matter. Under what circumstances can Kookaburras be exported from Australia?		
18.	1.4: BCD	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kookaburras – lawful exports	In a media article titled 'Kookaburra found in US pet shop leaves Aussie worried about 'this little guy' reared so far from home' published on March 26 2019, I note that the Department indicated it was seeking further information about the matter. Over the last five financial years, how many Kookaburras have been lawfully exported from Australia?	Written	SQ19-000383
19.	1.4: BCD	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kangaroos	In a media article title 'Kangaroo locked in tiny US petting zoo cage prompts petition to bring animal home' published on April 7 2019, media reports surfaced about a kangaroo in a petting zoo in Connecticut, USA. Under what circumstances can Kangaroos be exported from Australia?	Written	SQ19-000384
20.	1.4: BCD	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kangaroos – lawful exports	In a media article title 'Kangaroo locked in tiny US petting zoo cage prompts petition to bring animal home' published on April 7 2019, media reports surfaced about a kangaroo in a petting zoo in Connecticut, USA. Over the last five financial years, how many Kangaroos have been lawfully exported from Australia?	Written	SQ19-000385
21.	1.4: HRMD	Senator Chisholm	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - projects	Senator CHISHOLM: Will you get access to the information they received through grant programs to keep on file for future reference? For instance, if they had a good project or a good community group that could potentially help in the future will that information be kept with the foundation or would it be kept with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority?	Page 91 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000324

				<p>Mr Thomas: I'm not quite sure what you are getting at there, Senator. The marine park authority has a range of partnership arrangements with numerous stakeholders across government, industry and community groups et cetera. The foundation itself I am sure is going about its processes of identifying who it will partner with in investing its money. We work closely with them to ensure our respective roles marry up well in the interests of the Reef, and we'd routinely share information that we thought was beneficial to one another, as we would with any other organisation.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: With respect to the question about the performance of the foundation, its accountability is to the department in terms of reporting on their performance and also for us to work with them in terms of the evaluation. So that information absolutely will be within the domain of the government if that is in fact your question.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: What about in terms of projects that they are working on, in terms of the data if they have given a contract to an organisation who actually is the holder of the data that that organisation collects into the future?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I want to take that on notice, but you can imagine that a good portion of that is absolutely of interest to the public good and quite frankly to the academic sector et cetera. I'll see whether my colleagues who would sit on the project management committee might have a specific insight on that.</p>		
22.	1.5: ESD	Senator Chisholm	Agricultural review	<p>Mr Edwards: Yes. The review was looking at a range of things. Dr Wendy Craik was appointed as an independent reviewer. She was asked to look at the short-term opportunities to reduce red tape and find practical solutions to help farmers navigate the EPBC Act's rules. I will highlight key components of the terms of reference for you. They are to consider ways to approve farmers awareness and understanding of the</p>	Page 21 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000310

				<p>referral, assessment and approval requirements of the act; to explore farmers' engagement with the species and ecological communities listing process and to examine the interaction between the EPBC Act and state native vegetation regimes.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Minister, are you anticipating a date as to when this report will be released?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'm not anticipating a date, but I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>		
23.	1.5: ESD	Senator Rice	Adani groundwater management plan – CSIRO communications	<p>Senator RICE: Have you then further received any communications back from CSIRO and Geoscience Australia about those revised management plans?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As I said, yes, we have.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Exactly what was communicated with Adani, and are you able to table those communications?</p> <p>Mr Manning: The advice we received from those agencies went to the scientific underpinnings, if you will, of the science in those groundwater plans. We communicated some of the issues that that raised, and some of the areas where we felt changes needed to be made to those management plans as a consequence.</p> <p>Senator RICE: There's a lot of community concern about the issue of groundwater and the use of groundwater by Adani. Are you able to make those communications public?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We'd probably have to take that on notice. We don't have all those communications with us today. As Mr Manning and his team have been working with the company for months, if not years, in order to manage the process of doing the approvals of those management plans, there's a vast amount of communications both before and after the particular advice you're concerned about was received. We can certainly take that on notice.</p>	Page 58 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000348
24.	1.5: ESD	Senator Rice	Meetings with Adani representatives and	<p>Senator RICE: How many meetings have Adani representatives and their lobbyists had with the</p>	Page 60 Monday	SQ19-000349

			<p>lobbyists</p>	<p>department in relation to the groundwater dependent ecosystems management plan over the last six months? Mr Manning: We'd have to take that on notice. I think we got a question on that at a previous estimates where we provided that up to that particular date. We would have to take it on notice to update it since the information provided at that time. Senator RICE: I'm also interested in meetings with the minister. How many meetings have you had with CSIRO? Mr Manning: Likewise, I couldn't say offhand how many engagements we've had with CSIRO. I'd have to take that on notice. Senator RICE: Thank you. There's a really strong perception of misconduct and there's a huge amount of concern regarding the decision being made on the management plan.</p>	8 April	
25.	1.5: ESD	Senator McAllister	<p>Courier-Mail media report Adani delays - correspondence</p>	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Minister, are you actually saying that you don't know whether or not correspondence that's on the front page of <i>The Courier-Mail</i> has or has not been received by Minister Price? Is that your evidence? Senator Birmingham: I have no knowledge of such correspondence, but such correspondence is irrelevant to the fact of the matter, and the fact of the matter is that, in terms of the decision to be made around this plan by Minister Price, that decision will be made consistent with her legal obligations under the EPBC Act, the conditions imposed for the approval of the project, and the advice and expert opinions that the department has provided to her. Senator McALLISTER: Can I ask that the letter be tabled? Senator Birmingham: I'll take that on notice. Senator McALLISTER: Is Senator McGrath the only signatory to the letter or are there other co-signatories? Senator Birmingham: Well, I have no knowledge of</p>	Page 64 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000350

				such letter, aside from this media story, so I'll take that on notice. It may be a hypothetical question.		
26.	1.5: ESD	Senator McAllister	Adani news article – correspondence	<p>Senator McALLISTER: So you're aware of the article but you did not make any inquiries about whether this correspondence had been received?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I saw something in relation to the story. I don't know that I have seen the clipping as such, and the <i>Courier Mail</i> was not sitting on the plane this morning from Adelaide when I came here.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: The article says that, in addition to Senator McGrath, Mr Dutton and Mr Canavan were also seeking clarification. Has the minister met with Mr Dutton or Mr Canavan over the course of the budget week?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I will take that on notice. I'm sure that Minister Price, like all of us, engages with our colleagues informally and regularly throughout parliamentary sitting weeks, particularly when they're colleagues are in the same chamber, so I would be surprised if she hadn't spoken to Minister Dutton at some stage during the last week; whether it was about this topic, I have go no idea.</p>	Page 64 and 65 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000351
27.	1.5: ESD	Senator Rice	List of all federal approvals in relation to the Adani coalmine	<p>Senator RICE: On this issue, finally, could you please provide me with an updated list of all the federal approvals in relation to the Adani coalmine.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Just to be clear, do you mean in terms of how Adani have met their conditions? There's one approval for the Carmichael coalmine, which is the approval Minister Hunt made a number of years ago. I'm just trying to understand what exactly you mean. Then, in addition to that, Adani have a number of different projects with the Commonwealth, each of which either has or will require an approval. But the conditions for each of those approvals all have obligations that are imposed on the company which require, in some cases, the minister to approve plans after the formal approval's been made. So I'm trying to</p>	Page 69 and 70 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000393

				<p>get a sense of exactly what it is that you're seeking.</p> <p>Senator RICE: All of those.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Every approval?</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes. I'm happy for you to take it on notice to provide me with written documentation of it.</p> <p>Mr Manning: Whatever you'd prefer, Senator. Otherwise I can step you through it now, if you would like.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Everything?</p> <p>Mr Manning: Oh, everything will take longer.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Would you be able to take it on notice and get it to us by the end of today?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'm not sure about the end of today. Someone will have to go through each—</p> <p>Senator RICE: In terms of—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That's the Carmichael project that Mr Manning's talking to, which we can certainly give you by the end of the day. In terms of all the other approvals, someone would have to go through the condition sets—</p> <p>Senator RICE: I'm after the Adani Carmichael mine.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Just the Carmichael mine? Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Well, that is what the Adani coalmine is, isn't it?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes, but I'm saying that Adani have the North Galilee Basin Rail Project. They have a project at Abbot Point. That's what I was trying to clarify before. They have a number of projects. Carmichael is just the mine.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you can get me as many as you can by the end of the day that would be most appreciated and take the rest of them on notice—</p>		
28.	1.5: OoC	Senator Rice	Compliance investigations undertaken into land clearing	<p>Senator RICE: Can the department outline the number of compliance investigations it's undertaken into land clearing in the past three years?</p> <p>Ms Collins: I'm not sure if I've got the full data for the</p>	Page 11 and 12 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000312

