

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – BUDGET ESTIMATES 2021–22 - 24 MAY 2021

AGRICULTURE, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

QoN No.	Portfolio QoN No.	Department /Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Transcript Page
1	SQ21-000410	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	State of the climate reports - temperature data	<p>Senator ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. I draw your attention to your state of the climate reports 2016 and 2018 and specifically to two graphs of Australian surface air temperatures, one in State of the climate 2016 on page 4 and the other in State of the climate 2018 on page 2. Are you familiar with those reports?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'm familiar with the reports, but I confess I haven't committed those pages to memory.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: I can understand that.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I am familiar with the reports.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: One of our research scientists, in updating his records, compared your 2016 graph on page 4 and your 2018 graph on page 2. He then obtained, from the Bureau of Meteorology, the actual temperatures used in producing those two graphs. He found the two graphs very different for the dates from 1910 to 2016. Yet surely the temperature data from 1910 to 2016 should be the same for both graphs, shouldn't they?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I believe so, but, again, I'd need to check exactly what you're referring to. Dr Stone has the report in front of him. Are you able to shed any light on this?</p> <p>Dr Stone: I have the more recent one I'm sorry. Like Dr Johnson, I haven't committed the-</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: I'm happy for you to take these on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: Let me get to the core point then. The only changes to produce the 2018 graph should have been, as we see it, the addition of data from 2017 to 2018 on top of the 2016 graph. Yet the actual data shows that in the 2018 graph temperatures after about 1970-looking at the graph from your perspective-are inflated and progressively increased and the temperatures before 1970 have been progressively decreased with the effect of increasing the slope of the temperature</p>	125-126

					<p>graph, exaggerating the warming. I'd like to know, on notice, what is the reason for this when temperatures of historical records up to and including 2016 should not have changed at all, let alone systematically changed one way after 1970 and the other way before 1970 to exaggerate the warming. I'd like to know that answer.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'm happy to take it on notice to make sure we're answering your question accurately.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: On notice: on what basis was the temperature data from 1910 to 2016 changed to produce the 2018 graph for the years 1910 to 2016? Has the Bureau of Meteorology's Australian temperature record been wrong every year until 2018? Can you guarantee that the 2018 record will not turn out to be wrong in 2024 or is the Australian temperature record anything that BOM says it is? That's all I need answered.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: We'll take the questions on notice.</p>	
2	SQ21-000419	Bureau of Meteorology	Nita Green	Aviation funding	<p>Dr Johnson: Dr Johnson. That's Dr Stone over there.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I've been reading about both of you. I just want to go through the budget measures in the PBS. There's the COVID response package for aviation and tourism support. Is that a continuation of the Airservices waiver fee?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: There are two components to that. As you rightly point out, if you break that down, there's \$1.906 million, which is the Airservices waiver fee, and then there's \$24.823, which is basically supplementation for funds that we ordinarily would have received from the aviation industry for our aviation meteorology services. As you know, we recover costs for the delivery of our aviation weather services from the industry, and obviously the impacts on the industry have been significant. The government's formed the view that that capability will be needed in the future, so those measures are there to keep that capability in place and in situ until such time as aviation traffic resumes to its pre-COVID levels.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So that's a continuation? That was in place, and it's just been continued on?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Yes, it's being reviewed on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: For another financial year?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Yes. Obviously the future is uncertain with respect to aviation movements.</p>	122

					<p>Senator GREEN: Does that amount cover what you would have been receiving?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: It enables us to sustain our aviation capability going forward.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: That wasn't my question, Dr Johnson.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: It's not a like-for-like comparison.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: What's the shortfall?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The amount of money we receive is derived from a complex formula which I don't want to bore you too much with; it's an aggregate of inbound international flights, domestic flights, Qantas, Virgin and so on, and then a charge for general aviation. It varies every year, depending on those movements. It's an estimate. There was a gap, because there are still some aircraft flying. I came down from Brisbane this afternoon on a Qantas flight. So there's still some aviation occurring; it's just not at the same level as we had pre-COVID. We work closely with Airservices Australia and other relevant transport portfolios across government to make an estimate of what we think the volume of air traffic will be. There's a gap between that and what we need to sustain our capacity. That's what that figure represents, if that helps.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: It does. I'm just wondering, from a very black-and-white point of view, how much you received in the Airservices fee. What was that, roughly, in the last financial year, before COVID? That would have been 2019-20.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I don't believe we've got that on hand. I think it's a reasonable proxy to say that the \$1.906 million that we've received in this budget from Airservices and the \$24.823 are reasonable proxies of what the previous years costs would have been.</p>	
3	SQ21-000420	Bureau of Meteorology	Nita Green	Jobs moved from regional Queensland to major cities since 2014	<p>Senator GREEN: There's been a lot of media attention in the past couple of years about the automation process that the bureau has undergone and the impact that efficiency dividends have had on staffing numbers. The ASL cap is also impacting staffing numbers. How many jobs over the last seven years have been moved from regional Queensland into either Brisbane or another metro area or out of state?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'd have to get the exact movements in and out. It depends on how you define 'regional Queensland'. But, if I think about the part of the world you come from, we have more people based in North Queensland than we ever have. In other parts of Queensland, some of the stations, for example, further south, those folks have gone into Brisbane. But, for example, staff who are currently based in</p>	123-124

				<p>Rockhampton will be moving to Cairns. So there's been a lot of intra-regional transfer of staff. There's been a complex series of movements across many stations that goes back the best part of eight or nine years. If you want the full ins and outs, I'm happy to supply that to you on notice.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I don't really want the ins and outs.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The general message is that it's increasing.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I want what it was in 2013, the start of this term of government.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: It started in 2014.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, those cuts.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Sorry, can I correct that. There aren't cuts. This is a misconception. The overall footprint of the bureau has increased, certainly since I've been in this role. As I said before, in some parts of the country, numbers have increased. In other parts of the country, numbers have decreased. But the overall number of staff that we have in regional Australia has increased. There's been a redistribution of tasks and a redeployment of people into priority areas. It's a misconception that a lot of people have.</p> <p>CHAIR: Can I ask you how much longer you've got?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I have waited all day to ask these questions.</p> <p>CHAIR: I realise that, but we have 22 minutes remaining.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I'm doing my very best. The fewer interruptions, the more answers I'll get. If we can get, on notice, what the figure was in 2013 for the jobs that you're referring to and what it is now. Do you understand that there's a difference in redeploying someone from Cairns to another place in Queensland? You were talking about jobs not being cut, but they are being taken out of regional communities.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: They're being moved, in some cases, from one regional community to another. If a regional community may no longer have a bureau staff member there, another regional community may well be gaining a staff member. It depends on the individual transfer. As I said before, particularly in North Queensland, we have seen an overall increase of staff—a quite significant increase of staff.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I'd like to see the figures on that, because it's actually government MPs that have been out in the media attacking you about cuts that they say the bureau have done, and through the automation process as well, which I appreciate</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					isn't staffing-there's a reallocation of staffing, and the word 'automation' can sometimes spook people. But that's what they're referring to. If we can get those, then we don't have to go back and forth.	
4	SQ21-000732	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Statistical analysis for climate data homogenisation of Marble Bar weather station	<p>Senator RENNICK: There are two types of homogenisation. There's parallel runs and there's reference stations, right? I would argue that using a parallel run on the place between old and new is a lot more accurate than relying on weather stations up to a thousand kilometres away.</p> <p>Dr Stone: It would be for things like rainfall that vary highly spatially. But temperature is, in many instances, conservative across space or predictably different across spaces, so you do actually get more information about the impact of a change of observation practice like screen size by actually using the much larger-</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Well, I disagree. Marble Bar is 2,000 kilometres inland of Port Headland, which is one of the reference stations on the coast. Coastal conditions are completely different to inland conditions. Brisbane is 280 kilometres from my home town in Chinchilla, and they have completely two different weather patterns. One's dry, and one's humid.</p> <p>Dr Stone: Absolutely, but you wouldn't chose nearest neighbours that were wildly different. The process actually selects for those where there's a predictable difference.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: But that's what you have done with Marble Bar. You picked Port Headland as one of your reference stations.</p> <p>Dr Stone: If that's the case then it's because the statistical analysis has shown that there's a predictable difference between the two.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: I'm going to ask this for the third time-not the third time for tonight but this is the third time I've asked this question at estimates. I've asked for the workings of the statistical analysis, not a description. I want the actual workings that come back to those differences in December 1923. I don't want 1997, because that was a change of equipment. I want to see the statistical analysis for 1923 where you've changed the records at Marble Bar. Some days were up; some days were down. There was no shift one way or the other. It was up and down, up and down, up and down. How you predict that-</p> <p>Dr Stone: I can take you through that. It will be very difficult to show you the</p>	120-121

				<p>workings, though. So for Marble Bar, for example, the number of calculations used in the climate record for homogenisation of maximum temperature is between 350 million and 500 million separate calculations. Minimum temperature is between 250 and 300 million calculations in order to derive the transfer function that is actually generated on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: None of that's-</p> <p>Dr Stone: Once the transfer function has been generated, that then has several thousand calculations done on it to actually do the adjustments at individual sites.</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Rennick, you've had the five minutes you asked for.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: I've just got one more. When you pick these outliers, you have a fixed and absolute difference. So, for example, you're looking at an outlier if it's at least 0.3 difference in the annual mean temperature, at least 0.3 difference in the means of at least two of the four seasons, and at least half a degree difference in the mean of at least one season. Why are you using fixed numbers and not relative standard deviations from maximum and minimum rather than a fixed deviation from the mean, which would work against hotter stations that have higher numbers to begin with, so you'd get more variance there? If you're going to be statistical, you should be using numbers of standard deviations from the mean rather than a fixed number.</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Rennick, could I ask you to come to a question.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: The question is: why used a fixed number rather than a relative standard deviation to determine an outlier?</p> <p>Dr Stone: To be clear, those figures aren't used in order to determine an outlier. They are used-</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Well, they determine whether or not you've got a-what's the word you use? An incongruity?</p> <p>Dr Stone: A discontinuity.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Discontinuity, that's the one.</p> <p>Dr Stone: It makes sense to have an absolute level of discontinuity that you're looking for when you compare it with an absolute temperature scale. Really, again, I just want to be clear: that 0.3 that you referred to is not used in homogenisation. That's used to help-</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: To detect discontinuity?</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>CHAIR: Senator Rennick and Dr Stone, I'm going to pull you up here because we have 33 minutes remaining, we have three more questioners on the Bureau of Met and we still have the Antarctic Division to go.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: This is the third time I've come in here and asked for an answer on Marble Bar, and I still haven't got it.</p> <p>CHAIR: Then put it on notice.</p>	
5	SQ21-000519	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Senator Rennick written questions to the Bureau of Meteorology	<p>1. Recommendation A6 of the Independent Peer Review says the Bureau should include sufficient station metadata within the public ACORN-SAT station catalogue to allow independent replication of homogeneity analyses for individual ACORN-SAT stations. Given the Bureau's comments that millions of calculations are used to homogenise data sets how is it possible that this process can be replicated?</p> <p>2. Can the logic or an explanation of the calculations used in homogenising data because of discontinuities be provided?</p> <p>3. How can the Bureau use reference stations that have different climatic conditions? i.e. Port Hedland is on the coast, Marble Bar is inland.</p> <p>4. Are reference stations at the same altitude? If not, then how can the Bureau adjust for temperatures sets that have different altitudes?</p> <p>5. Recommendation C4 of the Independent Peer Review says that tests based on comparing neighbouring station records usually cannot detect network-wide changes. Why is the Bureau using reference stations to adjust for network wide changes such as the change in Stevenson screens, rather than the principle outlined in Appendix 2 of the Independent Peer Review - The Ten Principles for Long-Term Sustainable Climate Monitoring - that says a suitable period of overlap for new and old observing systems is required.</p> <p>6. Further to Recommendation C4 has the Bureau been able to demonstrate how these network-wide changes have been addressed. How can the Bureau demonstrate using millions of calculations to homogenise data is better than parallel run when there has been a network wide change of equipment?</p> <p>7. Why are statistical adjustments for discontinuities based on an absolute figure (i.e. 0.3 degrees difference in annual mean temperature) rather than a relative standard deviation from the mean?</p> <p>8. Won't observing stations located in areas with volatile weather patterns will be subject to more homogenisation than necessary if a fixed threshold is used?</p>	Written

					<p>9. Doesn't homogenising data because thresholds are exceeded run the risk of removing valid outliers?</p> <p>10. How does the Bureau determine what is a valid outlier and what isn't?</p> <p>11. How does the Bureau take into account wet seasons v dry seasons i.e. rainfall?</p> <p>12. How does the Bureau take into account the surrounding environment? For example, were records kept on flora that surrounded weather stations. If not, how does the Bureau know how to account for these impacts?</p> <p>13. What is the Bureau doing about ensuring that there are proper change management systems in place so that parallel runs can take place?</p> <p>14. What is the Bureau doing about ensuring the first principal of Long-Term Sustainable Climate Monitoring - "assessing the impact of new systems or changes to existing systems" - is enacted so that future changes in observing equipment will be accompanied by a parallel run?</p> <p>15. Given the Bureau carried out so few parallel runs (5 out of 112) on the change in Stevenson screens across the ACCORN network does the Bureau acknowledge it has a problem in the change management process of its observing equipment and that it needs to improve?</p> <p>16. Why did the Bureau average the results of the parallel runs in Stevenson screen changes given the Bureau's earlier statement that the Spanish study couldn't be relied upon as every location is unique?</p> <p>17. Shouldn't every change in observing equipment be accompanied by a parallel run between the old and the new systems?</p> <p>18. Shouldn't the Bureau be focused on digitalising records rather than homogenising records based on statistical guesswork?</p> <p>19. Records destroyed in 2003 from the Bureau relate to equipment (25 Series) presumably used. The third principle for Sustainable climate monitoring states that records relating to instruments should be documented and treated with the same care as the data themselves. Why did the Bureau destroy records relating to equipment used in measuring observations?</p>	
6	SQ21-000646	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	Rob Vertessy	<p>Do you know of Dr. Rob Vertessy?</p> <p>I'm advised that Dr Vertessy has been very influential and significant in BOM's work over many years, including BOM's work on climate.</p> <p>Could you please provide, on notice, a summary of his associations and interactions</p>	Written

					<p>with BOM? Specifically, I request:</p> <p>a. His past titles as an employee in various positions with BOM, years in employment in each title, and salary for each position;</p> <p>b. His consulting engagements with or for BOM, years for which he was engaged as a consultant, and amounts paid in consulting fees;</p> <p>c. Positions as a board member or advisory board member or advisor in agencies associated with BOM.</p>	
7	SQ21-000645	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	<p>BOM's projected future: temperatures</p>	<p>Looking at 100 years of data BOM has only projected a linear trend for the future temperatures. What are the 95% confidence intervals on the predictions based on this trend?</p> <p>BOM claims a current and ongoing warming trend, somewhat linear. Is BOM advising the public and parliamentarians that a linear trend of Australian air temperatures and secondly of global atmospheric temperatures is a realistic and accurate forecast of the future?</p> <p>Is BOM advising that a linear trend extrapolating along a linear trend is the way to predict future temperatures?</p> <p>Where are the error bounds on the forecast based on the linear trend you're calculated and projected?</p> <p>Is BOM advising the public and parliamentarians that this linear trend line represents a statistically significant and narrow band for future temperatures in Australia, and secondly, globally?</p> <p>Are you asserting that the residuals resulting from BOM's linear trend are random and so support the linear trend as a valid statistical model of the period? Note: Residuals mean the difference between the latest empirical measurements/observation and the model's equivalent projection for the same date based upon previous measurements/observations.</p> <p>6.1 What is BOM projecting for temperature for the years 2100 and 2120 for various levels of human CO2 production including:</p> <p>a. Business as usual</p> <p>b. Paris "Agreement compliance" globally?</p> <p>Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to make the temperature projection.</p> <p>6.2 What is BOM projecting as the rate of temperature rise from now through to</p>	Written