				<p>past three years, but, in terms of investigations over the last couple of years, in the 2017-18 financial year, the department received 45 allegations. At the moment, there are 10 investigations in Queensland itself and we've got a number of investigations in other states around Australia. I may take the question on notice for the last three years.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Those 10 investigations are over what period of time?</p> <p>Ms Collins: The 10 investigations are current investigations in Queensland.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you have some information there as to what hectares of clearing that's covering?</p> <p>Ms Collins: I haven't got the total hectares of those.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Have you got any indication of what those 10 instances are? Can you give us some more detail about those?</p> <p>Ms Collins: No; I haven't got the details in front of me.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: The other thing is that I'm thinking of a couple of those where they are very active, and we wouldn't want to get into specifics that would compromise that. But I can assure you that the number of hectares were dealing with is in the thousands of hectares.</p> <p>Senator RICE: From looking at the data, we've got about 800,000 hectares of land clearing in Queensland over the last three years, and you've got 10 investigations. I just want to get a bit of a feel as to how much of that 800,000 hectares of clearing has actually been under active investigation by the government.</p> <p>Ms Collins: It's really important to note that the state and territory governments are the primary regulators when it comes to land clearing. There will be a volume of those hectares that may in fact have approvals for clearing of native vegetation. From the Commonwealth</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>perspective, we only get involved where there are matters of national environmental significance and where there's likely to have been a significant impact on those. So, for those reasons, I don't imagine that we would have looked at all of those instances of clearing. We really take that focus where there is likely to be a significant impact on Commonwealth matters of national significance.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Quite a number of those would have been matters of environmental significance—in particular, impact on the Great Barrier Reef.</p> <p>Ms Collins: That's the very first thing that we assess—are there likely to be matters of national environmental significance—when we're looking into land clearing.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could take that on notice then, because I would be very interested to know what proportion of that 800,000 hectares of clearing has occurred. In fact, I've been told since 2014 and 16 that it's been covered by your investigations.</p> <p>Ms Collins: Definitely we can take that on notice.</p>		
29.	1.5: OoC	Senator McAllister	Ministerial briefing on land-clearing issues	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Has anyone from the department in the last, say, three years briefed Minister Taylor on land-clearing issues?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not to my knowledge, Senator, but we would have to take that on notice to check to be absolutely sure.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It may have come up in terms of its connection with respect to greenhouse gases, but we'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 76 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000354
30.	1.5: OoC	Senator Rice	Ministerial briefing – Jam Land Pty Ltd	<p>Senator RICE: Has Minister Price been briefed about the compliance action with Jam Land Pty Ltd?</p> <p>Ms Collins: We routinely update the minister's advisers in relation to matters of compliance activity. Certainly I've updated the advisers in relation to a whole range of investigations that we're undertaking, just so that they've got an awareness of the types of</p>	Page 79 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000355

				<p>projects. But there's been no detailed briefing, and no detailed briefing to the minister's office.</p> <p>Senator RICE: No detailed briefing, but you advised the minister's advisers of a range of actions, so the minister's advisers would know of the action that's been taken against Jam Land Pty Ltd?</p> <p>Ms Collins: I would have to take that on notice in terms of specific advice that has been provided. But, as I say, it's routine practice for us to advise the minister's office on the range of investigations that we're undertaking. It's not routine for us to go into the specifics of the investigation. So, at a high level, I do expect that I would have mentioned this investigation, but I certainly wouldn't have gone into a detailed briefing.</p>		
31.	1.5: OoC	Senator Rice	Dates of ministerial briefing – Jam Land Pty Ltd	<p>Senator RICE: But, in terms of your briefing with the minister's office, which is what I'm particularly interested in at this stage, what I'm getting to is the minister's awareness that there was an investigation being undertaken against a company where there was a connection with Minister Taylor.</p> <p>Ms Collins: As I said, as part of the routine briefings, I would have included briefings to the minister's advisers at a high level that this was one of the investigations. The briefing would have been no different to the type of information I would have given on any other investigation that we're undertaking. Whilst I can't say specifically whether I did or didn't, it's the type of information that, because I knew that there was a family relationship, I would have mentioned. But it wouldn't have been anything beyond that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me when those briefings would have occurred?</p> <p>Ms Collins: Not specifically; I don't have that information here. But I'd be happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Senator, I think it's important to keep in</p>	Page 79 and 80 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000356

				mind that the compliance office within the department is not subject to ministerial influence. It's run in its own right. It conducts its investigations in its own right. And therefore any briefing that would happen with the minister's office would be in a very high level nature—		
32.	1.5: OoC	Senator Rice	Briefings with the minister on compliance actions	<p>Senator RICE: At each of those fortnightly meetings, would you go through each of the compliance actions, or only if something had changed?</p> <p>Ms Collins: No, we don't go through compliance actions. As I say, it's about raising awareness at a high level. So it wouldn't be something that I would have discussed every fortnight. Whilst an investigation is underway, as long as there's an awareness, if it warrants an awareness from the minister's office, it's not something that I then mention on a routine basis.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So when did you last have one of those regular routine briefings with the minister's advisers?</p> <p>Ms Collins: I would have to take that on notice specifically.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You said fortnightly—</p> <p>Ms Collins: That's right.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So in the last fortnight?</p> <p>Ms Collins: No, not in the last fortnight, probably not in the last month. But, as I say, I haven't got the dates specifically in front of me. For example, for one of the most recent fortnightly meetings, I was away interstate. So I wasn't at that last fortnightly meeting.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay, so it wasn't in the last fortnight, so approximately a month ago?</p> <p>Ms Collins: In terms of whether this particular investigation has been mentioned recently, no, it hasn't.</p>	Page 80 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000357
33.	1.5: ESD	Senator Waters	Mount Lofty Referral EPBC 2018/8198	<p>What were the species for which the development was found to be a controlled action for?</p> <p>Is the site critical koala habitat?</p> <p>How does the EPBC Act protect critical habitat?</p> <p>How could the EPBC Act protect this site?</p>	Written	SQ19-000335

				<p>Why was the level of assessment ordered only preliminary documentation when community concern is high and this is the last remaining site of koala habitat in the entire federal electorate of Groom?</p> <p>What are the opportunities for public input into the process from here on in?</p>		
34.	1.5: ESD	Senator Siewert	Proposed infrastructure developments	<p>Is the Department aware of the proposed infrastructure developments at the location known as Deep Gorge, within the Dampier Archipelago, including Burrup Peninsula National Heritage Place?</p> <p>If so, on what basis were any approvals given for the proposed works?</p> <p>What assurances are in place that the proposed works will not adversely affect the National Heritage Values?</p> <p>Are the proposed infrastructure developments activity a breach of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?</p> <p>Who are the heritage professionals that provided the Department with expert advice to enable issuing a permit or consent advice?</p> <p>If there are no heritage professionals, why was no professional expert advice considered?</p> <p>If there are heritage professionals, does this person/s have the appropriated knowledge and experiences in regard to the National Heritage Values of the Dampier Archipelago National Heritage Place? If so, please provide relevant documentary evidence.</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>As the current Deep Gorge proposal and State Government s.18 permit will result in the destruction of National Heritage Values will the Minister intervene to protect the National Heritage Place? If so, when will this occur as ground disturbing activity is due to commence?</p>	Written	SQ19-000381