					<p>2100 and 2120 for various levels of human CO2 production including:</p> <p>a. Business as usual</p> <p>b. Paris "Agreement compliance" globally?</p> <p>Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to make the temperature projection.</p>	
8	SQ21-000642	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	<p>Past and present temperatures and rate of temperature change</p>	<p>5.1. According to BOM what is the rate of warming in Australian atmospheric temperatures using BOM temperature data for the following periods:</p> <p>i. 1910 to present?</p> <p>ii. Last 42 years starting with 1979?</p> <p>iii. Last 26 years starting with 1995?</p> <p>Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change.</p> <p>5.2. According to BOM what is the rate of warming in Australian atmospheric temperatures using University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH) data from NASA satellites for the following periods:</p> <p>i. Last 42 years starting with 1979</p> <p>ii. Last 26 years starting with 1995</p> <p>Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change.</p> <p>5.3. According to BOM what is the rate of warming in global atmospheric temperatures using BOM/GHCN/NOAA data for the following periods:</p> <p>i. 1910 to present</p> <p>ii. Last 42 years starting with 1979</p> <p>iii. Last 26 years starting with 1995</p> <p>Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change.</p> <p>5.4. According to BOM what is the rate of warming in global atmospheric temperatures using UAH satellite data for the following periods:</p> <p>i. Last 42 years starting with 1979</p> <p>ii. Last 26 years starting with 1995</p>	Written

					<p>Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade.</p> <p>Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change.</p>	
9	SQ21-000641	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	<p>Basis for scientific advice to governments on policy</p>	<p>In 1996 or since, has BOM received requests from Ministers or their departmental or other advisers for advice on climate?</p> <p>If so, did Ministers or their advisers specify the format for the advice they requested from BOM?</p> <p>If so, what was the format and basis for the advice they requested? And did BOM comply with the requested format?</p> <p>If not, on what basis and format did BOM provide its advice?</p> <p>Specifically, did Ministers or their advisers request, and did BOM provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity in Australia on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? ie, did Ministers request BOM to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from Australian human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from Australian human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect.</p> <p>Specifically, did ministers or their advisers request, and did BOM provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity globally on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? ie, did Ministers request BOM to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect.</p> <p>Does BOM have and does it follow any specific guidelines or standards for providing scientific advice to governments or government agencies when government's intention is to use such advice in formulating policy?</p>	Written

					<p>If not, on what quantified basis does BOM provide specific scientific advice when it is known or reasonably anticipated that BOM's advice will be the basis for climate or energy policy or for climate or energy policy initiatives?</p> <p>Is BOM directly, implicitly or morally responsible for watching over and checking government policy for soundness and accuracy? i.e. if BOM is aware of government policy not founded on or contradicting logical scientific points does BOM have responsibility directly, implicitly or morally?</p> <p>Has BOM ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed climate policies?</p> <p>Has BOM ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed energy policies based in turn on BOM's climate projections?</p> <p>Has BOM been involved in or consulted on the government's tracking of progress in implementing policy to measure policy effectiveness?</p> <p>Does BOM have any defined or implicit responsibility to question governments implementing policies not based on BOM advice and not consistent with or contradictory to empirical scientific climate data?</p> <p>What is BOM's understanding of the basis for government climate and energy policies?</p> <p>Has BOM provided governments with any policy structure as a foundation for climate and energy policies?</p> <p>Why has BOM never specified the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors including atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors?</p> <p>So that in conjunction with the budget, Senator Roberts can fulfil his responsibilities to his constituents and assess the basis for costly climate and energy policies and assess progress and effectiveness of climate and energy policies Senator Roberts requests that BOM, specify the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on each of the climate factors together for each factor with the specific logical scientific points proving cause-and-effect.</p>	
10	SQ21-000640	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	State of the Climate reports	These reports confirm natural variation in climate - something that the UN climate body, the UN IPCC attempts to ignore. So we're grateful for that.	Written

				2016, 2018, 2020	<p>Yet some MP's cite these reports as the basis for their belief that carbon dioxide from human activity - farming, transport, electricity, manufacturing - needs to be cut. Was that BOM's/CSIRO's intent with the wording in its State of The Climate reports?</p> <p>As is the case with the majority of people today, MP's generally show a poor understanding, indeed a misunderstanding, of variation. MP's fail to understand the difference between firstly, natural variation including cyclical variation and, secondly process change. Over a sufficiently short time span of course almost any variation can be made to look like a change in the system when in reality it's just natural variation.</p> <p>What is the intent for publishing these State Of The Climate reports? If it is to push the claim that human carbon dioxide drives climate and needs to be cut please provide the identification of, and specific location of, the logical scientific point(s) upon which BOM's claims or inferences rely. By logical scientific point* I mean the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving cause-and-effect. By location within a reference document I mean page numbers, sentences and/or data table especially when your point relies on reference to another document such as a UN IPCC.</p> <p>If State Of The Climate reports are not intended as support for the claim that human carbon dioxide drives climate variability and needs to be cut, please confirm that.</p> <p>A significant point that emerges from reading State Of The Climate reports is that it implies claims vaguely. Why does it do that when these claims cannot be taken seriously until they each quantify the specific effect/impact of carbon dioxide from human activity on each of various climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, rainfall, ocean temperature, snowfall, ocean alkalinity, drought, fire, sea level, ...?</p> <p>Without that it's not possible to develop sound policy for countering the future imagined effect of carbon dioxide from human activity.</p>	
11	SQ21-000639	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	Reports and correspondence on climate	<p>For a period of many years Ministers have said that on the subject of climate science they rely upon advice and reports from the Chief Scientist. Please provide a list of the documents in which BOM has provided scientific advice to Ministers including PM's, to MP's and to Senators and containing logical scientific points (see</p>	Written

				<p>below*) proving that CO2 from human activity needs to be cut.</p> <p>Please provide, on notice, BOM's specific formal policy advice on climate. I need to know the basis for current policies already destroying people's jobs, livelihoods, lifestyles and cost-of-living.</p> <p>I require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Type of document: e.g. letter, report, reference, article, journal paper, email; b) Date that BOM provided the documents on a timeline in chronological order; c) Recipients' names and titles; d) Identification of document provided being: title, date, authors' names, publisher; e) Identification of, and specific location of, the logical scientific points upon which BOM's advice is relying. By logical scientific point* I mean the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving cause-and-effect. By location within a reference document I mean page numbers, sentences and/or data table especially when your point relies on reference to another document such as a UN IPCC report or State of the Climate Report; f) The date range for documents is from the start of the Howard-Anderson government on 11 March 1996 to the present. <p>Malcolm Roberts' Freedom Of Information request on BOM in 2013 for documents sent to Ministers between 2005 and 2013 identified no documents or advice containing logical scientific points on climate from BOM to Ministers. The FOI request found that BOM provided 17 documents to MPs and none of the documents included evidence of causation and many were merely UN updates and various correspondence.</p> <p>Malcolm Robert's FOI request on CSIRO in 2013 for documents sent to Ministers between 2005 and 2013 revealed no correspondence on climate from CSIRO's Chief Executive to Ministers.</p> <p>Senator Roberts' recent parliamentary Library request failed to identify any documents from CSIRO to MPs containing logical scientific points proving causation.</p> <p>Malcolm Roberts' requests of previous Chief Scientists as far back as Dr Penny Sackett and, Dr Finkel's presentation to Senator Roberts in 2017 failed to provide any logical scientific points proving that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

12	SQ21-000638	Bureau of Meteorology	Malcolm Roberts	State of the Climate 2018 Graph of Temperatures	<p>Dr Andrew Johnston agreed in senate estimates hearings to take the following question as read in the hearings, on notice.</p> <p>I draw your attention to your State Of The Climate Reports 2016 & 2018 and specifically to two graphs of Australian Surface Air Temperature, one in SOTC 2016, on page 4 and the other in SOTC 2018 on page 2. One of our research scientists in updating his records compared your 2016 graph and your 2018 graph. He then obtained from BOM the actual temperatures used in producing the two graphs. He found the two graphs very different for the dates from 1910 to 2016. Yet surely the temperature data from 1910 to 2016 should be the same for both graphs?</p> <p>The only changes to produce the 2018 graph should have been the addition of data for 2017 and 2018, shouldn't they?</p> <p>Yet the actual data shows that in the 2018 graph temperatures after about 1970 had been progressively increased while temperatures before 1970 had been progressively decreased with the effect of increasing the slope of the temperature graph, exaggerating the warming.</p> <p>What is the reason for this when temperatures of historical records up to and including 2016 should not have changed at all, let alone systematically changed one way after 1970 - all increased - and the reverse before 1970, all systematically cooled, exaggerating the warming?</p> <p>On notice, on what basis were the temperature data from 1910 to 2016 changed to produce the 2018 graph?</p> <p>So, has BOM's Australian temperature record been wrong every year until 2018?</p> <p>Can you guarantee that the 2018 record will not turn out to be wrong in 2024?</p> <p>Or is the Australian temperature record anything BOM says it is?</p>	Written
13	SQ21-000551	Bureau of Meteorology	Anne Urquhart	Australian Climate Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What exactly will this service do that isn't already done? 2. How will the information be accessed? Via a website? 3. How will the funding be spent over the Forward Estimates, and beyond? 4. How many employees will there each year over the Forward Estimates? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. FTE ? b. Head count? 5. What kind of skills or qualifications will employees be required to have? 6. What kind of organisations structure will the service have and how will the leader be selected? 	Written

					<p>7. How will the service interact with BOM?</p> <p>8. Is BoM undertaking any specific climate attribution research?</p> <p>9. Were any of the agencies mentioned in the Minister's press release consulted about this service prior to it being announced?</p> <p>a. BoM?</p> <p>b. Geoscience Australia?</p> <p>c. CSIRO?</p> <p>d. ABS?</p> <p>e. Emergency Management Australia?</p> <p>f. National Resilience and Recovery Agency?</p>	
14	SQ21-000370	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Eric Abetz	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Senator ABETZ: The Register of Environmental Organisations, who's in charge of that? As the official is coming to the table, can you take on notice for me: who makes the determination whether an organisation is to be validly accredited, and the criteria for that, and whether the Bob Brown Foundation happens to be one of those organisations. So take all that on notice. Then can we be given a brief explanation as to whether or not these credentials are audited in any way to ascertain that these organisations are actually living up to what is required-namely, that there be a principal purpose of the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.</p> <p>Dr McMorrow: Certainly. I will take on notice the details around what organisations need to have in order to be on the register. That is set out in the act. In terms of compliance, organisations that are on the register must submit an annual return and, when that occurs, the department does an audit of compliance of things like whether their ABN is still valid, whether the principal purpose of the organisation is still for the protection of the natural environment and whether they've actually submitted their annual returns.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: So they tell you what their principal purpose is? But, if in fact their activities are other than that, how are you alerted to that? Do you do a forensic analysis of that which they assert?</p> <p>Dr McMorrow: We do do some analysis of what they-</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: "Some analysis"? I asked about forensic analysis.</p> <p>Dr McMorrow: of the information that they provide us and, if we're not satisfied that they have provided us with enough information, we do ask them to provide</p>	33

					<p>further evidence and information about it.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: But what would alert you to the fact that they might not be providing you with sufficient information?</p> <p>Dr McMorrow: I would probably have to take that on notice in terms of the-</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: That is why I asked whether or not you undertake a forensic audit in relation to that. For example, would it allow the foundation-and I ask this hypothetically for example-</p> <p>CHAIR: Hypotheticals are not allowed.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Alright. Would the principles allow for a person to be paid by his own foundation for speeches that he may or may not deliver, for example. So you've got tax deductibility status of donors, whose money is then paid to a speaker. The other issue that I would raise is: would it allow for these organisations to run hugely expensive, hugely costly advertising campaigns during state elections- such as "Green Your Vote" or "Green Your Voice". These are campaigns that suggest to me, just as a sort of amateur in this game, that-with a green party running at the same time, with the name Greens-there might possibly be a subliminal message there that it's actually campaigning using tax-deductible donations through a foundation to campaign for a particular political party. To me, that would not qualify for the purposes of that which the act requires. Can I ask you to come back to me on notice in some detail as to whether any analysis has been done by the department on this type of activity and whether that will be allowed in the future?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take all that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Thank you very much. I look forward to the answers.</p>	
15	SQ21-000572	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	Vessels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the MPV Everest completed the two journeys it was contracted to undertake? 2. When will the permanent replacement for the Aurora Australis commence operations? 3. Will there be a need for another temporary charter before the RSV Nuyina is handed over to the AAD and commences operations? 	Written

					<p>4. If so, will that charter activity be undertaken by the MPV Everest or another vessel?</p> <p>5. Can you please provide the Committee with a copy of the schedule for voyages to the Antarctic on behalf of the AAD for the years 2018 - 2021 inclusive?</p> <p>6. How much has the repatriation of the crew and expeditioners on board the MPV Everest during the fire cost and who has borne that cost?</p> <p>7. Where did those onboard the Everest at the time of the fire undertake the required quarantine on arrival in Australia, how much did it cost and who covered that cost?</p> <p>8. Given the late delivery of the RSV Nuyina, how much has the temporary charter of the Everest cost and who is bearing that cost?</p>	
16	SQ21-000459	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	Aurora Australis - request for tender for the provision of supplementary shipping capability	<p>Could the Department provide, in relation to the Request for Tender for the Provision of Supplementary Shipping Capability for an interim replacement for the Aurora Australis, the following information:</p> <p>i. A copy of the tender specifications?</p> <p>ii. The number of compliant tenders?</p> <p>iii. An outline of the tender selection process?</p> <p>iv. The specific labour standards, crewing standards and ship survey standards included in the tender specifications?</p>	Written
17	SQ21-000734	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Minamata Convention on Mercury	<p>1. When will the Australian Government ratify the Minamata Convention on Mercury?</p> <p>2. Noting that the Government last consulted the lighting industry in 2017, when will the Government be able to bring certainty to the industry, including users such as local councils, about the phasing out or banning of High Pressure Mercury Vapour lamps, so they can plan upgrading to LED street lighting?</p>	Written
18	SQ21-000366	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	\$2.7 million for pilot regional plan - priority regional area	<p>Senator GREEN: How will the area be selected? Do you have any details on that?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We're still working that through. Clearly, because this is a pilot, we'd be looking for an area that had a relatively significant degree of, if I can call it, 'development prospectivity' and also a relatively significant degree of</p>	7