				If not, why not?		
35.	1.5 OoC	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kookaburras – media article	In a media article titled ‘Kookaburra found in US pet shop leaves Aussie worried about ‘this little guy’ reared so far from home’ published on March 26 2019, I note that the Department indicated it was seeking further information about the matter. • What information has been provided to date?	Written	SQ19-000386
36.	1.5 OoC	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kookaburras – illegal trade	Is the Department aware of any illegal trade in Kookaburras? If so, please provide a description of that activity.	Written	SQ19-000387
37.	1.5 OoC	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kangaroos – media article	In a media article title ‘Kangaroo locked in tiny US petting zoo cage prompts petition to bring animal home’ published on April 7 2019, media reports surfaced about a kangaroo in a petting zoo in Connecticut, USA. • Has the Department undertaken any inquiries to determine whether this Kangaroo was exported from Australia or if it was bred overseas and onsold to this petting zoo?	Written	SQ19-000388
38.	1.5 OoC	Senator Patrick	Exportation of Kangaroos – illegal trade	Is the Department aware of any illegal trade in Kangaroos? If so, please provide a description of that activity.	Written	SQ19-000389
39.	2.1: CCD	Senator Keneally	Average cost of abatement under energy efficiency measures	Senator KENEALLY: Do you have an average cost of abatement under the energy efficiency measures? Ms Tilley: No, we don't have an average cost of abatement. It will be different for different measures in different circumstances. I don't believe we've tried to work out an average figure for that. Ms Evans: It's fair to say, though, that our experience with energy efficiency programs has been that they're really relatively low-cost abatement. In fact, they often deliver a net benefit in a cost sense for the abatement that you achieve. We can provide on notice the actual costs, but they're usually very, very low, if not benefits.	Page 47 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000313
40.	2.1: CCD	Senator Di	Climate Solutions	Senator DI NATALE: Let's talk about the abatement	Page 58	SQ19-000314

		Natale	Fund - abatement	<p>that you expect to get from that \$189 million of new money. What would you expect to get in terms of abatement?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: The estimate we provided for the Climate Solutions Package is that that \$2 billion would deliver, in actual delivered abatement by 2030, 103 million tonnes.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: That wasn't my question. The \$189 million over the forwards.</p> <p>Ms Evans: I think we would have to take that on notice, but it will be based on, roughly, our approximate emissions per tonne, because this profile reflects—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Your average abatement figure?</p> <p>Ms Evans: No, the projected emissions cost per tonne for this particular package, not the average over the history of it.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: So you'd expect it to be higher, because most of the low-cost abatement has been done already?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: We've looked at the previous auctions and modelled, to some degree, the volume of abatement that came forward at the beginning of the ERF, noting that there was a large funding announcement then, and assumed that, with a new funding announcement of \$2 billion, you would get a larger volume of abatement coming forward initially, because that announcement would signal opportunities under the fund. So, like we saw when the fund first operated through its first three or four auctions, the vast volume of abatement that has been contracted to date was delivered through the earlier auctions. While we would assume that there's a gradual price rise, this is purely an assumption for the purpose of costings. Given such a high amount of volume is expected at the earlier auctions, that keeps the average price per tonne low.</p>	Thursday 4 April	
--	--	---------------	-------------------------	--	---------------------	--

				<p>Senator DI NATALE: Just to put it in context: if we do assume a level of abatement, basically, that's consistent with some of those earlier projects, we're talking about 10 million tonnes of abatement broadly—would that be over the \$189 million?</p> <p>Ms Evans: Senator, I think you are mixing up the way that financial information is being presented in the forward estimates period with the abatement estimate, which is out to 2030 and which is in the context—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I am asking you over the forward estimates. Give me an estimate of the abatement over the forwards.</p> <p>Ms Evans: As I said, we'd have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Perhaps you could take it on notice.</p> <p>Ms Evans: Yes, I will take it on notice.</p>		
41.	2.1: CCD	Senator Di Natale	Meetings with the Minister - Trevor St Baker	<p>Ms E Johnson: Yes, that's right. It's a statutory 28-day consultation period, unless ERAC decides on a shorter period. But that's a full public consultation.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Will the outcome of the review be made public?</p> <p>Ms E Johnson: Yes, that's the standard practice.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Can I ask whether Mr Trevor St Baker has met with the minister?</p> <p>Ms E Johnson: We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: Not to my knowledge.</p>	Page 62 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000315
42.	2.1: CCD	Senator Martin	McKibbin model – sectoral coverage	<p>Ms Tilley: I don't have a breakdown of what sectors are covered. Given it was a broad model across the Australian economy, my presumption would be that the McKibbin model looked across all relevant sectors that we report on in the emissions inventory.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I think my understanding is that it excluded sources like agriculture, mining and manufacturing.</p> <p>Ms Evans: I have to take that on notice as well, but the minister is correct. I'm pretty sure the McKibbin modelling has a focus on energy, on the energy related</p>	Page 64 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000316

				sectors, so I don't think it's coverage is particularly strong on the land based sectors. Senator MARTIN: Okay. Ms Evans: We will have to take it on notice, to clarify, I'm sorry.		
43.	2.1: CCD	Senator Rice	Methodology relating to unlogged native forests	<p>Senator RICE: Is there a methodology that relates to unlogged native forest?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: No, not at this stage.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Has the department done any work on considering a methodology for unlogged native forest?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: Over the last four or five years there has been some very preliminary work done. Various people have asked us to have a look at whether it would be feasible or not, but it hasn't been a priority for us in the last couple of years.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Who asked the department to look at it?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: You probably would have seen in the media that the Victorian government requested that the minister have a look at it or that the department have a look on her behalf.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you give me more information about the representations from the Victorian government regarding looking at a methodology.</p> <p>Ms Maguire: I haven't got the letter in front of me, but there was a fair bit of information in the media in the last couple of weeks requesting that the federal government have a look at potential—</p> <p>Senator RICE: There's a letter. Were there other representations or would the letter have been the extent of the representations?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: The letter is what I understand to be the request.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you don't know of any other? Has there been any minister to minister discussion or anything like that, or is it just a letter?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: My understanding is it's a letter, but</p>	Page 65 and 66 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000317

				<p>we'd have to take on notice if there were any other representations.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Was that letter responded to?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: I understand it was. We'll have to take that one on notice.</p>		
44.	2.1: CCD	Senator Rice	Development of new methodologies - letters from state governments	<p>Senator RICE: How many letters do you get from state governments, though, asking you to develop methodologies? How many would it be?</p> <p>Ms Maguire: I can't tell you exactly how many, but we have had a number of representations on a range of different types of methods over time.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you take on notice the representations from state governments and whether they have resulted in methodologies, please.</p>	Page 67 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000319
45.	2.1: CCD	Senator Urquhart	Emissions projections 2030	<p>Senator URQUHART: What are the national absolute emissions projected to be in 2019?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: The projections indicated that the annual emissions in 2019 would be 541 million tonnes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What about 2030?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: It's 563 million tonnes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What percentage increase is that?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: For between 2018 and 2030, I'll just have to refer to another document. I'll find the number. While I'm finding it, I'll make sure, as we've noted in other estimates, all senators are clear that our performance towards our target—both the 2020 target and 2030 target—are measured on a budget basis. It's the total allowable amount of emissions over that target period. The actual emissions in any particular year don't necessarily impact whether or not—a growth in emissions in a particular year doesn't mean that you can't meet the overall budget target.</p> <p>Ms Evans: The mathematical question was what the percentage increase is. Maybe we will just take that on notice to make sure we get it right.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Sorry, I didn't quite catch that.</p>	Page 93 and 94 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000362

				<p>Ms Evans: You asked for the percentage increase between 2030 and 2018. It's just not a period we have precalculated. We will just take it on notice and make sure that we calculate it properly.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I thought Ms Tilley said that she had it there.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I can compare what the projected 2030 emissions would be in a percentage term against the 2005 level of emissions, which is the baseline for the 2030 target. Against the 2005 level of emissions, emissions in 2030 are expected to be seven per cent below 2005 levels.</p>		
46.	2.1: CCD	Senator McAllister	Advice to Department of Industry, Innovation and Science - modelling	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Just finally you said we'd need direct questions about the industry department modelling to the industry department—fair enough. Are you involved in it in any way—are you providing advice?</p> <p>Ms Evans: We have been asked for technical advice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What advice have you been providing?</p> <p>Ms Evans: You're asking me to share with you a matter of policy questions which I'm not prepared to do.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Oh, Ms Evans, I'm afraid you're not allowed to just not answer questions. The standing orders do require you to provide an answer.</p> <p>Ms Evans: We've provided technical advice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What specific parameters are they seeking advice on?</p> <p>Ms Evans: I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 96 and 97 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000363
47.	2.1: CCD	Senator McAllister	Department of Industry, Innovation and Science – modelling emission reduction target	<p>Senator McALLISTER: And are they modelling a 45 per cent emission reduction target?</p> <p>Ms Evans: Senator, these are questions you should put to the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science. It's not a product of the Department of the Environment and Energy.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Have they advised you that</p>	Page 97 and 98 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000364