					<p>environmental assets that required protection. In order to undertake that pilot to determine if this system could work more broadly, we would clearly need to have an area where you had both development and environmental assets in play.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Has the government done any thinking about what areas this budget measure is for? Is there a particular area that was thought, 'This would be a great idea and we'll put this in the budget, and then we can deliver it later on'?</p> <p>Senator Hume: A geographical area?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, geographical.</p> <p>Senator Hume: I'll have to take it on notice.</p>	
19	SQ21-000371	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Spending to save report - minutes of meeting with NESP scientists	<p>Senator GREEN: Have you got minutes of the meeting that took place where the options were not put forward?</p> <p>Dr Box: Yes, there's a meeting outcome record that's in the FOI documents. That's the record of the meeting.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: No, not the meeting outcome. Are there minutes of the meeting?</p> <p>Dr Box: They are the minutes of the meeting itself.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Could you provide those to the committee on notice in case the FOI didn't cover all of the materials associated with that document.</p> <p>Dr Box: Sure.</p>	36
20	SQ21-000375	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Breakdown of \$3.4 million spent on bushfire recovery expert panel	<p>Senator GREEN: Okay. Was there an amount spent on obtaining expert advice and program administration? I think we've identified \$3.4 million on an expert panel.</p> <p>Dr Fraser: Within the \$50 million emergency response was \$3.4 million, which was identified for departmental funds-not for expert advice but to deliver that program.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Not for expert advice.</p> <p>Dr Fraser: No. The expert advice was associated with the departmental component of the \$150 million part of the package-the second part of the package.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay. I'll come back to that then-</p> <p>Dr Fraser: Oh, excuse me, sorry. Part of that \$3.4 million did contribute to paying for the bushfire recovery expert panel.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: How much of it?</p> <p>Dr Fraser: I would have to take that precise amount on notice.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So some of the \$3.4 million of the emergency funding was spent on the expert panel, and you said there was another portion which was on administering it-is that right?</p>	43

					<p>Dr Fraser: Yes, that's right.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can we get a breakdown of the two components of that \$3.4 million?</p> <p>Dr Fraser: Yes, though I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Dr Box: Sure. So the expert panel was convened in January 2020. It was there to assist in prioritising actions for native species, ecological communities and natural assets that were impacted by the 2010-20 bushfires. They did a huge body of work to identify the species and the ecological communities most in need of urgent management intervention following the fires. They undertook a scientific assessment, looking at factors like how threatened a species already was, how much of their range was in the distribution of the fire and how vulnerable particular species were to fire. They looked at vertebrates and invertebrates and plants, and also threatened ecological communities. We drew on a whole range of expertise. So we had fire ecologists, conservation biologists and species experts. So we brought together a range of expertise with those nine members that Ms Kennedy mentioned, but also we had state and territory advisers on that panel. We were really keen for that panel to draw on the expertise that was in the states and territories as well. That panel also drew on the expertise of the department. So we've got species experts in the department. We have fantastic species databases and geospatial experts in the department. So we did bring the department's expertise to bear, but were guided by this expert panel.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay. If we can get the funding breakdown for the panel, that would be helpful.</p> <p>Dr Box: Sure.</p>	
21	SQ21-000367	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Breakdown of \$500 million for projects supporting threatened species projects since 2014	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Dr Box, surely you have an idea as to how much money has been allocated in the forward estimates for saving threatened species. That's your job.</p> <p>Dr Box: We have a tally. There has been \$560 million mobilised for projects supporting threatened species outcomes since 2014. That includes historical programs, like the 20 Million Trees Program and the Green Army Program, but it includes current programs like Regional Land Partnerships, the Environment Restoration Fund and the bushfire response package. Then, as new measures come</p>	16

					<p>on board, we look at them and, as projects are approved and contracted and we know that they're going to be providing benefits for threatened species, we continue to tally that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So is that \$500 million since 2014 what has been spent, or is that what has been allocated?</p> <p>Dr Box: That's projects that have been approved or committed. So that doesn't include, for example, the \$29.1 million pests and weeds measure. It also doesn't include the \$18 million under the oceans package, because that's not yet been approved or committed.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could we have a breakdown of the \$500 million by what you're saying has been approved or been committed? I'd like a time frame for how that money is being allocated.</p> <p>Dr Box: I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	
22	SQ21-000595	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Current projects supporting the swift parrot	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG : What about the swift parrot? Is there anything in this budget for the swift parrot?</p> <p>Dr Box : There's not any dedicated money for the swift parrot.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe : But, again, there are existing programs where money is being spent, Senator, that are being rolled out. I'm sure Dr Box could talk about those programs.</p> <p>Dr Box : That's right. There's a range of funding through the Regional Land Partnerships program for projects that have a primary outcome for the swift parrot. There's also funding through the bushfire package for projects that are supporting outcomes for the swift parrot. I'm very happy to give you a list of current projects underway on the ground now that are supporting the swift parrot.</p>	18
23	SQ21-000373	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Advice from TSSC on threatened species	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How many of the 167 species now won't have a threatened species recovery plan? Is it 150, as Professor Marsh suggested?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I think Professor Marsh was quite clear that the final decision hasn't been made. The Threatened Species Scientific Committee has provided its first round of advice. There then needs to be public consultation on that advice. The Threatened Species Scientific Committee will then consider the comments from public consultation and provide their final advice to the minister. The minister will then consider the public consultation comments and the threatened species scientific advice, and then make a decision. So there are several steps in the process that haven't been gone through. So, as she said, the initial advice is that</p>	40

					<p>150 of those species are appropriately managed with conservation advice in place. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Can we have a list of those 150 species? Dr Stobutzki: I think we can take that on notice. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Okay. Why are we only hearing this now? It was only back in February that I was asking questions about the number of species having outstanding recovery plans. What has changed between February and today? Dr Stobutzki: The advice from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee was provided in March. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Can we have a copy of that advice? Was it written? Was it in a report? Was it a briefing document? Dr Stobutzki: There's a letter from the committee to the minister. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Can we have a copy of that? Dr Stobutzki: I presume we can provide that. Mr Metcalfe: We'll take it on notice.</p>	
24	SQ21-000385	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Environment Restoration Fund - timeframe of ocean package and pest and weed package	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I want a bit more detail on the Threatened Species Strategy announcement by the minister on Friday last week. Just to be clear-and we went through this a little bit earlier-the money that was announced is not all new money. I would just like to know the time frame that it's going to be spent over. Dr Box: The new money? Senator HANSON-YOUNG: The money that was attached to this announcement on Friday. Dr Box: The program with the \$10 million under the Environment Restoration Fund runs to June 2023. Then the \$18 million oceans package and the \$29.1 million pests and weeds package, I understand, are over the forward estimates. I will have to double-check with colleagues, but that's my understanding. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: There was \$57 million, but we actually discovered that it's really only \$47 million out of the budget because \$10 million has been brought forward from the restoration fund. So that's to be spread across the next four years? Dr Box: I think so. I'll have to double-check the time frame for that pest and weed package and the oceans package, but the ERF definitely goes to June 2023.</p>	51

25	SQ21-000398	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Offset management system - project finalisation and money allocated	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When is this project going to be finalised? I guess it will always be a work in progress, because it'll be updated, but when will we be able to see some of this?</p> <p>Mr McNee: The first phase, which is the back collection of information on a project-by-project basis, is now complete. The build for the system is underway. I'll come back and correct this if this is inaccurate, but my understanding is we would have that at a test level by the end of the year. As we move into 2022, that's when the other elements will come forward.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Was there extra money allocated to this, or is this just out of the general departmental budget?</p> <p>Mr McNee: The government has made a number of commitments around congestion busting which relate to our effectiveness and efficiency and how we do our work. We've been using some of those funds to support these particular activities.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If you could take those things on notice, that would be great. I look forward to having an update as to how things are going with that transparency project.</p>	75
26	SQ21-000374	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Status of 167 species with outstanding recovery plans	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Out of those 167 species, how many have become more under threat, more endangered?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: In what time frame?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Since they've been waiting for a recovery plan.</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I'd have to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have any of them?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Some of them may have changed their status because of bushfires and other things. I'm not sure. We're going through a process.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If it's not bushfires, what other elements might threaten a species even though it's been listed, is waiting for a plan and has conservation advice? What are the other threats?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: There are changes to levels of threats all the time. If you look at the changes in drought and the changes in fire associated with climate change, there are a range of different threats that might change to a species and might influence its status.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So you can't tell me today-given that this is the section in</p>	41-42

					<p>which the Senate can ask these questions-how many of the 167 have had their status changed while they've been waiting for a recovery plan?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: No. I don't have that level on me. But we can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Does the department hold that level of detail?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Can we get it?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: It's a matter of looking at the recent changes in the status of species and comparing that list to the 167. So I think taking it on notice is quite reasonable.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Of the 150 that are now not going to get a recovery plan-if the minister takes the advice-how many have become more under threat?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think that's a subset of your earlier question, Senator, so we'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have any of that 150 become less threatened?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Again, I'd like to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Do you think any of them may have become less threatened?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I'd have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think it's best if we check and let you know, Senator.</p>	
27	SQ21-000397	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Approved EPBC Act projects and offsets	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: First, I'd like to know-and I assumed you're going to have to take this on notice, but if you have any sense of it that would be helpful-how many projects have been approved overall since the EPBC Act came into effect.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think we probably will need to take that on notice, because, from memory, that dates back to 1996, or soon thereafter.</p> <p>Mr McNee: To be precise, I think we'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Okay. But you would have that somewhere, wouldn't you?</p> <p>Mr McNee: Yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I want that full figure. Then what I want to know is: how many of those approved projects have required offsets as part of the conditional approval?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you. The follow-up is: are there any existing elements to those offsets that are still in place? Some conditions may already have</p>	74-75

					<p>been done and completed and others may still be ongoing. I like to know what the status of those are, which is why I understand you'll probably have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr McNee: It would be useful to clarify what you mean there, I think. Generally, where offsets have been required, there are ongoing requirements, in terms of management and maintenance, so we would anticipate that if an offset were required then it would be ongoing into the future.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes. But some may not have had that land purchased yet, depending on what their conditional offset approval was. I'd like to know what the status of that is.</p> <p>Mr McNee: We can definitely do that on notice, because we've actually been doing that process of looking at all offsets in all states to be able to bring them into an offset management system.</p>	
28	SQ21-000586	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Impact Reconciliation reporting	<p>See response document for Table 1: Impact Reconciliation reporting.</p> <p>For the projects shown in Table 1 above, you are requested to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a map showing the area of native vegetation cleared during the previous two calendar years[1]. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Clarify what area (in ha) of native vegetation was cleared during those same two years1. ii. Clarify the period to which the map (Q1) and area (Q2) relate. 2. Has the mine development envelope for each project has changed (size or shape) since the federal Minister's approval was granted <p>[1] For projects where an Impact Reconciliation Report was due in 2020, a map showing clearing and area cleared in the two years to 31 December 2019, respectively, will suffice.</p>	Written
29	SQ21-000580	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Heritage council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please list all the places that are currently being considered by the heritage council or by the Minister that are past their statutory deadline? What is the most overdue? How many are more than five years overdue? 	Written

					2. What resourcing does the Heritage Council have to deal with this backlog? Has the Department requested extra resources to deal with the backlog?	
30	SQ21-000575	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	National Farmers Federation Grant	<p>A grant of \$150,000 was provided to the National Farmers Federation to enable it "to work with the farming community and help them prepare to contribute to the EPBC Act review".</p> <p>1. How much of that money was spent? 2. What was it spent on? 3. Was the NFF required to acquit its spending of that grant and to whom?</p>	Written
31	SQ21-000567	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Convention on Biological Diversity - 'zero extinctions' commitment	As the country with the highest rate of mammal extinctions - Is there any reason Australia would not commit to 'zero extinction'?	Written
32	SQ21-000566	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Global Biodiversity Framework	<p>The 24th Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the 3rd Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) of the CBD are currently underway (from 3 May to 13 June) to advance preparations for the 15th Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity currently scheduled to take place in October 2021 in China.</p> <p>A new post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) is currently being developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Officers from the department are actively engaging in these negotiations.</p> <p>a) Who is responsible for these negotiations? (from within the department, and government). Can you outline the scheduled timeline for these negotiations? b) What is currently being negotiated? c) Can the Department update the Committee on progress at these meetings and the position the Australian Delegation is taking on the agenda items:</p> <p>SBSTTA-24 Agenda . The post-2020 global biodiversity framework . Synthetic biology</p>	Written

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Risk assessment and risk management of living modified organisms (LMOs) . Marine and coastal biodiversity . Biodiversity and agriculture . Programme of work of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) . Biodiversity and health . Invasive alien species <p>SBI-3 Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety . The post-2020 global biodiversity framework . Resource mobilization and the financial mechanism . Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, knowledge management, and communication . Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives . Mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation . Review of the effectiveness of the processes under the Convention and its protocols . Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors and other strategic actions to enhance implementation . Specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments (Article 4.4 of the Nagoya Protocol) . Global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Article 10 of the Nagoya Protocol) . Administrative and budgetary matters 	
33	SQ21-000591	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	St Kilda Mangroves	<p>The St Kilda Mangroves North of Adelaide. The Mangroves and adjacent saltmarsh and samphire provide vital habitat for migratory shorebirds along the East-Australasian Flyway.</p> <p>Last year, saltfield ponds next to the bird habitat badly leaked causing extensive dieback to many hectares of mangroves and saltmarsh.</p> <p>1. How is it possible to appropriately manage the inherent conflict of interest that</p>	Written

					<p>exists when a state government agency that has an express mandate to champion and support development opportunities is also required to appropriately consider national and international environmental obligations/considerations?</p> <p>2. What avenues does the Minister and the department have to intervene and ensure a best practice remediation plan is enforced?</p>	
34	SQ21-000589	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	2014-7275 Solomon Iron Ore Expansion	Given the Minister signed the Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund on 19 November 2020, please advise when the approval holder will be required to make a payment to the PEOF.	Written
35	SQ21-000590	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	2017-8024 Eliwana Iron Ore Mine Project and 2017-8025 Eliwana Iron Ore Rail Project	<p>1. In a Compliance Report published by the approval holder on or about 31 March 2021, the approval holder states the Eliwana Offsets Strategy required by condition 4 of both the above project approvals was submitted for Ministerial approval on 21 February 2020; however, the same Compliance Report indicates the Eliwana Offsets Strategy has not yet been approved by the Minister. For these projects:</p> <p>i. Has the Eliwana Offsets Strategy been approved?</p> <p>ii. If not, what issue(s) prevents the approval of the Eliwana Offsets Strategy?</p> <p>2. Has the development envelope for each of these two projects changed (size or shape) since the federal Minister's approval was granted?</p> <p>If the answer is yes, please provide a map and the current area (in ha) of the current development envelope(s).</p>	Written
36	SQ21-000565	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	ANAO report - EPBC Act	<p>The ANAO report Referrals, Assessments and Approvals of Controlled Actions under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 published on Thursday 25 June 2020 was scathing and deeply concerning. The Auditor General made 8 recommendations to the department. The department agreed to all 8 recommendations.</p> <p>1. How is the Department progressing on addressing the recommendations from the report?</p> <p>2. In terms of budget allocations, does the department have enough funding to sort out these problems?</p>	Written

37	SQ21-000587	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	2013-7055 Christmas Creek Iron Ore expansion project	<p>1. Is mining authorised under this approval still occurring? We ask given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. no Offsets Plan has been published consistent with condition 7, and ii. either an Offsets Plan required under condition 12a would need to have been approved by 3 Jan 2019, or iii. an offset payment would have to have been paid to an approved Fund by 30 June 2019, and neither a nor c have occurred. <p>2. Given the Minister signed the Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund on 19 November 2020, please advise what action is being taken to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. obtain and arrange for the publication of an impact reconciliation report as required under condition 12(b)(iv) ii. obtain and arrange for the publication of spatial data (a map) identifying the areas of suitable habitat for EPBC Act listed species removed during the [period from commencement] to 31 December 2021, as required under condition 12(b)(v) iii. (assuming they are now and still authorised to make a payment to the PEOF) ensure the approval holder makes a payment to the PEOF by 30 June 2021. 	Written
38	SQ21-000576	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Agriculture 2030: Environmental markets and biodiversity stewardship	<p>a) What metrics will be used to assess outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Biophysical? Monetary? At farm-level? Landscape level? <p>b) What methods will be used to measure outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Field surveys? Remote sensing? <p>c) What mechanisms will be used or tested to ensure value for money?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Targeting high conservation value geographies? ii. Targeting more receptive landholders? <p>d) What payment vehicles will be used or tested?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conditional payments for ecosystem services? ii. Interest rate or insurance discounts? Tax relief? Performance bonds? <p>e) How will they assess supply-side willingness and incentivise farmer participation?</p>	Written

					<p>f) How will they assess private sector demand-side appetite and incentivise scaling up? Are there plans to survey potential private sector buyers? i. Pilot projects? Tax incentives?</p> <p>g) How will this initiative link to other and existing schemes? i. EPBC assessments? Biodiversity offsets? Carbon farming? ii. Best Management Practice / sustainability frameworks and certification schemes? MLA-WWF-UQ Smart Farming Partnership on sustainability credentials for beef producers? iii. New federal soil initiative? iv. What are the milestones / KPIs that would trigger increased government investment? v. How will they ensure efficient administration of scheme? vi. Are there plans to out-source management of the scheme and, if so, will this be based on competitive tendering? vii. How will they ensure independent scientific review of methods and results? viii. How will they keep stakeholders informed and facilitate participation?</p>	
39	SQ21-000585	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Fortescue Metals Group and offset payments due	<p>The Minister approved payments to the Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund on 19 Nov 2020 (see Media). However, in its latest report dated 31 March 2021, Fortescue continues to state it is their intention to make payments once an Offset Fund has been approved by the Minister. Reference: Joint media release: Environmental offsets agreement a win for the Pilbara Ministers (awe.gov.au)</p> <p>What is the status of this Offset Fund?</p>	Written
40	SQ21-000570	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Convention on Biological Diversity - The Leaders' Pledge	<p>The Leaders' Pledge for Nature is a leaders' level statement, which calls for a range of actions over the next ten years. In response to my QoN 58 the Department states 'Australia is well positioned on many of these commitments, and the government is still considering its position on the Pledge'.</p> <p>1. Please expand on the response from QoN 58 with what commitments are Australia well positioned on?</p>	Written

41	SQ21-000574	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Threatened Species Strategy	Will the TSS ensure that 100% of Australia's threatened species have time-bound, fully costed recovery plans?	Written
42	SQ21-000569	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Convention on Biological Diversity - Species target	<p>The current (expired) Aichi Target has a goal of "Avoiding the extinction of known threatened species". The revised goal being discussed globally is weaker, with a goal to "Reduce the number of threatened species by [x]%" with x the subject of international negotiations.</p> <p>1. Is Australia championing a target or goal to avoid the extinction of native species, as was in the previous Aichi Targets? i.[If no] Why not?</p> <p>2. Is Australia supporting a goal or target on implementation that requires parties to ensure the availability of financial means and capacity to meet the new CBD goals and targets?</p> <p>3. Are you concerned at all that the Global Biodiversity Framework may end up representing a weakening of the targets set in the Aichi Targets?</p>	Written
43	SQ21-000568	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Convention on Biological Diversity - 30x30 and the high ambition coalition	<p>The High Ambition Coalition (HAC) for Nature and People is an intergovernmental group of 60 countries co-chaired by Costa Rica and France and by the United Kingdom as Ocean co-chair, championing a global deal for nature and people with the central goal of protecting at least 30 percent of world's land and ocean by 2030. The 30x30 target is a global target which aims to halt the accelerating loss of species, and protect vital ecosystems that are the source of our economic security. Although not a CBD member, US President Joe Biden has also supported 30X30 and specifically committed to protect 30% of US lands by 2030. Australia recently joined the global ocean alliance by committing to protect 30% of its ocean (already achieved). Australia is currently not a signatory of the High Ambition Coalition.</p> <p>1. In relation to the Convention on Biological Diversity COP15 negotiation toward new global targets, can you advise on Australia's priorities in terms of improving the current zero draft?</p>	Written

					<p>2. Noting US president Joe Biden recently committed to protecting 30% of US lands by 2030, what is Australia's position on the push by members of the High Ambition Coalition for a target to protect 30% of the land and 30% of the oceans by 2030?</p> <p>i. Will Australia match the US commitment to protect 30% of land given we are closer to that target already?</p> <p>3. Has Australia been approached to join the "High Ambition Coalition"?</p> <p>i. [If yes] Which country requested Australia to join? Does the government intend to join the High Ambition Coalition?</p>	
44	SQ21-000571	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC Act Review	<p>1. Has the department been requested to prepare a response to any of the recommendations of this comprehensive review yet?</p> <p>i. If so - what recommendations.</p> <p>2. In response to my QoN 32 the Department states: 'The government has committed to work through the full recommendations of the Review in detail with stakeholders and the Minister has made a public undertaking to provide a timeline for subsequent phases of reform'.</p> <p>i. Can the timeline of the phases of reform be provided to committee?</p> <p>ii. [If not] When can we expect to see this timeline?</p> <p>3. Is there any money in the 2021-22 budget or the forward estimates specifically earmarked for the development of future iterations of national environment standards--- (i.e. not the interim standards as currently proposed by the Government) including stakeholder consultation and departmental resourcing?</p> <p>i. If so, can the Department break down the proposed allocation of funding to both Departmental resourcing (including what that will be spent on) and consultation?</p> <p>Professor Graeme Samuel in his Final EPBC Review Report recommended that "a full suite of National Environmental Standards" should be immediately developed and implemented to provide clear rules and improved decision-making, including standards covering community consultation, compliance and enforcement and data and information.</p>	Written

					4. Has any money been put aside in this Budget (21-22) or the forward estimates to develop interim standards for these areas?	
45	SQ21-000573	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Department resourcing, devolution and accreditation - EPBC Act	<p>On 11th December 2020 National Cabinet agreed the immediate priority was to pass legislation streamlining approval processes and to develop national environmental standards reflecting the current requirements of the EPBC Act.</p> <p>In response to QoN number 31 - The Department states they began to work on the national environment standards for matters of national environmental significance reflecting the agreement with the national cabinet on 16th December.</p> <p>1. Can you provide the committee the outline of what was in the agreement? 2. Is there any recorded mins, drafting instructions / directions? 3. Can you table to the committee all documents in relation to the agreement on 16th December and correspondence as referred to in QoN 31.</p>	Written
46	SQ21-000581	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Blue Mountains World Heritage Area	<p>One of those that is overdue is the NSW Government proposed extension to the Blue Mountains World Heritage Area. Yet I don't see any formal extension that has been granted by the Minister.</p> <p>1. Why is that? 2. Why has this listing been deferred? 3. Is the Government aware that an area that is nominated for the National Heritage List by the NSW government under this listing is also being proposed as a future coal mining area?</p>	Written
47	SQ21-000583	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Juukan Gorge	<p>This week is the second anniversary of the Juukan Gorge destruction.</p> <p>1. If the Juukan Gorge hadn't been destroyed, does the Department or the Heritage Council believe that it would have been worthy of national or world heritage listing? 2. Did Juukan Gorge have characteristics that would have made it eligible for World Heritage? 3. If the Department or the Heritage Council isn't conducting scans of sites that are likely to be of national or world heritage status, how many other sites of such importance may be destroyed?</p>	Written

48	SQ21-000579	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Heritage places under the EPBC Act	Can you please tell me what breaches there have been of statutory obligations regarding deadlines and heritage places under the EPBC Act?	Written
49	SQ21-000582	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Indigenous Heritage	In the recent round of nominations the Minister called for Indigenous Heritage to be prioritised. Can you tell me what sort of financial support or direct support the Government has provided to First Nations groups to assist them in putting forward nominations?	Written
50	SQ21-000584	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	The petroglyphs of the Burrup Peninsula	The WA and Federal Government have recently nominated the petroglyphs of the Burrup Peninsula onto the candidate list for World Heritage. 1. As the site is not yet formally accepted by the World Heritage Committee, what protections are the Government putting in place for its protection? 2. Does it have protection under Australian law as if it was already world heritage, or does that need to wait for the world to sign off? 3. Can the Minister give it a de facto level of protection in the meantime?	Written
51	SQ21-000622	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Stationery	1. How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Written
52	SQ21-000602	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Executive office upgrades	1. Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Written
53	SQ21-000609	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Acting Minister arrangements	1. Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister from 24 August 2018 to 30 May 2021. 2. Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period.	Written
54	SQ21-000600	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial functions and meals	1. In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, can the following be provided: a. List of functions.	Written

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. List of all attendees. c. Function venue. d. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e. Details of any food served. f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g. Any available photographs of the function. h. Details of any entertainment provided. <p>2. In relation to any breakfasts, luncheons, dinners or other meals hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, can the following be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. List of dates and types of meals. j. List of all attendees. k. Function venue. l. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). m. Details of any food served. n. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. o. Any available photographs of the function. p. Details of any entertainment provided. 	
55	SQ21-000607	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	FOI	<p>1. Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for the following years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 2013-14; b. 2014-15; c. 2015-16; d. 2016-17; e. 2018-19; 2019-20, and; f. 2020-21 to date. <p>2. For each year above, please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full; b. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part; c. The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and d. The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under 	Written

				<p>the Freedom of Information Act.</p> <p>3. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <p>a. The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and</p> <p>b. The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request).</p> <p>4. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <p>a. The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the OAIC; and</p> <p>b. The number of times has the OAIC overturned - in whole or in part - the Department's decision to refuse access to material.</p> <p>5. Please provide the staffing (both ASL and headcount) of staff at the Department who work exclusively on FOI requests, broken down by APS level (e.g. three EL1s, four APS6s, one SES) for each of the following years:</p> <p>a. 2013-14;</p> <p>b. 2014-15;</p> <p>c. 2015-16;</p> <p>d. 2016-17;</p> <p>e. 2018-19;</p> <p>f. 2019-20, and;</p> <p>g. 2020-21 to date.</p> <p>6. For each of the years above, please also list the number of officers who are designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Department.</p> <p>7. In the past 12 months, has the Department seconded additional resources to processing Freedom of Information requests? If so, please detail those resources by APS level.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>8. Please provide the number of officers who are currently designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Minister's office.</p> <p>9. Please provide the number of FOI requests currently under consideration by the Department. Please also provide the number of these requests that are currently overdue in response.</p> <p>10. Does the department consult or inform the Minister when it receives Freedom of Information requests? If so: a. How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and b. Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister.</p> <p>11. Has the Department consulted or informed another Department or agency about any FOI request in the past twelve months. If so, please provide the legal basis on which that consultation occurred (e.g. third party consultation, transfer of request).</p>	
56	SQ21-000616	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial domestic travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all domestic travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, please be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying</p>	Written

					<p>departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</p>	
57	SQ21-000615	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial overseas travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, please be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</p>	Written
58	SQ21-000625	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental staff in Minister's office	<p>1. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including:</p> <p>a. Duration of secondment.</p> <p>b. APS level.</p> <p>2. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level.</p>	Written
59	SQ21-000606	Department of Agriculture,	Kristina Keneally	Secretarial travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-</p>	Written

		Water and the Environment			<p>31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.</p>	
60	SQ21-000610	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental staff allowances	1. Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.	Written
61	SQ21-000630	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Comcare	<p>1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status.</p> <p>2. Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the each of the periods; 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p>	Written
62	SQ21-000628	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Recruitment	<p>1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021?</p> <p>2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.</p>	Written

63	SQ21-000633	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.	Written
64	SQ21-000635	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of interest	1. Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2. Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of interest as at 31 May 2021?	Written
65	SQ21-000637	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of gifts and hospitality	1. Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2. Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of gifts as at 31 May 2021?	Written
66	SQ21-000624	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Communications staff	1. For all departments and agencies, please provide - in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff - the following: 2. By Department or agency: a. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location. b. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. c. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. d. How many are graphic designers. e. How many are media managers. f. How many organise events. 3. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios. a. If yes, why. b. When was it established. c. What is the set up cost. d. What is the ongoing cost. e. How many staff work there and what are their classifications.	Written
67	SQ21-000614	Department of Agriculture,	Kristina Keneally	Collateral materials	1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on collateral materials, including banners, publications, maps, charts and high visibility or protective clothing for events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site	Written

		Water and the Environment			visits, including Ministerial events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 2. For each event or function where the Department/agency expended funds on collateral materials, provide details of the event, including the date and location of each event, and details of the types of materials.	
68	SQ21-000619	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including: a. Date commissioned. b. Date report handed to Government. c. Date of public release. d. Terms of Reference. e. Committee members and/or Reviewers. 2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost. 3. The background and credentials of the Review personnel. 4. The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel 5. The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review. 6. How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level. 7. What is the current status of each report. When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so.	Written
69	SQ21-000604	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Staff travel	1. What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Written
70	SQ21-000608	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Briefings	1. Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives. If so, can the following be provided: a. The subject matter of the briefing. b. The location and date of the briefing.	Written

					<p>c. Who proposed the briefing.</p> <p>d. Attendees of the briefing by level/position</p>	
71	SQ21-000621	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Appointments - briefs prepared	<p>1. How many times has the Department prepared a brief for statutory authorities, executive agencies, advisory boards, government business enterprises or any other Commonwealth body which includes a reference to a former Liberal or National member of parliament at a state, territory or federal level.</p> <p>2. For each brief prepared, can the Department advise:</p> <p>a. The former member.</p> <p>b. The board or entity.</p> <p>c. Whether the request originated from the Minister's office.</p> <p>d. Whether the appointment was made.</p>	Written
72	SQ21-000620	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Board Appointments	<p>1. Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members.</p> <p>2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio</p> <p>3. Please detail any board appointments made from 30 June 2020 to 31 May 2021.</p> <p>4. What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid.</p> <p>5. What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors.</p> <p>6. What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors.</p>	Written
73	SQ21-000623	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Media monitoring	<p>1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to each Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p> <p>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services.</p> <p>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</p> <p>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21.</p> <p>2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p> <p>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services.</p> <p>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media</p>	Written

					monitoring contracts in each period please be provided c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21.	
74	SQ21-000627	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Congestion busting	1. Can the Department/agency advise how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks. 2. Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department.	Written
75	SQ21-000634	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Public Interest Disclosures	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many public interest disclosures have been received.	Written
76	SQ21-000599	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Executive Management	1. In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021: a. The total number of executive management positions b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. c. The change in the number of executive manager positions. d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.	Written
77	SQ21-000629	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Staffing	1. How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at each of 30 June 2019 and 30 June 2020, 31 May 2021? 2. How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing. 3. How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. How many were: a. voluntary b. involuntary. 4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies. 5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff. 6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December	Written