				<p>they're a modelling a 45 per cent emission reduction target?</p> <p>Ms Evans: They have a number of scenarios that they are modelling.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Have they advised you that one of those scenarios is a 45 per cent emission reduction target?</p> <p>Ms Evans: I'd rather take it on notice and ask the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science if they're comfortable with us talking about their modelling work.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Senator, if I could jump in: I don't want to be seeming to be difficult, but if we were providing advice direct to our minister we would of course be very uncomfortable about telling you what policy advice we are currently providing to our minister—the nature of that advice. If we are providing policy advice, even of a technical nature to the industry department, which is doing work which it may use to inform its policy advice to their minister, then it's an extension of the same issue. That is why we are not able to talk clearly about this. It's not because we are trying to—</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Mr Pratt, you will have heard the opening statement by the chair which says that advice to government is not a sufficient reason to refuse to answer a question. Are you claiming public interest immunity in relation to this? If you're not, you need to answer the question.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: What I'm saying, Senator, is that we do not—and this has been a longstanding position under successive governments—provide details about the nature and content of the policy advice that we provide to ministers. That is a longstanding understanding.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: The problem with that analysis is that almost nothing that any department does can then be the subject of discussion, which is why the formal advice, read by the chair, is that advice</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>to government is not a sufficient reason; there needs to be some demonstration of actual harm if you wish to claim public interest immunity.</p> <p>CHAIR: If I could assist here: I think Ms Evans did say she was taking the question on notice—am I right?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Actually she did, and then Mr Pratt chose to engage in another discussion about this, which I've had about five times in the last five days.</p> <p>CHAIR: Ms Evans, just to confirm: you are taking that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Evans: I'm happy to take it on notice.</p>		
48.	2.1: CCD	Senator McAllister	Modelling conducted by the industry department	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Is the modelling being conducted by the industry department, or is it being commissioned by the industry department to be performed by a third party?</p> <p>Ms Evans: It's a question that you would be best to give to the industry department. It's their modelling.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Have they informed you whether they are doing it in-house or whether they are commissioning a third party to undertake the work?</p> <p>Ms Evans: They have.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What have they told you?</p> <p>Ms Evans: It's a question I would rather you put to the Industry, Innovation and Science portfolio. It is their modelling. I'm happy to take it on notice again to find out and consult with them, if they're comfortable for me to talk about their modelling.</p>	Page 98 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000365
49.	2.1: CCD	Senator Storer	Projects under the 2015 iteration of the landfill method	<p>Senator STORER: What percentage of projects under the 2015 iteration of the landfill method are electricity generating?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I'd certainly have to take that one on notice and consult with the Clean Energy Regulator. On your earlier question, a colleague has just handed me some information on the 2015 landfill gas method and the number of projects that are under it. I can give you some details on that, which leads into the contracted</p>	Page 102 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000358

				<p>and delivered abatement, which is ACCUs, as you asked. There have been 107 different projects registered under that method, and 92 of those have been contracted through the ERF auctions for government to purchase that delivered abatement. Those contracted projects collectively represent 20,869,222 tonnes of abatement. That would equal that number of ACCUs that are currently contracted under those projects. To date, under those projects, 8,695,867 tonnes of abatement have been delivered and, therefore, ACCUs issued to those projects.</p> <p>Senator STORER: Thank you. I'll just return to the next question. What percentage of projects under the 2015 iteration of the landfill method are mutually registered under the Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I'd have to take that one on notice.</p>		
50.	2.1: CCD	Senator Storer	Advice provided by the Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee	<p>Senator STORER: What advice was provided by the Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee in its crediting period extension review?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: Again, I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STORER: If you could, please.</p>	Page 102 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000359
51.	2.1: CCD	Senator Storer	Development of methods - project funding	<p>Senator STORER: These are steps that have been taken by the department?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I'm sorry?</p> <p>Senator STORER: These are the steps that have been taken by the department to address this?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: These are steps that are taken in the development of methods that then go through the independent Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee to assess if they meet the standards such as going beyond business as usual.</p> <p>Senator STORER: That's projects going forward?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: That's methods, which are the project rules.</p> <p>Senator STORER: Regarding new projects.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator STORER: But the concern here is about the</p>	Page 103 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000360

				<p>previous projects and that there's funding going on that would have gone to projects that were happening anyway.</p> <p>Ms Evans: I think we've said a few times we're not aware of anything that would support the claim that you're making, but we're happy to take it on notice and have a look.</p> <p>Senator STORER: If you could.</p>		
52.	2.1: CCD	Senator Storer	Energy efficiency	<p>Senator STORER: Quickly, I might ask a question about energy efficiency. It's with regard to measures for carbon abatement. It follows a question that I put in estimates in February. It was about the percentage of carbon abatement being achieved by energy efficiency measures. The answer was that not all energy efficiency measures are able to be quantified. So I want to understand: other than the Climate Solutions package, what energy efficiency measures can be quantified in Australia's emissions projections?</p> <p>Ms Croker: It's actually an issue under outcome 2— for those numbers.</p> <p>Senator STORER: I was advised that I could ask it in this, due to the energy efficiency. I'll have to take it up with them.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: You can always put it on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Ms Croker: Yes, we'll take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator STORER: I'll put it on notice, and read out the question: other than the Climate Solutions Package, what energy efficiency measures can be quantified in Australia's emissions projections? Secondly, what is the estimated percentage of Australia's current and projected carbon abatement being achieved by energy efficiency measures?</p> <p>Ms Croker: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 113 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000361
53.	2.3: CCD	Senator Di Natale	Electric Vehicles funding	<p>Senator DI NATALE: I will ask them, but I am interested, given you are saying you have given some attention to this. You have now told me that the CFC</p>	Page 60 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000333

				<p>has provided \$1 billion. I asked you specifically about electric vehicles. Is that \$1 billion going towards electric vehicles?</p> <p>Ms Evans: They are going to low-emissions vehicles and I did say that the first time.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: The question I asked was about electric vehicles specifically.</p> <p>Ms Evans: It includes electric vehicles, so it is a relevant answer to your question.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: How much of that billion dollars is directed at—</p> <p>Ms Evans: I can't give you that specifically. I will have to take it on notice. But the CEFC would be able to answer that question when they are called.</p>		
54.	2.3: CCD	Senator McAllister	Electric Vehicles – infrastructure and charging infrastructure	<p>Senator McALLISTER: So we expect them to improve. The third impediment that the minister identified at that time was infrastructure. I know that the department and some of your partner agencies who appeared before us earlier today are working on infrastructure and charging infrastructure. How is the rollout progressing?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: At the moment, the Commonwealth, and certainly not this department, isn't responsible for a particular rollout of charging infrastructure. But I think we have acknowledged—and we noted this at estimates last Thursday—that there is a range of Commonwealth support that, through the CEFC and ARENA, has supported electric vehicles. I know ARENA and its Chargefox initiative provided \$6 million late last year for an ultrarapid charging network for electric vehicles powered by renewable energy. I don't have the number of installations that it would lead to, but I can find out and come back with it this evening.</p> <p>I would just say as well that there are certainly a number of state and territory government initiatives that are looking in particular at supporting charging infrastructure—I have some information on that here, if</p>	Page 90 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000366