					2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	
78	SQ21-000631	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Commission	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.	Written
79	SQ21-000632	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Ombudsman	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.	Written
80	SQ21-000626	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	CDDA Payments	1. How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021? 2. How many claims were: a. Accepted. b. Rejected. c. Under consideration. 3. Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide: a. Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations b. The date payment was made c. The decision maker.	Written
81	SQ21-000605	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Legal costs	1. What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Written
82	SQ21-000601	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental functions	1. In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 can the following be provided: a. List of functions.	Written

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. List of all attendees. c. Function venue. d. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e. Details of any food served. f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g. Any available photographs of the function. h. Details of any entertainment provided. 	
83	SQ21-000618	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Departmental equipment	What was the estimated value of all Departmental equipment that was lost, damaged, stolen or written off during each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Written
84	SQ21-000636	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Travel and expense claim policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please produce a copy of all travel and expense claim policies. 2. Please produce a copy of all claim forms. If the forms are digital, please provide a screen shot of each section, including all dropdown options. 	Written
85	SQ21-000603	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Facilities upgrades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment. 2. If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). 3. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided. 	Written
86	SQ21-000611	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Market research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies. 2. If so, can the Department provide an itemised list of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Subject matter b. Company c. Costs each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. d. Contract date period 	Written

					3. Can the Department/agency advise what, if any, research was shared with the Minister or their office and the date and format in which this occurred.	
87	SQ21-000612	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Advertising and information campaigns	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p> <p>2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide:</p> <p>a. When approval was first sought.</p> <p>b. The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process.</p> <p>c. the timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline.</p> <p>3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided.</p>	Written
88	SQ21-000613	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Promotional merchandise	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p> <p>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided.</p> <p>3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided.</p>	Written
89	SQ21-000617	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kristina Keneally	Social media influencers	<p>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.</p> <p>2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote.</p>	Written

					<p>3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided.</p> <p>4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided.</p>	
90	SQ21-000407	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	Cumberland Plain Woodland at Orchard Hills - advice from the Department of Infrastructure	<p>Senator McALLISTER: What advice did the infrastructure department provide to your department that the Cumberland Plain Woodland at Orchard Hills would increase its quality score from a seven to a nine in 10 years?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: That was a decision made a number of years ago. I wasn't around then, so I can't speak directly to it. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Is there anyone in the room who can? Notwithstanding the issues raised by Senator Hanson-Young in terms of the probity of some of these acquisitions, the quality of them is clearly in scope for your department. Is there anyone who can talk about it?</p> <p>Mr Manning: I think at the time that decision was made we asked the department of infrastructure to provide a biodiversity assessment report-it was something of that nature; I forget the exact name-which required a quantification of the quality of the biodiversity, the habitat on site, both before and after the offset was implemented. My recollection is that that was done by the department as part of the due diligence on the Biodiversity Offset Delivery Plan-but I'm going back to a decision I made three years ago.</p>	78
91	SQ21-000399	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	Biodiversity Offset Delivery Plan - maintaining the habitat	<p>Senator McALLISTER: On the question of maintaining that habitat in perpetuity, there is a funding stream that is available for 20 years under the agreement. What is the mechanism to maintain the habitat? Assuming it reaches the quality projected in the agreement, what's the mechanism by which that quality will be maintained and preserved in perpetuity?</p> <p>Mr Manning: I would presume, though I'm stretching my memory here, that there will be commitments in the Biodiversity Offset Delivery Plan to that maintenance. So the investment is to lift it-to put in the effort to lift it from the score it's at now to the higher one. I'm presuming there are commitments in the Biodiversity Offset Delivery Plan to maintain it once you've got it at that higher level, but I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Will they be in breach of their development approval if they</p>	80

					<p>don't?</p> <p>Mr Manning: If what I'm suggesting is true, if there is a commitment in that document, then yes, because that's enforceable under the act.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I'm not super comfortable with the hypothetical nature of the answers.</p> <p>Mr Manning: I apologise. I just can't remember the document in enough detail to answer that particular part of it.</p>	
92	SQ21-000408	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	Roundtables - Minister Ley	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Thanks very much. I just wanted to ask about round tables. At the last estimates, we asked for details about the round tables that Minister Ley has participated in and hosted. Specifically, we asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many roundtables has the Minister hosted since May 2019? 2. How much has been spent on roundtables hosted by the Minister for the Environment since May 2019? 3. Please provide a list of all roundtables the Minister for the environment has participated in . including associated costs. <p>The reason for asking is that the minister has made numerous references to these round tables. In fact, you can find 13 occasions, either in press releases or transcripts issued, where she has been talking about round tables. The response from the department was pretty thin. To question 87 the response was:</p> <p>Minister Ley has met with a significant number of stakeholders since May 2019. This has included attending, participating in, and hosting a number of meetings.</p> <p>Does the department not know how many round tables the minister has hosted?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Senator, the minister's hosted a number of round tables on a variety of different topics. I guess, from our perspective, there were-as you are aware, and I think we might have talked about it before-the round tables in relation to the national environmental standards, which is why I came to the table. I don't have the exact details of those round tables in front of me, but I can get them.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: That's the problem, isn't it? Senator Urquhart asked for the exact details of those round tables. It's a reasonably straightforward question to a department about</p>	18-19

					<p>what the minister is doing in terms of stakeholder engagement and the way the department is supporting her. The answer was a two-sentence general answer which says, 'The minister's met with a number of stakeholders.' Why doesn't the department know, having been asked back in April, what was going on with the round tables? Why does the department still not know how many round tables the minister's participated in?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Senator, as I said, we do know-certainly my area knows-how many round tables the minister's participated in, in relation to national environmental standards.</p> <p>Senator MCALLISTER: Well, why was that information not included in the answer to question No. 87? It was a very specific question.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll have to check as to why the question was answered in that way, Senator. But certainly we do know that the minister is very active in meeting with a whole range of people on a regular basis. As you would expect.</p> <p>Senator MCALLISTER: I do expect it, and it was why I asked for a very specific answer. Can I table the answer that was provided? Do you have it in front of you, Mr Metcalfe?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Thanks. I've got it now, Senator.</p> <p>Senator MCALLISTER: Great. Do you think that's an acceptable answer to the Senate?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think that the question was addressed to the minister's office. That's the response that was provided, Senator. I can ask whether there's any more detail. The question doesn't ask how many round tables the department has records of, for example. It asked the question and it's been given that answer.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Minister, are you satisfied with that answer?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'm very satisfied-</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: No, I'm asking the minister. My apologies, Mr Metcalfe.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'm sorry, I didn't hear.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: Perhaps there was a misunderstanding around what the threshold for a round table is. I don't know. As Mr Metcalfe has indicated, the best thing for us to do is to go about providing as much accurate information as possible around the question that was asked. I can give at least one example of Minister Ley having a round table with me and the forestry industries post the Samuel review. But let's</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>get the detail you are seeking, and do so on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: The reason I ask is that there is a certain tenancy in the government to make grandiose announcements without a lot of substance behind them. Senator Urquhart asked the department a pretty straightforward fact based question about how many of these round tables had actually happened. Mr Metcalfe, can you assure me that you know how many of these round tables have actually happened and how many are just press releases?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We certainly have records of which ones the department has been directly involved in.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Well, perhaps the minister can augment those departmental records with any other information she has about things that she asserts are round tables.</p>	
93	SQ21-000378	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Jenny McAllister	\$15 million Indigenous Protected Areas program - anticipated expenditure	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Mr Metcalfe, this is another finance question. It seems better to put it on notice and then perhaps Mr Pak Poy can come back after lunch. In an answer to a question asked by Senator Urquhart at additional estimates, question No. 97, the department indicated that \$4.1 million had been paid to grant recipients under the \$15 million IPO program. My question is: what is the profiling for the anticipated expenditure of the balance of that program? It was a six-year program, so we're about half way through and I'm interested in understanding in what year the money will be expended.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Thank you, Senator.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I can probably help with that, partially. It might be something we need to take on notice, because it is a little bit complicated. It depends on the speed with which the projects that have been agreed go from the consultation phase to the dedication phase. I don't have it with me in a detailed breakdown now, but we can certainly provide that detail on notice.</p>	45-46
94	SQ21-000394	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Bridget McKenzie	Staff working on the Regional Forestry Agreements	<p>Senator McKENZIE: Is the department working to change the RFA framework and the exemption of part 3 of the EPBC Act?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: As I said, we are taking the time to carefully consider any policy or legal implications both from this committee's report into your bill, Senator, and from the court case and we're looking at the implications raised by those. We will work with government on how it can continue to meet its policy objectives for RFAs, which are about certainty for the forest industry and forest dependent</p>	67

					<p>communities, ecological sustainable forest management and the protection of Australia's forest biodiversity.</p> <p>Senator McKENZIE: How many staff have we got working on this-carefully considering this complex decision?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I'll have to take the exact number on notice but it's a team of about five or six in my division and we have support of the legal division as well.</p>	
95	SQ21-000594	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Samantha McMahon	Spending profile of \$1000 for remediation of Jabiru	<p>Senator McMAHON: I have a question around the spend profile. It looks like in 2022-23 we're spending \$1,000 for the year on remediation of Jabiru. That seems awfully weird. Are we shouting everybody lunch?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: That does seem like an odd number. I may have to, again, take some advice on that. I think what is likely to be the case is that the remediation of Jabiru is a number of quite complex projects-things like changing all the asbestos roofs in houses in Jabiru, cleaning up the waste facility. What has probably happened is that we have a number of those set up for next year. We think there'll be a delay until we can do the work to actually to put in place the rest of the arrangements. A lot of those are because in the deed of remediation we've included a 12 to 18 month period to plan and agree with people what the work is that needs to be done. That's probably what's throwing a bunch of the work into that outer year and having that break at one year in between. It will be the period where we can't do the immediate work and we're planning to do the longer-term work.</p>	110
96	SQ21-000388	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	National Environmental Science Program - resilient landscapes hub bids	<p>Senator RICE: I want to specifically go to criterion 2, the scientific expertise networks and leadership capability. How were the research partners of both bids taken into account in terms of their engagement? The further partner organisations that were listed in each bid-was there a consideration of the researchers who were named and provided in each of the two leading bids?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I will have to get back to you on that, but these were very comprehensive assessments done against the criteria as set out in the guidelines. As I said, it was quite a substantial technical advisory panel that was looking at all of the listed criteria.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Was a comparison made of the research impact metrics provided in the CVs of the lead researchers in assessing scientific capability?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I would have to get back to you on that. I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me how many key personnel were named in the</p>	61

					<p>consortia for each of the two bids-how much each offered in co-investment in both cash and in-kind contributions?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I will have to get back to you on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I note that you've got seven your selection advisory panel. Did they each give individual scores for the bids?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Yes, it's my understanding that each member of the selection advisory panel undertook their own assessment of the applications and then the panel came together, discussed the scores and came to a panel-wide position.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can we get a copy of the individual scores of those seven members of that advisory panel?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: I will take that on notice.</p>	
97	SQ21-000379	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Management intervention for greater gliders	<p>Senator RICE: What is the urgent management intervention that is being considered for greater gliders in Victoria but specifically in forests that are open for logging?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I don't have the detail of what's been implemented under the multiregional funding at the moment. I will just check to see if one of my colleagues does.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I have some details about the bushfire recovery package funding 19 projects with identified actions to benefit the recovery of the greater glider. An example is the New South Wales government installing nest boxes in the Blue Mountains region.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I'm running out of time. Can you take those on notice, specifically in Victoria in forests that are open for logging?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think Dr Box can help us.</p> <p>Dr Box: I don't have the exact geographic area for you, but we can take that on notice. Like Ms Kennedy said, there are 19 projects under the bushfire package that are supporting outcomes for the greater glider. As Dr Stobutzki said, 10 species were prioritised for multiregional action and the Victorian government has recently held a working group meeting and brought together experts to identify what might be the on-ground actions that we should implement additionally over the next year. That information will come to light soon.</p>	46-47
98	SQ21-000381	Department of Agriculture,	Janet Rice	Correspondence with Victorian	<p>Senator RICE: You say that it's complex, but VicForests winning their appeal showed clearly that federal environment law doesn't matter when it comes to an RFA. The</p>	47-48

		Water and the Environment		Government regarding implementation of conservation advice for Leadbeater's possum	<p>one ground that they lost on was that Commonwealth law hasn't got jurisdiction under an RFA; it's all up to the states. What difference does it make what the federal environment law is when it comes to Leadbeater's possum, other than if you have a legally enforceable recovery plan?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: As I've said, there is comprehensive conservation advice in place. We have been working with the Victorian government, ongoing, and we continue to work with the Victorian government to make sure that they are informing us of how they're implementing that conservation advice for the Leadbeater's possum.</p> <p>Senator RICE: When did they last inform you of how they were implementing the conservation advice?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I think-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I recently asked for an update from my counterparts in Victoria as to the situation. That letter was sent last week.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You have asked for an update. When did they previously inform you of how they-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'd need to check that, but there are clearly very regular discussions about this issue. We can check.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Thank you.</p>	
99	SQ21-000415	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	National Environmental Science Program - release of bids with redactions	<p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Senator Rice, you asked for further detail [see p.59] about the factors that led to UWA being considered ahead of the University of Melbourne application, and in particular the partnership with CSIRO. I can confirm that both UWA and University of Melbourne had partnerships, or partnership agreements, with CSIRO, but they were quite different in nature. CSIRO described their role in the UWA consortium as being a core partner with CSIRO's contribution spanning several business units, and there were seven of those. The way they described their engagement with the University of Melbourne application was that they can collaborate to provide capability, and they listed four areas where there were synergies between their work and proposed hub outcomes-so there are differences there. We also indicated that there were differences in the approach to Indigenous engagement, and the defining elements of that in the UWA proposal were a partnership with NAILSMA, the Northern Australian Indigenous Land and Sea Management Alliance; support and mentoring for early and mid-career Indigenous researchers; and support for the establishment of a national Indigenous</p>	59 & 90

					<p>environmental research network, which a number of Indigenous researchers have proposed. And so it was the maturity in the WA application. As you may be aware, the leader of the UWA hub did actually come from the northern Australia hub and so had pretty sophisticated arrangements as a result.</p> <p>The other question was about the response of the hubs to release of the applications. University of Melbourne were happy for all of their application to be released. University of WA did not want their vision and some of the information on their co-design process released; they felt that they would lose intellectual property as a result and they sought a commercial-in-confidence redaction. And University of Sydney were happy to provide it, with redactions for privacy.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can I then get what you are able to provide me, with redactions, of those three bids-the full University of Melbourne bid and the other two with the redactions?</p> <p>Ms Stuart-Fox: Yes.</p>	
100	SQ21-000578	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	National Environmental Science Program	<p>1. Did the Department discuss changing the authorship of the "Spend to Save" paper in the meeting with the academics?</p> <p>2. In relation to NESP hub funding applications:</p> <p>a. Please provide full copies of all applications for all NESP hubs.</p> <p>b. In relation to the process of arriving at a group score for the resilient landscapes hub bids (Hansard, 24 May 2021, p. 62; https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22committees%2Festimate%2F397ae0b4-3e50-44ff-b815-66e752c97f24%2F0000%22)</p> <p>i. What date did the meetings of the selection advisory panel occur?</p> <p>ii. Who attended those meetings?</p> <p>iii. Were minutes kept? If so, please provide them.</p> <p>iv. What was the process and criteria used to reach the final scores for each assessment criteria?</p> <p>c. Please provide a list of the research institutions that formed the official consortia for each of the bids, including official partners.</p> <p>d. Please provide a list of letters of support that were attached with each bid.</p> <p>e. How many key personnel were named in the consortia for each of the bids?</p>	Written

					f. How much did each of the bids offer in co-investment in both cash and in-kind contributions?	
101	SQ21-000409	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Threat abatement plans completed since 2013	<p>Senator SHELDON: Have there been any threat abatement plans completed since 2013?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Since 2013, there have been 12 threat abatement plans completed.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Would you be able to provide me with a list of those?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Yes. The list is available on the website, but we can provide that.</p>	85
102	SQ21-000412	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Threat abatement plan review - feral pigs	<p>Senator SHELDON: Regarding the feral pigs review, do we know whether the review has been commenced, or do you need to take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll check.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Perhaps if you just outline your question, we'll endeavour to answer everything we can tonight, after the dinner break. Anything else we'll take on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Righto. Regarding the feral pigs threat abatement plan, when was it required to be reviewed? Has a review been commenced? When will it be complete? They're the three questions.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Thank you.</p>	86
103	SQ21-000413	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Threat abatement plan review - feral goats	<p>Senator SHELDON: I note that the threat abatement plan for feral goats needs reviewing. When was that required to be reviewed? Has a review commenced? When will it be complete?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll check on that as well.</p>	86
104	SQ21-000389	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Product Stewardship Investment Fund allocation	<p>Senator SHELDON: Are you able to tell me what the outstanding amount, which hasn't been allocated from the first round, is?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I can certainly give you the figures. It was a \$20 million fund, in the first instance. A competitive round closed on 21 August last year, and \$10½ million was allocated across 15 projects in November last year. Then in March this year, on 15 March, the government announced additional funding for four more projects, with an additional investment of \$3 million. So that brings it to \$13.3 million that's been allocated to those projects. In addition, the government has allocated \$1 million to support the Battery Stewardship Council to establish a national battery stewardship scheme, and an additional \$1 million has been allocated to support the establishment of Australia's first Product Stewardship Centre of Excellence. I think,</p>	102

					<p>by my calculations on that, we're up to \$15½ million across those activities. There is a small component of that funding that is for the administration of the program-so it's essentially supporting the department-and there are additional processes underway. For example, the department opened a partnership call in December last year to seek partnering proposals to develop and implement an industry led product stewardship scheme for photovoltaic systems. Applications were submitted on 29 January, and the assessment of those proposals is reaching its final stages. So there are some mechanisms underway that are yet to be finalised and announced.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: On my rough calculations, there's around 22 per cent still to be allocated from the first round.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I believe it's slightly less than that, but I can confirm that figure for you and come back on notice.</p>	
105	SQ21-000390	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	2025 packaging targets	<p>Senator SHELDON: Sorry; I'm just not clear on an answer you gave me before. What is the status of the Australian Packaging Covenant? I'm still not clear on the time lines of that covenant.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: It is yet to be accredited as a voluntary arrangement under the Recycling and Waste Reduction Act.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: And what's the time line for that to happen?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I'm not entirely certain of the time line for that particular project.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Is there someone here who can tell us?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: We got a press release in October last year, and we still haven't got a covenant to review. In relation to the government target of 20 per cent of Australia's plastic packaging to contain recycled content by 2025, are you able to provide me with the department's assessment of how that's tracking?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Senator, I won't be a moment; I'm just finding the relevant information. The Australian government supports APCO's work with industry to deliver the National Packaging Targets. We are monitoring APCO's progress to deliver the 2025 National Packaging Targets through our government official's group and the senior industry Collective Action Group. I don't have figures at the moment that I can provide to you about how we believe that's tracking.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Someone may be able to verify this here-and I heard what you</p>	103

					<p>said-but I'm led to believe that the latest data has the rate currently sitting at four per cent. If that's the case, are you confident that we can get to 20 per cent by 2025?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Senator, sorry; I would have to take that detail on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: There isn't somebody here who can answer that?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Not on that particular topic, no. Sorry.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: If you can take it on notice, that would be appreciated. The 2025 packaging targets are due to be reviewed in 2022. What contingencies has the department put in place if the review finds that the 2025 targets won't be reached under the current regulatory settings? You can take it on notice.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Thank you, Senator. I'm happy to take that on notice and get back to you.</p>	
106	SQ21-000411	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Threat abatement plans reviewed since 2013	<p>Senator SHELDON: Just on the threat abatement plans: there's a requirement that they be reviewed every five years at the most. How many threat abatement plans require review?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: There was reporting on that in the third year of the Threatened Species Strategy. My recollection is that they have all been reviewed, but I'm just checking. My understanding is they've all had their reviews undertaken.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: There aren't any that are overdue?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: How many have been completed in this parliament? Separately from that, how many have been completed since September 2013?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Probably the best thing that we could do is take it on notice and get you the answers to those properly. Is that okay?</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I'm happy to do that.</p>	85-86
107	SQ21-000597	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Banning of domestic ivory trade	<p>Senator SHELDON: Yes. The minister announced back in September 2019 that the government would ban the domestic trade of elephant ivory and rhino horn. Has that happened?</p> <p>Dr Banks: No, I don't think it has. Basically, state and territory ministers met to work through identifying appropriate mechanisms for that. States and territories have responsibility for the domestic trade of ivory, so it's really in their hands, and the Commonwealth was going to ensure that there was greater awareness, when that happens, to ensure obligations relating to the holding of ivory and so on were</p>	86-89

				<p>considered appropriately.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Was the banning of the domestic trade of ivory on the agenda at the most recent meeting of environment ministers?</p> <p>Dr Banks: No, it wasn't.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Why not?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I wasn't at that meeting.</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Sheldon, while they're looking, do you have much more in this line of questioning?</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I've only got a couple of very brief questions.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: One factor of ministerial council meetings is that, as a result of the review undertaken and provided to national cabinet by Mr Peter Conran, Commonwealth-state ministerial meetings are somewhat different in nature than they have been in the past. Effectively, there's a requirement for national cabinet that ministers only focus on three, or maybe four, major areas of significance and that their agenda would be determined by first ministers. That's still something that's being recognised within the system. We've got exactly the same issue with agriculture ministers' meetings, which are now more focused than they may have been previously. That's one possible explanation as to why this particular issue wasn't on that agenda.</p> <p>Mr Locke: It wasn't on the agenda for the 15 April meeting. The agenda was proposed by the Commonwealth and agreed with senior officials, and that formed the basis of the meeting.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: So the minister announced back in September 2019 that the government would ban domestic trade of elephant ivory and rhino horn. You're now telling me that it's up to the states to do it. Why did the minister make an announcement that that was going to go ahead? Now you've just informed me that it wasn't put down at the last environment ministers' meeting. I'm aware that Mr Metcalfe gave the reasons why, but that flies in the face of a September 2019 announcement by the minister.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think what we need to do is provide a better explanation of what has happened as a result, and the ministerial meeting is not the only way in which these matters can be advanced. But I'm not sure if we've got more information to provide.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Dr Banks: Sorry, it was also considered as part of the EPBC Act review. There were two recommendations in it. That report was obviously released in January of this year as well. That's where there's a clear role for the states and territories in terms of the domestic trade of ivory. And the Commonwealth has an important role; our role relates to the role in CITES.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: According to the minister's media release in August 2019-and thank you for that answer: Australia's delegates encouraged other nations to close domestic markets, with the meeting resolving that those countries which have not taken such action be required to report through CITES on the measures they are taking to ensure their markets are not contributing to poaching or illegal trade. So is the government taking any steps? Any steps is a bit broad, isn't it? What steps has the government taken and what time frame is there for the banning of the ivory trade to commence?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: The minister's media release from August 2019 went on to say: Australia has already ensured that all our international trade is in strict compliance with CITES regulations. Australia's domestic market does not represent a major threat to world ivory trade but it is important to ensure there are no 'back doors' to encourage illegal activity by those seeking to circumvent CITES principles. The minister 'will meet with national environment ministers in November'-that was November 2019-'to ensure steps are being taken to formally end domestic trade in all jurisdictions.' I think it's very clear from the minister's media release that it does rely upon action from the states and territories to put this in place. She indicated that she's pursuing it, not that it would be legislated or done. I've indicated that the most recent meeting of environment ministers is now in a different form in terms of agendas. That may have been the case previously. If there's anything more that we can add about steps that have been taken since then to work with the states to encourage them to step up in this area, we'll provide that to you.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I appreciate that a number of discussions have taken place and it does involve the states. You rightly outlined-I gather that was the rest of the press statement; I take your word for that, Mr Metcalfe.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes, I just read it off the internet then, so it must be true.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I'll just finish with this. So we've got the media release in August 2019. We've got the September release in 2019. We've got the minister saying that</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>we want to be leading the way on the CITES measures that should be taken to deal with rhino and elephant horn. Of course, it would be logical to say that the minister on those occasions was trying to set parameters for other countries to be considering what they do about domestic trade. If Australia is going to lead the way, can we start leading?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think that the minister made it clear that the Commonwealth's key function in this area is international trade, and that's something that's being absolutely dealt with, and that there would be work done with the states and territories. Unfortunately, because of who's in what role at the moment, we don't have anyone here at the moment who can talk about what has happened in terms of working with the states and territories since that meeting back in November 2019, but we will endeavour to provide more information to you. If we can do that tonight, we will.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: ... Senator Sheldon, I can confirm that the ministers for the environment meeting in November 2019 did indicate in its record that there was agreement that all jurisdictions would identify appropriate mechanisms to eliminate domestic trade in ivory and rhinoceros horn, including working with relevant trading houses. Ministers agreed the right to make a submission through the Commonwealth's review of the EPBC Act. If there's anything further I can add about further action following that time, I'll provide that on notice.</p>	
108	SQ21-000377	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Plastic Waste Exports - recycling capacity	<p>Senator SHELDON: I'd like to ask about plastic waste exports. I want to talk about waste exports, and I suspect the right people for that are on their way up. For the mixed plastics covered by the export ban which comes in on 1 July this year, how many tonnes of that material was exported in 2019-20?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I might call my colleague up to the table as well, just to refer to the specific tonnage.</p> <p>Ms Burgess: Based on data from Australian Border Force that informed the waste export ban, it's estimated approximately 642,000 tonnes of mixed plastic are affected by the waste export ban.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: How much additional capacity was created for recycling these plastics in the last 12 months?</p> <p>Ms Burgess: Through the Recycling Modernisation Fund, significant investments</p>	96-97

				<p>have been made around processing capacity. To date, 16 mixed plastic projects have been funded, creating an additional capacity in Australia of 98,479 tonnes of mixed processing for plastics. We also note that we are hearing from stakeholders that there is already spare capacity within Australia's existing processing-noting also that mixed plastics can still continue to be sold and distributed within Australia.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Just to be clear, we have 642,000 tonnes that were previously exported for recycling and we only have an increase in recycling capacity of 98,479. You said that there is some excess capacity already within the system. How many tonnes is that?</p> <p>Ms Burgess: I would have to take that question on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: So we're going to have a shortfall for this year. From 1 July this year what is the actual tonnage that we can process when the ban comes on?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: As Ms Burgess mentioned, that is a question we would have to take on notice for you. Often the tonnage for each of the existing plants across Australia is not publicly available. We have information about the processing facilities that currently process waste plastics in Australia-the ones that are operational. We can provide some detail to you about those, but we would need to take on notice the actual tonnage of their processing activities.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: So we've got two to three years before we get to 163,000 tonnes-I stand to be corrected here; maybe I misunderstood you-and we don't know how much mixed plastic can be recycled by 1 July this year?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Not to hand, no. That's something we'd need to take on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I just want to make sure I've got this clear. So even if, in three years time, we're 12 per cent below the intended amount of mixed plastics that we have to actually deal with as of 1 July-are you able to tell me whether, in relation to the 163,321 tonnes, we'll be halfway there on 1 July this year?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I'm not able to tell you that offhand, but I can take it on notice and come back to you.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Senator SHELDON: Is it easier if I say you'll get 10 per cent of the way? Mr Metcalfe: I think it's better if we provide you with the right figures.</p>	
109	SQ21-000380	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anthony Sheldon	Processing infrastructure project supported under the Recycling Modernisation Fund	<p>Senator SHELDON: I won't labour the point. I'll ask you another question because it is self-evident. The government commissioned a report that said the possibility of landfilling or stockpiling mixed plastics was high. What has the government done to prepare for the contingency, given that the waste export ban starts in July and projects from the Recycling Modernisation Fund have not come online? Senator Hume: First of all, the point should be made that the total volume of waste material that's subject to the ban is less than one per cent of Australia's total waste generated per year. The \$190 million Recycling Modernisation Fund, which also will leverage \$750 million of investment from Australian state and territory governments and industry, has already been signed with six of the eight states and territories-only the Northern Territory and Queensland remain to be announced. We've already co-funded 44 separate projects, and that covers 969,000 additional tonnes of waste. Senator SHELDON: So we've got 187,000 tonnes that are going to be banned as of 1 July. Are we able to say how much of that 163,000 there will be in three years time? I understand that you're going to start doing some figuring on that, because that seems like a pretty fundamental thing if you're trying to meet your time frame. In a government report in March 2020 it stated in analysis prepared for government in March 2020-if I understand correctly, it was a DAWE commissioned report: Plastic which is not being processed domestically is either exported, landfilled or stockpiled. With the implementation of the export ban, and in the absence of processing capacity expansion, the main risk will be around increased landfill and stockpiling and their associated risks. ... The likelihood of low-value plastics (soft and rigid polymer types 3-7) being landfilled is high. How much is going to be put into landfill? Senator Hume: Can I clarify, of those recycling modernisation funds, 26 of the 44 specifically are for plastics and they address almost 164,000 tonnes of plastic waste.</p>	97-98