				<p>that would be useful—as well as, of course, private sector investments in charging infrastructure.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, because it doesn't all need to be done by the public sector, does it? Some of the infrastructure is likely to be able to be run on a commercial basis.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: That's correct.</p>		
55.	2.3: CCD	Senator McAllister	ACE Cargo vehicle	<p>Senator McALLISTER: I notice that Minister Andrews, the Minister for Industry, Science and Technology, attended a conference with the Motor Trades Association of Queensland, where she spoke in glowing terms about a vehicle called the ACE Cargo. She said:</p> <p>What a privilege to be one of the first people to see the ACE Cargo, made in Australia and finished just hours before I spoke at Motor Trades Association of Queensland Carmageddon symposium. This Australian-made vehicle proves the future for our automotive industry is bright.</p> <p>Can you tell me what the ACE Cargo vehicle is?</p> <p>Ms Evans: I'm afraid I'll have to take it on notice. I'm not familiar with that vehicle.</p>	Page 91 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000367
56.	2.3: CCD	Senator McAllister	Electric vehicle battery capacity advice	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Right. One thousand kilometres on one battery charge, says Greg Hunt. Is the department aware of the tweet the Minister Taylor put up on 6 April? He has now deleted it, so you may not have a copy, but he tweeted a YouTube video from the BBC's <i>Top Gear</i> that claimed that electric vehicles run out of charge over a short distance. That video was proven by the car manufacturer, Nissan, to be fraudulent, because the vehicle's monitoring device found the Top Gear hosts ran the battery down by driving it round and round in circles until the battery was flat. But Minister Taylor captioned the tweet with a 'welcome to range anxiety' headline. I might just table the <i>Guardian</i> article that went through all the problems with that <i>Top Gear</i> video. Did Minister Taylor seek</p>	Page 92 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000368

				<p>advice from the department about the adequacy of the analysis in the <i>Top Gear</i> video?</p> <p>Ms Evans: Not from the department.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Has he sought advice from the department on electric vehicle battery capacity?</p> <p>Ms Evans: I'm not sure. We've certainly advised on various times on electric vehicles. I would have to take on notice whether that covered specifically the battery capacity issue.</p>		
57.	3.1: AAD	Senator Urquhart	Antarctic Program budget	<p>Senator URQUHART: Hello down in Hobart. I've just got one question, but it has got some components to it. Could you give me some information on the Antarctic Program—each component, including uncommitted versus committed funding, and how the program will be implemented.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I think I'll take that question on the details of the budget on notice.</p>	Page 41 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000332
58.	3.1: AAD	Senator Urquhart	Australian Antarctic Program – contracts	<p>Mr Cahill: If it helps, Senator, there are three groups of funding for the Australian Antarctic Program. There is the departmental appropriation, which then is supplemented by some revenue we get from other sources. We then have equity and capital injections. There is an equity injection of capital for the Antarctic icebreaker and major capabilities as well as, as you'll see in the budget papers, a commitment to a large capital investment program for reinvigorating and rebuilding our bases down on the southern continent. Thirdly, we have a series of other appropriations that pick up expenses or other matters like the operating side of running ships and such.</p> <p>What I can say in terms of commitments is that the program this year is fully committed. By its nature, when you're running bases and ships and such, there are some long-term commitments. The ship contract itself is a 30-or-so year commitment with contractual obligations. And then we are moving from a one-year</p>	Page 41 and 42 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000331

				<p>to a five-year planning scheme, so there are commitments in an accounting sense—contracts signed—and there are commitments you just have to maintain.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you know what the value of those are?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: No, I'd have to take that on notice. That's very detailed. As you'd imagine, the amount of contracts we would have in place just to run the logistics and supply of bases would be quite large.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You can't give me the uncommitted?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: No. What I'm saying is: this year is fully committed and by the nature of how we operate—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When you say 'this year' you're talking about the 2018-19 financial year?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Yes, and there are already contractual arrangements in place for 2019-20, 2020-21 and various seasons to be able to run those bases, because that's the nature of the operation we have.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: All right. If you're able to provide some more—</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We'll give you as much detail as we practically can.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Thank you.</p>		
59.	3.1: AAD	Senator Patrick	Australian facilities in Antarctica inspected by other nations	<p>Senator PATRICK: Can I ask: what Australian facilities in Antarctica have been inspected by other nations, which facilities were they, which inspecting nations, and on what dates? I'm happy for you to take that on notice. Firstly, perhaps not on notice, have our bases been inspected from time to time?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Not recently. I'd have to take that on notice to provide you the details. There have been inspections but not in recent times.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. I'm satisfied with that if you take that on notice.</p>	Page 43 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000330
60.	3.1: AAD	Senator	Update - Icebreaker	Mr Sumner: The ship will conduct sea acceptance	Page 44	SQ19-000390

		Patrick	vessel milestone dates	<p>trials in the Black Sea. It will then go around through the Mediterranean to the Netherlands. From there it will go to the North Atlantic and conduct special sea trials off the coast of Norway and towards the top, into the Arctic itself.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I presume that would involve using the icebreaker in an operational scenario?</p> <p>Mr Sumner: Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: In addition, when the ship does arrive in Hobart in the middle of next year, there is a warranty period after that as well.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. But it's always much more expensive to fix a defect on the other side of the world.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Very much. We're acutely aware of that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. If you could update question No.127, that would be appreciated.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Will do.</p>	Thursday 4 April	
61.	4.1: ESED	Senator Keneally	Battery of the Nation project – detailed analysis	<p>Senator KENEALLY: Thank you for being here today. I'd like to ask some questions about the Battery of the Nation project. I attempted to ask these earlier in a previous section. My questions arise from the citation of the Battery of the Nation abatement targets in the government's Climate Solutions Package. The Climate Solutions Package indicates that the Battery of the Nation will contribute 25 megatonnes of CO2 abatement by 2030. Where is that figure derived from?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: In terms of detailed analysis, I will have to take that on notice. In terms of how that figure was arrived at, it was building on the potential of the megawatts that would come out of Battery of the Nation in terms of the pumped hydro, looking at the assumptions around the renewables coming online, and the timing of that, and looking at the capacity with respect to the potential sites. ARENA worked with Hydro Tasmania to identify up to 4,800 megawatts. From that, there were an additional 2,500 megawatts and a whole bunch of assumptions about what that</p>	Page 70 and 71 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000329

				pumped hydro based on renewables coming online would displace. The assumptions in terms of the calculations would also take into account demand and projections in Victoria. That would have formed the basis in terms of a number of assumptions around what the possible abatement is.		
62.	4.1: ESED	Senator Keneally	Battery of the Nation project – renewable energy investment	<p>Senator KENEALLY: Minister, that's entirely what I'm trying to understand from this figure of 25 megatonnes of CO2 abatement. How much more renewable energy investment is required to meet that?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: To have a correct answer, we will take it on notice. We're really talking about the renewable energy that will exist in Victoria and, to lesser extent, South Australia, for the megatonnes of abatement. The gas peak is there, and the coal-fired generation largely in Victoria is not needed as much because the power can come from Tasmania. When you think about renewable energy, it's the penetration of intermittent wind, grid-scale solar and rooftop solar—largely but not exclusively in Victoria—that will require the firming that will be provided by Battery of the Nation, via both Basslink and Marinus Link. Having said that, I hope to give you a sense of the renewables coming in north of Tasmania, and we'll take that on notice to provide a more accurate breakdown of what those underlying assumptions are.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: If you're taking that on notice, can I also ask that you address these questions. What amount of renewable investment is required to deliver this abatement via the Battery of the Nation project? What share of renewable energy does this lead to overall? What is the cost of that investment and who pays for it?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 71 and 72 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000328
63.	4.1: ESED	Senator Chisholm	Marinus Link feasibility study	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Okay. I wanted to get a sense of what are the assumptions about renewable energy generation that underpin that abatement number.</p>	Page 105 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000369

				<p>Mr Heferen: That renewable energy all comes from Battery of the Nation. The expansion of Battery of the Nation, which will be hydro—that extra pumped hydro there is what will flow through to reducing the need for the gas peaker, largely in Victoria. So, when the demand in Victoria goes up—say, on a summer day—there will be more demand for electricity in Victoria. At the moment what would happen is that the coal fired generators would be typically running, and probably would be running as hard as they can, and the extra power will be delivered through gas peakers that come on for a short period of time—because the price of gas is very high and the open cycle systems are designed to run for a short period of time—down through the interconnectors from Snowy Hydro. Then, in the future, it will be through the two interconnectors from Tasmania, Basslink and Marinus. So the renewable energy, if you like, is in the Battery of the Nation; that's the hydro. The emissions abatement comes about through no longer having the need to run a gas peaker as much.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: I took on the calculations about what the demand will be, the time the gas peaker would run and so forth to actually get that figure that was in the climate solution package. They are the things I took on notice to endeavour to go back and provide the detail, the assumptions behind that, for the committee.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: So the abatement allocated to the Battery of the Nation requires the Marinus Link?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: So the Marinus Link itself, according to the initial feasibility study, only has a positive net benefit with renewable investment consistent with the AEMO ISP fast-start scenario; is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Gaddes: That may be one of the early scenarios</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				that ARENA and TasNetworks have looked at for Marinus Link. One of the components of the \$56 million that was announced by the Australian government in recent weeks is to go and do a full feasibility study. I could take it on notice to look at what that scenario was, but that would be only an early feasibility study. The full feasibility study is being done now.		
64.	4.1: ESED	Senator Chisholm	Marinus Link feasibility study – Dr Tamblin’s report	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: The initial Marinus Link feasibility study concluded that the project has a positive net benefit under a business-as-usual renewable energy investment scenario?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Is that a question?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Yes. Does the initial feasibility study conclude that the project has a positive net benefit under a business-as-usual renewable energy investment scenario?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: If we are talking about the initial feasibility study, we’re talking about Dr Tamblin’s report. I think we’d need to take that on notice to ensure you got an accurate answer. It’s just that that was a few years ago, I don’t have the report in front of me and I don’t think my colleagues have Tamblin’s report.</p>	Page 105 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000370
65.	4.1: ESED	Senator Rice	Proportion of diesel used for light vehicles	<p>Senator RICE: What proportion of our liquid fuels is used in Australia by the sort of vehicles that we are talking about—light vehicles, which the current discussion about electric vehicle targets are addressing?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: My recollection is that around about 30 per cent of the fuel we use in Australia is petrol. That fuel use is predominantly made up by light vehicles. Any time there is an increase in electric vehicle use, it is potentially decreasing the amount of petrol that we would be using.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You also have light vehicles using diesel. Do you know what proportion of the diesel that’s used is for light vehicles?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: No. I would have to take that on</p>	Page 107 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000371

				notice.		
66.	4.1: ESED	Senator Storer	Snowy 2.0 investment	<p>Senator STORER: Mr Heferen may be the relevant person with regard to questions on Snowy 2.0. But, firstly, Minister, why wasn't a competitive tender process undertaken before the \$1.5 billion investment in Snowy 2.0 was announced?</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STORER: There are a number of pumped hydro projects in South Australia that would have, I'm sure, appreciated an equity investment like this, which I believe would be cheaper and quicker to build. Why weren't they given an opportunity to compete for this investment?</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 112 Monday 8 April	
67.	4.1: ESED	Senator Chisholm	ARENA Hydro Tasmania feasibility study	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: I have some documents I want to table which might help provide some clarity on the questions around the ARENA Hydro Tasmania feasibility study. The table below makes clear that the Marinus Link only provides a positive net benefit in scenarios which include a high emissions-reduction target, as you can see from that table. I just wanted to seek a comment on that.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: I'm happy to provide a comment, but I'd need a—</p> <p>Senator Ruston: Without wanting be to be antagonistic here, I'm somewhat confused. We are talking about what is, effectively, a project that is a great big battery. It's about renewable dispatchables. Are you prosecuting an argument to suggest that we shouldn't be investing in renewable dispatchables?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: No, I'm prosecuting an argument that your policy doesn't stack up. That is the argument, because it only actually works if you have a high emissions-reduction target, which is what the study shows. Did you want to answer that one?</p> <p>Senator Ruston: It's interesting that you've backed in the project—the Labor Party has backed in the project.</p>	Page 113 and 114 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000373

				<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Because it would stack up under us, because we've got a high emissions-reduction target.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I will allow the officials to answer it; I'm just very confused at your argument.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: I'm happy for you to answer it, seeing as you've got a lot to say about it.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I don't have the detail; I'm just—</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: You're happy to comment about it.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: asking you a simple question.</p> <p>CHAIR: Who are you asking your question of, Senator Chisolm?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: The table.</p> <p>CHAIR: An answer will be forthcoming.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: It's a little bit hard with table 10 and not really knowing what table 10 is in response to. I think it would be safest for all if we took this on notice to provide an accurate answer to your question.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Do you concede that that table says that there's only an economic benefit under a high emissions-reduction target?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Sorry, on what basis would I read that into that table?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: That the economic worth under a high emissions-reduction target is \$490 million, whereas under a neutral scenario it's negative \$270 million.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: And a 300 megawatt load loss would be \$477 million. I think my point is—I shouldn't have said that because I said I'd take this on notice to make sure an accurate answer is given. On the base, there could be any number of orders of these or issues that table 9 or table 8 or somewhere in the text deals with to provide some qualification around how they've arrived at those numbers, so I think any discussion on that would be, at best, interesting but, at worst, misleading.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>I'll take it on notice and provide the committee with an accurate answer.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Did you take into account the ARENA Hydro Tas feasibility study when you were providing advice to the government around the climate solutions policy?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Sorry, climate solutions is an issue for outcome 2. We're in outcome 4. I think we've finished with outcome 2.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Surely you can answer it though.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: The Climate Solutions Package comes under outcome 2. The people in the department who are expert on that and who would know what was provided as far as advice goes were in that outcome, not this one.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Table 10 is the overview of sensitivity results. It: ... summarises the sensitivity studies undertaken, and the difference in economic worth from the neutral scenario. Unless noted otherwise, 600 MW of Marinus Link capacity is commissioned in 2025, with the second 600 MW ... commissioned in 2028. That's what the table is providing.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: We've taken it on notice so we can provide the committee with an accurate answer. I don't have anything to add to that.</p>		
68.	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Combustion of municipal solid waste	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could I ask some follow-up questions to questions on notice that I put through at the last estimates. The first one is question on notice 227. I note that questions 227, 228 and 229 weren't answered by ARENA. Question 227 asks: 'Does Arena consider the combustion of municipal solid waste to generate electricity to be renewable energy? The question was not answered. Would you be able to answer that question for us today.'</p> <p>Mr Miller: There is a component of renewable energy</p>	Page 77 and 78 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000327

				<p>in the combustion of municipal solid waste. That is calculated as a result of a life-cycle costing analysis which is done both prior to the construction of the project and after the construction of the project. Following that analysis, the renewable percentage of the fuel in the incineration stream is determined.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Why are those components considered renewable?</p> <p>Mr Miller: I can do it at a high level. Essentially what you would be doing is comparing the case of consuming the waste and producing electricity from that waste—what sort of electricity you are effectively offsetting by injecting that form of electricity into the national grid, or the Western Australian grid. And you would also be counting the avoided methane emissions leaching from landfill had you essentially left that landfill to rot in a pit. The combination of those factors gives you the calculations you need for the renewable energy component.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If we break it up into biomass and non-biomass components, do you consider the non-biomass component of municipal solid waste to be renewable energy?</p> <p>Mr Miller: I can't answer that question. I would have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: You did last time and you never responded to it. So could you have a crack at it now.</p> <p>Mr Miller: I can't, off the cuff, tell you how all the components of the waste stream are treated. I don't know why we haven't responded. I have seen the responses on notice and I thought we had provided that to you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: You responded to the other questions but there was no answer to those three questions.</p> <p>Mr Miller: That would be an error on our part if that</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>is right, so I would have to check. Again, I would have to take that on notice and get back to you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: But do you see what I'm getting at? I understand that the biomass components can be considered renewable in some shape or form, but I'm interested in the fact that these funding arrangements that have gone to electricity generation from burning municipal waste will have a fairly large non-biomass component. So I'm just trying to get a grip on whether this is actually renewable energy. It seems to be the trend at the moment.</p> <p>Mr Miller: Municipal solid waste would have a variety of components, some of which can't be separated out; there would be an element of the remaining waste stream that is inseparable that you would have to incinerate at the same time as the organic components. That's why the renewable energy component is not 100 per cent; there is a fractional element to that. I would have to get you the exact fractions.</p>		
69.	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Municipal solid waste – Kwinana waste-to-energy plant	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Let me give you an example of one you did provide some feedback on. In answer to question on notice 230, from last estimates, you stated that the calorific component of the municipal solid waste intended to go to the proposed Kwinana waste-to-energy plant was roughly 50 per cent biomass. In other words, only half of the fuel there, according to regulations, is going to be renewable. Is this the first time that ARENA has put money towards a new project where only half of the fuel source is from fossil fuels?</p> <p>Mr Miller: I don't know. ARENA has done 400-odd projects; I couldn't tell you if it's the only one. But certainly I take your point. I think that's largely right—that the waste stream is not all renewable; it's a 50 per cent ratio.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In this case it is, but it</p>	Page 78 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000326