				<p>Senator GREEN: You said 27. Have you signed 27 contracts?</p> <p>Senator Hume: It's 26-24 have already been co-funded.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: They are subject to national partnership agreements with jurisdictions. Those schedules have been signed and those projects have been announced. So in some cases the projects are existing facilities that are, where there's co-funding from governments and industry, expanding. In some cases, they're new facilities. That's a level of complexity with these figures that we need to take on notice.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: How many of them will be underway, partially completed or completed by the July figure that Senator Sheldon is asking about? That's really what it comes down to, isn't it? You can announce as many as you want, but, if they're not actually up and running, it's not going to make much difference.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I have some figures in terms of commencement time frames for some of those projects but not exhaustively. I'd need to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Lynch: The project that Senator Hume referred to, for example, in Albury is a plastics recycling facility. That project is expected to process an additional 5,000 tonnes and will process mixed plastics into commercial grade recycled HDPE-</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: So that's 2.5 per cent of the tonnage that we're banning from 1 July?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: There are multiple projects here. I can take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can you table that? Is there any reason that you can't just give us-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think we would want to check it first.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, just check it. If you have a list and it's got the tonnage, that would be helpful.</p> <p>Senator Hume: Some of those are obviously government funded projects. There are also ones that are funded by the private sector, which is all about setting the policies, putting the policies in place to give businesses the confidence to make investment decisions in this space.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Can you provide a breakdown, as you've offered, of each processing infrastructure project that has been supported under the Recycling Modernisation Fund, specifically noting by waste type the number of tonnes expected that domestic reprocessing is set to increase. In the case of plastics, a</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>further breakdown based on type of plastics correlating to the categories within the waste export ban would be helpful. This should also include an estimated completion date for each project.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice.</p>	
110	SQ21-000593	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Benjamin Small	Shark research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What current research is being undertaken into shark numbers on the west coast of Australia? Elsewhere in Australia? 2. What is the nature of the research? 3. What is the confidence interval of this research, particularly when compared to previous research? 4. Do researchers in this field have a view on what population level would enable the removal of a species from protected species listing? 5. What would the process be for removal of the Great White Shark from the protected species listing, inclusive of who the ultimate decision maker is? 6. Does the research into Great White Shark numbers take into account the prevalence of attacks or fatal attacks on humans? 	Written
111	SQ21-000532	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Roundtables	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many official roundtables has the Minister hosted since 2019? 2. How much has been spent on roundtable hosted by the Minister since May 2019? 3. Please provide a list of all roundtables the Minister has hosted in and their associated costs. 	Written
112	SQ21-000531	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Conflicts of interest	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The department told the auditor general that it had not established a conflict of interest register as it had not identified any conflicts of interest. I understand you have now established a conflict of interest register. Can you tell me how many declarations the department has since received? 2. Of the staff that have now declared a perceived or actual conflict, how many were employed prior to November when the register was introduced? 3. Last estimates, we were told that staff members of the compliance division were not yet required to make a conflict of interest declaration. Has that been resolved? 	Written
113	SQ21-000524	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Grant programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For all grants programs or funds administered by the department, please provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Name of the program or fund b. Total budgeted funding c. Total funding paid out to grant recipients 	Written

					<p>d. Final decision-maker</p> <p>2. Were there any new grants programs or funds to be administered by the department introduced in the 2021-22 Budget?</p> <p>a. If so, please provide:</p> <p>i. Name of the program or fund</p> <p>ii. Total budgeted funding</p> <p>iii. Final decision-maker (or intended final decision-maker)</p> <p>3. Were there any grants programs or funds to be administered by the department provided with additional funding in the 2021-22 Budget?</p> <p>a. If so, please provide:</p> <p>i. Name of the program or fund</p> <p>ii. Funding profile for the additional funding over the forward estimates</p>	
114	SQ21-000530	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Interim standards	<p>1. When did the department publish their proposed national environmental standards? Was it before or after the government tabled their standards and assurance bill?</p> <p>2. When were the Minister's standards finalised?</p> <p>3. Who was provided a copy and when? Please provide details including dates.</p> <p>4. Was every stakeholder provided a copy of the standards at the same time?</p> <p>5. Why were business groups provided a copy of the standards almost an entire month before other stakeholders?</p> <p>6. Why did the Minister provide standards that were nothing like the ones that had been broadly agreed to by stakeholders?</p> <p>7. Did the Minister ask for feedback on the content of the proposed interim standards?</p>	Written
115	SQ21-000543	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Commonwealth-accredited regional plan pilot	<p>1. What is a Commonwealth-accredited regional plan?</p> <p>2. How will it accelerate development? What kind of development does the government mean?</p> <p>3. Samuel, in his review, argued that governments should "shift their focus from individual project approvals to a focus on clear outcomes, integrated into national and regional plans" (p. ix). To what extent does this pilot program take into account what Samuel recommended?</p> <p>4. Was Professor Samuel consulted on this announcement?</p> <p>5. Has the priority regional area been selected?</p>	Written

					<p>6. How will the regional priority area be selected?</p> <p>7. When will it be selected?</p> <p>8. What is the criteria for selecting a region?</p> <p>9. How will it improve the environment in that region?</p> <p>10. Who was consulted about this announcement?</p> <p>11. Which, if any, stakeholders were consulted about this announcement?</p>	
116	SQ21-000529	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Bilateral agreements	<p>1. Has the Department done any modelling or analysis on what resources will be needed for jurisdictions to implement EPBC Act requirements? Can you please table that.</p> <p>2. Can the department provide the current number of projects being assessed under bilateral agreements or accredited processes under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>3. Can the Department provide the current number of Commonwealth agency referrals or actions on Commonwealth land or sea being assessed under EPBC?</p>	Written
117	SQ21-000542	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Regional Land Partnerships	<p>1. Can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in?</p> <p>2. How much of those funds have been spent?</p> <p>3. How do you apply for a grant? Is it an open grants process? How are recipients selected?</p> <p>4. Of the \$450 million, how much has been contracted? How much has been spent?</p> <p>5. Were grant guidelines provided to Finance for their advice? If not, why not?</p> <p>6. How was eligibility be determined for grants?</p> <p>7. Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund?</p> <p>8. If a Minister is not the final decision-maker for grants, will the Minister or their office be informed of recipients of grants from the fund?</p>	Written
118	SQ21-000549	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threat abatement plans	<p>1. Can you confirm that the listing of a key threatening process is the first step in identifying and then managing threats under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>2. How many key threatening processes have been listed since September 2013? What about in the current parliament? What about since the 2019-20 bushfires?</p> <p>3. Since the bushfire, has the Minister consulted with the TSSC about threat abatement plans?</p> <p>4. How many threat abatement plans have been completed since September 2013? How many threat abatement plans have commenced (i.e. work has started on them)?</p>	Written

					<p>5. Threat abatement plans are required to be reviewed every five years at the most. How many threat abatement plans require review? How many are overdue? How many have been completed in the current parliament? How many have been completed since September 2013?</p> <p>6. I note that the threat abatement plan for feral pigs needs reviewing. When was that required to be reviewed? Has a review commenced? When will it be complete?</p> <p>7. I note that the threat abatement plan for feral goats needs reviewing. When was that required to be reviewed? Has a review commenced? When will it be complete?</p>	
119	SQ21-000525	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Marine Parks grants program	<p>1. Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund?</p> <p>2. When will potential recipients be able to apply for grants from the new funding provided in the budget?</p> <p>3. When will grants be paid to recipients from the new funding provided in the budget?</p> <p>4. What is the new total budgeted funding for the fund?</p> <p>5. How much has been paid out from the fund to recipients, to date?</p> <p>6. On notice, can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in?</p>	Written
120	SQ21-000592	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Senior advisory group on joint management arrangements for Commonwealth National Parks	<p>On 31 March 2021, Minister for the Environment Sussan Ley announced the establishment of a Senior Advisory Group to examine current joint management arrangements.</p> <p>Booderee (Jervis Bay NSW), Kakadu and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Parks (Both NT) are all Aboriginal land that is leased to the Commonwealth to be jointly managed with the Director of National Parks through Parks Australia.</p> <p>The media release said "Members have been chosen for their experience and expertise in governance and Indigenous affairs.</p> <p>The announcement follows meetings between Minister Ley and Traditional Owners</p>	Written

					<p>of Kakadu National Park last year, which saw a number of structural changes within Parks Australia. These changes have seen the appointment of two Park Managers, including at least one Traditional Owner, and a key senior executive position relocated from Canberra to Darwin.</p> <p>The six member panel is: The Hon. Amanda Vanstone AO (Co-chair), Mr Joe Martin-Jard (Co-chair), Ms Helen Williams AC, The Hon. Shane L Stone AC QC, Mr Nolan Hunter, Ms Denise Bowden.</p> <p>1. What are the terms of reference for the Senior Advisory Group for the joint management of parks announced by Minister Ley on 31 March 2021? Can that be tabled?</p> <p>2. How many times has the Senior Advisory Group met since its announcement?</p>	
121	SQ21-000528	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environmental offsets	<p>In relation to the due diligence process the Morrison Government undertook in relation to the environmental offsets purchased in relation to the Western Sydney airport:</p> <p>1. What involvement did the Environment department have in that process?</p> <p>2. What involvement did the Minister for the Environment have in that process?</p> <p>3. At the last estimates in March 2021 the department told us that there still wasn't a centralised database for offsets.</p> <p>a. Is that still the case? When can we expect to see the database up and running?</p> <p>b. Is there a map of all offsets, can you please provide that to me?</p> <p>4. Is there an assessment of the net loss of habitat for threatened/endangered species that has occurred in relation to approvals that were granted on condition of an offset being provided?</p> <p>5. Can you provide a summary of offsets that involved restoration of habitat as opposed to protection of existing habitat in perpetuity?</p>	Written
122	SQ21-000547	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	congestion busting environmental assessments - staffing	<p>1. After a decisions were being made late and there was a backlog of assessments, the Minister committed \$25 million in 2019 to go towards "congestion busting environmental assessments" and then a further \$36.6 million in 2020 to "maintain the timeliness" of environmental approvals, and now the Minister has announced an additional \$29.3 million in the 2021 budget.</p> <p>a. Can you confirm that all of this funding is to go towards additional resources for the department so that decisions can be made on time?</p>	Written

				<p>b. What is the total amount that has been announced on additional resourcing for decisions?</p> <p>c. Of each of these funding announcements, how much has been spent?</p> <p>i. \$25 million</p> <p>ii. \$36.6 million</p> <p>iii. \$17.1 million</p> <p>d. How many additional staff were brought on with these funds in total? Does that figure include staff that may have terminated their employment?</p> <p>e. Have any permanent staff been brought on with this funding?</p> <p>f. When will this funding be fully expended?</p> <p>i. \$25 million</p> <p>ii. \$36.6 million</p> <p>iii. \$17.1 million</p> <p>g. What is the award for a FTE person engaged via labour hire?</p> <p>h. How does that compare with a person employed at the department?</p> <p>i. Over the time that the funding is available, how many people will have been employed?</p> <p>2. Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount.</p> <p>3. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2021.</p> <p>4. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracted entered into in this current parliament.</p> <p>5. What kind of training do the third party contractors undergo?</p> <p>6. Who in the department trains staff engaged through labour hire?</p> <p>a. Does that happen all at once?</p> <p>b. Is a staff member in the department required to train the third party contracts?</p> <p>c. Is group training provided?</p> <p>d. Is individual training provided?</p> <p>e. How frequently is training provided?</p> <p>7. How many hours would be spent on training an individual third party contractor?</p> <p>8. What is the rate of attrition? How many don't complete their work for the duration of their contract?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

123	SQ21-000544	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Deer as a key threatening process	<p>1. Is there a standalone listing for feral deer as a KTP under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>a. Why not?</p> <p>b. Are there are plans to list the deer as a KTP?</p> <p>c. The government announced funding for a deer management coordinator, have they approached the department in relation to listing deer?</p>	Written
124	SQ21-000535	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Listing of contemporary fire regimes resulting in the loss of vegetation heterogeneity and biodiversity throughout Australia	<p>With reference to Environment Minister Sussan Ley's response to Question in Writing No.275;</p> <p>1. What is the latest information about progress of the listing of 'Contemporary fire regimes resulting in the loss of vegetation heterogeneity and biodiversity throughout Australia' as a key threatening process under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>2. Why has progress on this listing taken so long?</p> <p>3. What action is being planned by the federal government to abate this major threat to Australia's native wildlife?</p>	Written
125	SQ21-000526	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National Product Stewardship Investment Fund	<p>1. Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund?</p> <p>2. When will potential recipients be able to apply for grants from the new funding provided in the budget?</p> <p>3. When will grants be paid to recipients from the new funding provided in the budget?</p> <p>4. What is the new total budgeted funding for the fund?</p> <p>5. How much has been paid out from the fund to recipients, to date?</p> <p>6. On notice, can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in?</p>	Written
126	SQ21-000553	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environment Restoration Fund	<p>1. Can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in?</p> <p>2. And how much of that fund has been spent (i.e. is out the door)? How much has been contracted? How much has been allocated?</p> <p>3. In total, how many projects have been funded? How many were election commitments?</p> <p>4. How many projects have been funded since the 2019 election?</p> <p>5. Has there been any funding allocated for election commitments for the next election?</p>	Written

					<p>6. The ERF is a non-competitive closed grants program, is that correct? Does the department know why this approach has been used? Where is that documented?</p> <p>7. How much of the \$18 million koala package is funded through the Environment Restoration Fund?</p> <p>8. Who is the final decision maker?</p> <p>9. Were the grant guidelines provided to Finance for their advice?</p> <p>10. How has eligibility been determined for grants?</p> <p>11. Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund?</p> <p>12. If a Minister is not the final decision-maker for grants, will the Minister or their office be informed of recipients of grants from the fund?</p> <p>13. When has grants been awarded to recipients, and when will grants be paid to recipients?</p>	
127	SQ21-000548	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Key threatening processes	<p>1. Since 2013, how many Key Threatening Processes have been listed? How many applications have been made? Please provide details of these.</p> <p>2. Since 2013, how many Threat Abatement Plans have been implemented? How many are currently being considered? Please provide details of these.</p> <p>3. There was no threat abatement plan for bushfires, is that correct? Would that have helped during the 2019-20 crisis?</p> <p>4. Why haven't bushfires been listed as a threat under the act?</p> <p>5. What has been listed under the act since 2013?</p> <p>6. Where is the bushfire key threatening process listing up to?</p>	Written
128	SQ21-000546	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Expert Panel	<p>1. The expert panel has wrapped up, was that always the government's intention?</p> <p>2. The expert panel identified 810 priority species and ecological communities for urgent priority intervention. How many priority species won't receive urgent intervention? Why can't the department deliver for the 810 priority species?</p> <p>3. The expert panel identified five priority actions for immediate implementation. Can you tell me whether these are happening, and to what extent;</p> <p>a. Rapid on-ground assessment for species and communities of concern?</p> <p>b. Feral predator and herbivore control to reduce the pressure on native species?</p> <p>c. Emergency salvage of plant and animal species for ex-situ conservation or wild-to-wild translocation?</p> <p>d. Supplementary shelter, food, and water for animals where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Protecting unburnt areas within or adjacent to recently burnt ground that</p>	Written

					provide refugia? 4. How much assistance was provided by the department to the expert panel? Can you quantify that? (i.e. in hours, or FTE staff members for a certain time period?)	
129	SQ21-000527	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Natural Capital Fund	<p>1. The Minister said in an interview with Fran Kelly on 21 July 2020 in response to the Samuel review interim report, that the government was making two early moves, one of them being a "Natural Capital Fund", which she said would "bring serious money to the table".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has this been established? Where is this up to? How is this being funded? Was there any funding for this included in the recent budget? Who has been engaged to administer the fund? Will it involve a grants process? Sussan Ley also said in her interview that the Natural Capital Fund would leverage private investment. Has that happened? How will that work? How will the Nature Capital Fund leverage money? Will it be in the same way as the GBR Foundation? 	Written
130	SQ21-000534	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Critical habitat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have the provisions under the Act relating to protecting critical habitat been used since September 2013? How many "critical habitat" listings been made since September 2013? Is the Minister aware that these provisions exist? What would be the impact of listing certain areas as "critical habitat"? What are the related offences for damaging critical habitat? What are the implications for the minister, should she be required to make future decisions about a proposal that may impede upon the listed critical habitat? How does the critical habitat identified under the EPBC Act interact with critical habitats as they are mentioned in recovery plans and conservation advices? 	Written
131	SQ21-000545	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Indigenous Protected Areas	<p>1. The Government committed \$15 million for 12 projects in 2017 under the Indigenous Protected Areas Program, but as at 9 April 2021 only \$4.1 million has been spent, according to QoN no.97, Additional Estimates, March 2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is this still the case? Why the delay in getting funds expended? 	Written