				<p>would be interesting to know how you calculate that component in other projects, as you said earlier, with your life cycle analysis. I'll get to some questions in a second on what's separable and what's not. I've got some questions on whether burning municipal solid waste is actually better than landfill, which seems to be the assumption on why these projects are going ahead. In question 228, I asked you to explain how you assess the net emission impacts of burning municipal solid waste, as opposed to landfilling it. Your response directed me to ARENA's guidelines, as you said earlier, on life cycle analysis of bioenergy products and projects. If 50 per cent of the calorific fraction of the municipal solid waste is from biomass, as we saw with Kwinana, what is ARENA doing to determine the life cycle impacts of the fossil fuel fraction of that component?</p> <p>Mr Kay: We'd have to take that on notice.</p>		
70.	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Kwinana plant	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Did you use the bioenergy life cycle analysis to assess the Kwinana plant specifically, which you put money into?</p> <p>Mr Miller: We have a life cycle analysis; that's happened on the Kwinana plant, and there'll be another one done post-completion of the plant.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I would like to tie those two questions together. You'll have to take that on notice. I would be very keen to know why, potentially, you're using a life cycle analysis that's not fit for purpose if you haven't actually factored in the life cycle impacts of the fossil fuel fraction of that waste.</p> <p>Mr Miller: We'll take your question on notice and get you the details that you want.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes, because I would like to compare that as to whether the Kwinana plant will result in a net reduction in emissions compared to landfilling that municipal solid waste. But you can take that on notice as well.</p>	Page 78 and 79 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000325

				<p>Mr Miller: Yes. The analysis we've done is that the Kwinana plant will avoid 228,000 tonnes of carbon emissions per year. That is the end result, if you like, of the life cycle analysis. As to the efficacy of the life cycle analysis, I was suggesting that might be part of your question and we can get you the details of the specific way that's been analysed.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: My office has just done this very basic flow chart. This is what I'm trying to get my mind around. I ask you to have a look at that. Feel free to pick any holes in it or tell me what bits are missing, or potentially do that after as well. I've got landfill versus waste to energy there, with the two basic types of landfill—organic and non-organic. Obviously, when you get the non-organic waste fill and it's buried, you don't get any emissions from it. With the organic waste fill, you get captured and burnt and you get non-captured methane. I've been out to landfill sites, and since the carbon price has been in place, most large landfill sites around the country do capture their methane and burn it as energy. Then, if we look at waste to energy, you've got the organic, which is burnt, and then non-organic, which is burnt, the key difference being you're getting CO2 emissions from burning the non-organic part of the waste stream. That wouldn't happen if it had gone to landfill. I just want to be confident that your analysis has actually got the accounting right on this.</p> <p>Mr Miller: I understand your question and we will answer it for you on notice.</p>		
71.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Urquhart	Radar gaps	<p>Senator URQUHART: When you talk about community impact you're talking more about the information that is available to that community rather than the impact of a radar being placed in that area—or is it both?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Clearly it's both, but the primary impact is having that real-time information to help</p>	Page 5 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000336

				<p>communities and emergency services personnel make decisions.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have a list of where the gaps are?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'd be happy to provide that to you on notice. We have a map of the country where there are gaps.</p>		
72.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Urquhart	Rain gauge gaps	<p>Senator URQUHART: Great. Can you tell me how the bureau determines where to put new rain gauges?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: That's also a complex question. We have many hundreds of rain gauges that we own and operate but we also draw upon a massive national network of equipment that is owned by states, territories and other agencies. We're looking to provide the maximum spatial and temporal coverage in our datasets and, again, prioritise those investments where we think the positive impact for the community will be the highest. It's a similar story to the radar situation.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have a list of where the rain gauge gaps are as well?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I could provide you with coverage. That will be again more difficult to interpret visually, because the rain gauge provides a point coverage, whereas a radar provides a spatial coverage up to 300 or 400 kilometres in some cases.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, it's a surface.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I can give you a spatial representation of where our rain gauge network is. I think it's important to understand that the bureau, for all its observational data, relies on a collaborative approach. Whether it's satellite data, radars, rain gauges, flood gauges or river height monitoring, we draw upon a national and sometimes international network to bring data into the organisation.</p>	Page 5 and 6 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000375
73.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Urquhart	Cost of moving radars	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you talk us through the budget measure.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The one in relation to the rain gauges and</p>	Page 6 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000376

				<p>radars? Senator URQUHART: The \$28 million. Dr Johnson: The budget measure is designed to support, as I said early in my answer to you, closing some significant gaps in our radar coverage through eastern and north west QLD into the Northern Territory. The proposal will involve us: moving the current Moree radar slightly north-east to Boggabilla, which will close a gap that exists in the southern Darling Downs, in the western part of the New England area; and moving the current Marburg radar up onto a site somewhere in the vicinity of Oakey, up in the eastern Darling Downs, which will provide a- Senator URQUHART: What is the cost of moving each of those radars? Dr Johnson: It depends on the type of the radar and what the site location costs are. The costs for shifting from Moree to Boggabilla would be different to what it costs to shift from – Senator URQUHART: What would that one be, then? Dr Johnson: Moree to Boggabilla? I don't have that figure in front of me; it's part of the overall measure. If you want that level of detail, we can give you an estimate of what we think it might be. It reflects differences in energy costs, land costs and telecommuniations costs. Each site will be different. Our team will have budgeted at that level of fine detail I just don't have that in front of me right now. Senator URQUHART: You can provide that.</p>		
74.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Urquhart	Location and number of meteorologists	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you go through where Australia's forecasters are based now and how many there are. Dr Johnson: I would probably prefer to use the word 'meteorologists'. Senator URQUHART: Sorry, okay. Dr Johnson: Our meteorologists are based right around Australia. So we have them in Darwin, in</p>	Page 8 and 9 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000337

				<p>Cairns. I might take a step back. Are you asking about our meteorologists that deliver services to the general public and emergency management? We also have meteorologists that deliver services to ADF colleagues. Are you just interested in those who deliver public services or everybody?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: All of them.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Well, Darwin, Cairns, Townsville, Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart, Adelaide—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How many, though? Can you break it down?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I can give you that list, yes. That's not a problem.</p>		
75.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Urquhart	Complaint about Perth phone line	<p>Senator URQUHART: I've received a complaint from a man who lives in Perth who claims that the public phone line for the Perth office transfers to Melbourne. Is that the case?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'm not sure. Look, it wouldn't surprise me that at some stage if there was—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I'd be interested to know.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'd have to check. There may be a volume issue. In other words, there may be people ringing in and, if the colleagues in Perth are unable to answer that call, it may transfer to another number.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: This complaint says: 'You cannot ring the Perth number and get through to the Perth office. There is no option to do so. All you can do is key in 7 and get through to the Melbourne office.'</p> <p>Dr Johnson: That may be the case. I'd be very surprised if you can't call the Perth office, but I'm happy to check that out.</p>	Page 11 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000338
76.	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Storer	Rainfall in the Murray Darling Basin catchment over last 30 years	<p>Senator STORER: I think my questions may well follow a lot of the answers given to Senator Rice. Has there been a decrease in rainfall in the Murray-Darling Basin catchment area over the last 30 years, and, if so, by how much?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Yes, there's certainly been an overall</p>	Page 15 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000339

				<p>signal of drying in the basin. I don't have that figure committed to memory. If you're interested, I can provide it on notice to you.</p> <p>Senator STORER: If you could, yes, please.</p>		
77.	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator McAllister	Financing electric vehicles	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Can we stick with the banks? It is an interesting project. I'm not really asking for a critique of whether it's a good idea or not. I'm just asking about what actual transactions have taken place. It's with the four major banks?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: The four major banks.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What's the size of the facility for each of the banks?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: It's possibly best if we take that on notice, otherwise we would be ploughing through a long list, unless you want me to do that. But, for example, people like NAB and CBA have facilities in the order of \$300 million. They're quite large. The NAB, for example, has been very successful in financing the agricultural sector around energy efficiency.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So these facilities aren't exclusively for electric vehicles?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: Not exclusively.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: The structure is that there is a range of products agreed between yourself and the business.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: Correct.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Do they all include electric vehicles?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: I would have to take that on notice to come back to you definitively. I believe that many, if not most, do have that ability.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Specifically, does the NAB agreement include a provision for financing electric vehicles?</p> <p>Mr Powell: We might need to take that on notice; but it's fair to say that, if we were approached by one of the</p>	Page 31 and 32 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000340

				<p>banks to finance an electric vehicle in that manner, we would then make it available under the facility.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Can you tell me whether the Commonwealth Bank arrangement—</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: It's in the same position. We believe it is, but we will come back on notice just to confirm that.</p>		
78.	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Spender	Rates of return	<p>Senator SPENDER: Okay. At the outset you referred to your rate of return being a touch below target, being a reference to government bond rates. How do your rates of return compare with comparable private sector entities?</p> <p>Mr Powell: We can take that on notice, but it's probably an unfair comparison in terms of the restrictions that we have on us as a fund. We are only allowed to invest in primarily Australian-based investments. We can only invest in renewables, low emissions technologies and energy efficient projects, and that is a significant constraint relative to anything that a private sector financier would be faced with.</p>	Page 34 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000341
79.	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Spender	Electric vehicles life-cycle analysis	<p>Senator SPENDER: In your previous discussion about electric vehicles you referred to a particular report, but I'm not too sure whether that report established the following: do you know how current life-cycle emissions for electric vehicles in Australia compare with the life-cycle emissions of non-electric vehicles in Australia currently?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: I think we'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SPENDER: How can you not know the answer to the question, and still think that investing in electric vehicles currently is a good idea for reducing Australia's emissions?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: What we know is electric vehicles being powered by an increasingly decarbonised electricity grid will have a far better emissions outcome than internal combustion engine vehicles.</p> <p>Senator SPENDER: In a life-cycle analysis based on</p>	Page 35 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000342

				current EV technology? Mr Learmonth: I'd have to get detail of exactly what you mean by life-cycle analysis.		
80.	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Spender	Electric vehicles in Australia	Senator SPENDER: Yes. If I get re-elected, that'll be my first annoying task for the Clerk! I'll have to add the CEFC Act. On EV: you've done some current investments. Where are they located geographically in Australia at the moment? Mr Learmonth: We'll have to take that on notice. We don't have that information to hand. Senator SPENDER: Was your decision— Mr Learmonth: These programs are all national. But on just precisely the break-up between states and territories, we would have to come back to you.	Page 37 Monday 8 April	SQ19-000343
81.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Chisholm	Shark control program	Senator CHISHOLM: I have some questions about the shark control program operation in the marine park. Minister, have you or the environment minister been briefed on the outcomes of the AAT decision of 2 April? Senator Fifield: No. Senator CHISHOLM: Is the department aware? Mr Thomas: We are very aware of the AAT decision two days ago and are looking at that. Senator CHISHOLM: Mr Pratt, is the department aware of the AAT decision from 2 April? Mr Pratt: I believe so. I think we discussed this extensively with Senator Siewert earlier in the day. Unfortunately I don't have the relevant officers here who were testifying at that stage. I believe the minister has been briefed on that, but we'll correct on notice if I'm wrong. Mr Thomas: The minister is aware of it.	Page 92 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000323
82.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Briefing to the Minister – Professor Hughes paper	Senator WATERS: Okay, but you would have known if you'd done the briefing or hadn't done the briefing. I'm just wanting to know if the minister asked for the briefing that she ultimately received or if you provided it of your own volition or, perhaps, at the request of the	Page 93 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000322

				<p>department?</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: We had prepared dot points to send to the minister's office this morning. I don't know if we sent those in time before—</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Sorry, the minister did ask for it.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: After you had prepared it? Or was the impetus for you preparing it the request from the minister?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I'm not sure of the exact sequence but we knew the paper was likely to be released today, through chatter in the academic class. Dr Wachenfeld got his hands on it very early this morning. I think it was released in the wee hours of the morning—worked on it for several hours and provided the briefing sometime in the middle to early afternoon.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Was it just a written briefing or were you able to give a verbal briefing to the minister?</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: Just a written briefing.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Has the minister asked for follow-up advice either from the department or the authority?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: On the particular paper?</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes. On responses to it and whether regulation needs to be changed and what can be done?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I still don't know.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Are you able to check, given that I'm sure you have email on your device, like we all do here?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I do. It is not working wonderfully in here because of the reception. But—</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Our paper was just provided mid-afternoon this afternoon. We can certainly check that and follow up.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you.</p>		
83.	Great Barrier Reef Marine	Senator Waters	FOI refusals by GBRMPA	Senator WATERS: Well, I don't know the detail of this, but my understanding is you only go to the	Page 94 Thursday	SQ19-000321

	<p>Park Authority</p>		<p>Information Commissioner when you haven't been able to get the document from the agency that you asked in the first place. So, presumably, you said no, and he went to the Information Commissioner. It took them a long time, and then it sounds like you were forced to provide the documents after all. So why the reticence to just providing them in the first place?</p> <p>Ms Leo: The applicant didn't seek a primary review with the agency. It was open to them to do that. It was recommended that they do that, but they chose to go to the Information Commissioner. Then our role was to feed into that review process.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay. Perhaps you could give me some more details on notice because that really doesn't match up with my understanding of what has happened. I would be keen to see some detail on that. There was a reference in that report that FOI refusals by the authority have been at record high levels since records began in 2010 and that there have been more than 2,000 requests that have taken longer than the statutory time frame of three months for release.</p> <p>Ms Leo: That figure doesn't refer just to the authority.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay. Do you have the figures just for the authority? Is that also the case that there has been an increase in delays—</p> <p>Ms Leo: I would need to take on notice how many requests have been refused over that time period.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: And also whether or not the statutory time frames are met.</p> <p>Ms Leo: I can assure you that all statutory time frames have been met through 2017-18 and for the year to date 2018-19.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay. The substance of that request went to whether or not agency resources had been used to try to convince other countries that the reef was completely fine in the face of all scientific evidence to the contrary. Can you give me any figures</p>	<p>4 April</p>	
--	------------------------------	--	--	----------------	--

				<p>on how much of the agency's moneys and resources was dedicated to that task? If you can't give that to me off the top of your head—although I hope you can—can you take it on notice. I'm also keen to know whether you have had any expenditure that you'd characterise that way in the last couple of years?</p> <p>Ms Leo: I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>		
84.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Expenditure on diplomatic relationships	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. Has there been any expenditure on diplomatic relationships, meetings with other members of the World Heritage Committee or their representatives in the last couple of years, between GBRMPA and those folk?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I am aware the authority has on occasion taken visiting dignitaries et cetera out into the reef, given presentations et cetera to representatives from other nations. I don't know the exact nature of those engagements. We'd have to look into that further.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: If you could give me a full update of that on notice at your earliest convenience that would be greatly appreciated.</p>	Page 94 and 95 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000320
85.	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Waters	Staffing and funding trajectory for the last six years	<p>Senator WATERS: Okay. Could you take on notice what your staffing and funding trajectory has been in the last six years—perhaps, let's make it seven, so we have a comparison year. It was certainly not good news a couple of years ago and I'm interested to know if that trajectory has continued down. If you do have it to hand, one final question: what is your current staff FTE?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: We do have that figure. Can I just clarify something while Ms Leo is looking that up.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It would be best to get the exact figure from the authority—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I'll wait for that. Thank you.</p> <p>Ms Leo: You asked for the FTE figures.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Leo: We are currently at 225 FTE, as of the period</p>	Page 95 and 96 Thursday 4 April	SQ19-000318

				of 6 March. Senator WATERS: I can't recall what it used to be. Has that changed significantly in recent years? Ms Leo: I would need to take that on notice.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--