132	SQ21-000541	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened Species Strategy	<p>1. According to the government's media release, the strategy will be accompanied by \$57.1 million of "new funding for threatened species", please identify which components are "new".</p> <p>2. With reference to the \$10 million allocated for grants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund? How much has been paid out from the fund to recipients, to date? On notice, can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in? <p>3. According to the media release, "the first action plan will be released after stakeholder consultation in the second half of the year." When will the first action plan be finalised?</p> <p>4. Did the 2015 five year strategy work to improve the trajectory of species as expected? Can you please provide an update of the species outcome for each of the 70 species (20 mammals, 20 birds, 30 plants)? In the cases where there was an improved trajectory, how many of these involved simply a slower rate of species decline rather than an actual increase in species numbers?</p> <p>5. Was reporting consistent across each of the progress reports?</p> <p>6. The government's initial threatened species strategy back in 2015 said that "[t]o ensure thorough accountability, systematic annual reporting against each of the targets in the plan will be completed" and that "[a]nnual reviews of the Action Plan will also take account of improving information and scientific understanding so that scientific evidence continues to inform action" (p.62). But the Year Four Report (the most recent) doesn't record any systematic reporting against any of the targets, why is that?</p> <p>7. The Year Four Report is only 13 pages long, whereas the Year Three Report is 108 pages long. Why is that?</p> <p>8. To what extent does the department assist with the preparations of the progress reports?</p> <p>9. How much funding is allocated to the Threatened Species Commissioner each year? How many staff assist with the Commissioner's workload?</p> <p>10. How does the proposed 10 year Threatened Species Strategy interact with threatened species requirements under the EPBC Act, including but not limited to,</p>	Written
-----	-------------	--	---------------	-----------------------------	--	---------

					recovery plans, key threatening processes, threat abatement plans and critical habitat?	
133	SQ21-000540	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	20 million trees program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are funds still being paid for this program even though it has concluded? 2. Has the 20 Million Trees program been reviewed now that it is complete? 3. Will the 20 Million Tress program be monitored to ensure that the trees actually survive into the future to become mature plants? 4. How many different trees were planted? 5. Were they all juvenile trees? 	Written
134	SQ21-000537	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Koalas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the government have any plans to renew the National Koala Conservation Strategy? Why not? 2. I want to talk about the government's November 2020 in relation to koalas. Did this \$18 million come from the Environment Restoration Fund? 3. Of the \$24.3 million for koalas over four years, how much has been spent and on what? How much has been contracted and on what? 4. How much is expected to be spent each year over the forward estimates? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 2021-22 FY b. 2022-23 FY 5. Where is the koala's recovery plan up to? How many years late is the recovery plan for the koala? 	Written
135	SQ21-000538	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Bushfire funding	<p>I want to ask about the \$50 million for emergency funding for wildlife after the bushfires.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much has been contracted? How much has been spent? (i.e. is out the door and on the ground) 2. The department confirmed an additional that an additional \$3.4 million was spent on obtaining expert advice and program administration. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Was all of that funding used for the expert panel? b. Why couldn't that advice be provided by the department, wouldn't they already have information available about priority species and actions ? <p>I want to ask about the \$149.7 million for bushfire recovery for native wildlife and habitats.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. I note that \$110 million is allocated to on ground support. 	Written

				<p>a. How much of this has now been spent and is out the door and "on the ground" ?</p> <p>b. How much has been contracted? How much has been spent?</p> <p>c. What projects are being funded with these funds (please provide a list of all projects)?</p> <p>d. How much of this funding is sitting with states and territories?</p> <p>4. I note that \$28 million was allocated to further scientific assessment, but it appears that's entirely gone to the department.</p> <p>a. Is that because the department wasn't properly resourced to administer these funds?</p> <p>b. Did any of these funds go to third party contractors or labour hire staff?</p> <p>i. Were there tenders for this work? Were the same contractors being used as those the department hired in the assessments division?</p> <p>c. Can you provide a breakdown of how these funds were spent, including on training staff, on researching, assessing etc?</p> <p>d. Does this involve on-ground monitoring of species? Does it include the \$2 million koala census funding? What gaps in baseline data have been identified and are any of the funds going towards filling those gaps?</p> <p>5. I understand there are \$12 million worth of grants.</p> <p>a. How much has been contracted? How much has been spent?</p> <p>b. How are these grants being made available to groups?</p> <p>6. Please provide a list of all recipients of each grants program from the bushfire wildlife funding to date, including the electorate they are in.</p> <p>7. Have grant guidelines been completed for all grant programs related to bushfire recovery and the environment?</p> <p>8. Were they circulated for consultation? When did that occur?</p> <p>9. Were the guidelines provided to Finance for their advice? If not, why not?</p> <p>10. How was eligibility be determined for grants?</p> <p>11. Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund?</p> <p>12. If a Minister is not the final decision-maker for grants, will the Minister or their office be informed of recipients of grants from the fund?</p> <p>13. Can potential recipients apply for all components of the grants?</p> <p>14. When will grants be paid to recipients?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

136	SQ21-000550	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recovery plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many species require a recovery plan? Please table a list. 2. How many recovery plans are overdue? Please table a list, including species, when recovery plan was due and when it is expected to be complete. 3. When can we expect the Tasmanian Devil recovery plan to be complete, when was it due, when will it be complete? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What about the Southern Brown Bandicoot, or the Golden Bandicoot? b. What about the Northern Hairy-nosed wombat? 4. How many staff are working on recovery plans in the department? 5. How resource intensive are recovery plans to develop? How many people in the department would it take? 6. What are the main differences between a recovery plan and a conservation advice? 7. Can the Minister make a decision that is inconsistent with recommendations from a recovery plan? 8. Can the Minister make a decision that is inconsistent with recommendations from conservation advice? 9. Does a conservation advice include short, medium and long term priority actions? 10. Does a conservation advice include monitoring requirements? 11. Does a conservation advice include implementation requirements? 12. Are there "recovery" principles in conservation advice? Or is a conservation advice there to merely "conserve" the status quo? 13. What kind of legal implications are there should a proponent, or the Minister or anyone else act against recommendations of the conservation advice? 14. What kind of legal implications are there should a proponent, the minister or anyone else act against recommendations of a recovery plan? 15. If there were sufficient resources to start, complete and implement a recovery plan, or a conservation advice, which one would actually assist with "recovering" the species? 16. With 170 recovery plans overdue (that is, is taking more than six years), how does the TSSC prioritise which recovery plans to start producing? 17. Obviously there has been some significant pressure for the koala recovery plan to be produced, and I recall interest in flying foxes a number of years ago, which led 	Written
-----	-------------	--	---------------	----------------	--	---------

					to a Senate Inquiry, is it fair to say that species needing a recovery plan are prioritised based on notoriety or the media? If not, is it charisma? Is it the "high profile" species that are preferenced? 18. How many recovery plans have been reviewed? How many recovery plans were reviewed as a result of the national bushfire crisis? Were those reviews recommended by the expert panel or the TSSC or the department? Have those reviews been complete?	
137	SQ21-000539	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Myrtle rust action plan	With reference to the myrtle rust action plan developed by the Plant Biosecurity Foundation; 1. What action is being taken by the federal government to implement the Myrtle Rust National Action Plan? 2. Will the federal government advance the three urgent actions proposed in the statement of concern: a. The formation and endorsement by Australian governments of a national steering committee of science and practitioner experts, to commence implementation of the National Action Plan for Myrtle Rust in Australia. b. The appointment of a project officer for three years to facilitate the work of the steering committee and the implementation of the Plan. c. The national steering committee to report through the Environment and Invasives Committee to the National Biosecurity Committee, and to national environmental agencies across jurisdictions through the inter-governmental Biodiversity Working Group.	Written
138	SQ21-000536	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	World Heritage Committee	1. Who from the government will be attending the World Heritage Committee meeting set for June? 2. In 2017, the committee told the Australian government that water quality improvements needed to be accelerated, but the recent reef water quality report card gave the condition of the marine environment a D. Will that report be presented to the committee?	Written
139	SQ21-000533	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Reef 2050 plan	1. According to the government's website, a final updated Reef 2050 Plan was expected to be released in early 2021. When can we expect to see this Plan? 2. How much funding was allocated? Is this enough to achieve the short and medium term outcomes of the Plan? 3. Has any of the \$444 million grant funding provided to the foundation helped	Written

					<p>achieve any of these targets?</p> <p>4. How many targets were revised? What kinds of revisions were made? Are they more achievable or less achievable than the previous targets?</p>	
140	SQ21-000556	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	<p>ANAO report - Implementation of the Great Barrier Reef Foundation Partnership - May 2021</p>	<p>1. The ANAO pointed out that the Foundation hadn't set any interim targets. Why hasn't the Foundation set interim targets? When did the department first become aware that no interim targets were set?</p> <p>2. How does the department satisfy itself that the foundation is on track without any target?</p> <p>3. The ANAO found that only \$5.5 million had been raised through cash contributions and acquitted in-kind contributions from research and delivery partners out of a target of \$357 million. Is that an adequate amount? How does the department satisfy itself that this is an appropriate level of funding raised against that target?</p> <p>4. According to the recent ANAO report, the foundation has spent or committed \$154.8 million. Can you tell me how much of that was actually spent and how much was committed?</p> <p>5. With reference to the Reef Restoration and Adaptation Science Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why has only \$3 million out of the \$100 million been contracted or spent? b. Of the \$100 million, how much has been contracted? How much has been spent? c. When did the department become aware that only \$3 million had been contracted or spent? d. Does the department expect that all of the funding will be expended by 2024, and if so, how? <p>6. With reference to the Indigenous and Community Reef Protection Program;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How much has been contracted b. How much has been spent c. What are the reasons only \$5.1 million had been spent as at 31 December 2020. <p>7. The ANAO report also said that a further \$46.5 million was contracted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Can you please provide a list of all delivery partners? b. Can you also please tell me how much of that contracted amount has been spent by the delivery partners? 	Written

				<p>8. The ANAO found that "[t]he foundation has not consistently implemented arrangements to cap the administration costs of its subcontractors" (p.9).</p> <p>a. When did the department first become aware of this?</p> <p>9. Do administrative costs cover the administration of every program?</p> <p>10. Do administrative costs cover only the operation of the Great Barrier Reef Foundation?</p> <p>11. How are staff that work on individual projects paid?</p> <p>12. How many staff are paid out of the administrative costs of the grant?</p> <p>13. Are staff working on the Crown of Thorns Starfish (COTS) control program paid out of the administrative funding or the COTS funding? How much are they paid?</p> <p>14. The ANAO reported that there was "inconsistent follow-up action being taken by the foundation in respect to the shortfalls in contributions" (p.9).</p> <p>a. What is the department doing about this? Is the government playing any role in chasing up these funds?</p> <p>15. The ANAO found that "[t]he approach to selecting investment advisers was not open or sufficiently competitive".</p> <p>a. How were advisers selected?</p> <p>b. Did the department provide any guidance or advice in relation to advisers?</p> <p>c. How many have connections to the Liberal party?</p> <p>16. I understand the Foundation has a target of \$100 million to be raised from philanthropists. How many commitments from philanthropists has the foundation received?</p> <p>17. The ANAO found that "[w]hile competitive selection processes have been employed most of the time when awarding grant funding, there has been insufficient use of open and competitive approaches for procurements."</p> <p>a. Why has the Foundation failed to use competitive procurement processes?</p> <p>18. The ANAO found that "[f]or grants awarded through non-competitive processes and for the majority of procurement, it has been common for selection criteria to not be specified" (p.8).</p> <p>a. How has the Foundation determined how to spend its funds without a selection criteria?</p> <p>b. When did the department become aware that the Foundation was not using open and competitive selection processes to undertake procurements?</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>c. Is the use of open and competitive selection processes included in the grant agreement?</p> <p>d. Was the Foundation compliant with its own agreement in that regard?</p> <p>e. Was the department monitoring the Foundation in respect of whether they were using open and competitive selection processes?</p> <p>19. When it comes to using open tenders for procurement, I understand the Foundation's policies set out that they use tenders for all procurements with a value above \$250,001. The ANAO said that there had been 14 procurements over that amount, but only half of them were via open tender.</p> <p>a. Please provide details of what occurred with the remaining half.</p> <p>b. When did the department become aware that the Foundation were only using open tenders half of the times they were supposed to?</p> <p>c. What steps will the department take in relation to this finding?</p> <p>d. Has the department had a conversation with the Foundation about this issue?</p> <p>20. Does the department have any capacity to withdraw any or part of the grant should they find it has been improperly used?</p> <p>21. The ANAO found that "[t]he foundation has not consistently adopted and applied appropriate selection criteria."</p> <p>a. When did the department become first aware about this?</p> <p>b. How has the department responded to this finding?</p> <p>22. The ANAO also found that "[w]ritten contracts have not been put in place for all expenditure".</p> <p>a. When did the department first become aware of this?</p> <p>b. How has the department responded to this finding?</p>	
141	SQ21-000557	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Crown of Thorns Starfish control program	<p>1. Can you confirm that \$57.8 million out of the \$443.3 million is allocated to the Crown of Thorns Starfish control program?</p> <p>2. How much of that has been contracted? How much has been spent?</p> <p>3. Can you tell me who is involved in this program?</p> <p>4. Can I have a breakdown of funding?</p> <p>5. How much are the people working on the program being paid? Are they paid out of the grant money allocated to the program? Or are they paid out of administrative costs?</p> <p>6. The department provided a high level break down of the costs associated with</p>	Written

					<p>this program, but have said that the "DAWE does not receive a further breakdown of costings for individual contracts that are awarded against these sub-components". Why doesn't the department receive a further breakdown?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who is being paid to manage this program? Who is being paid as part of this program? Who are the delivery partners? 	
142	SQ21-000554	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Spending to Save: What will it cost to halt Australia's extinction crisis	<p>1. I refer to an email by Nicholas Post in which he that "retrofitting" would be required in relation to the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is meant by that? Does that mean changing the content of the paper? Does that mean taking out or altering the content of the paper? Censoring it? <p>2. Mr Post also said that objectives of the Threatened Species Recovery Hub should benefit "both science and APS perspectives".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is the APS perspective? Which part of the APS perspective is not served in this paper? <p>3. Mr Post has also said that NESP researchers aren't asking the "right questions". I want to take you to the question that the scientists are asking in this paper: "What should Australia be spending if it is to prevent further species loss and maximise the chance that listed species recover?" (p. 4 of 7, Wintle et al.).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why is this question the wrong question? 	Written
143	SQ21-000552	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	NESP - Research papers	<p>Spending to Save: What will it cost to halt Australia's extinction crisis, published by researchers at the Threatened Species Recovery Hub, which is funded through the NESP program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does anyone from the Minister's Office or the department ever contact NESP participants about media? Has a department official or someone from the Minister's office ever told - verbally, informally or via correspondence - members of the Threatened Species Recovery Hub not to publish a research paper? Is it typical the department would amend papers prior to publication? How often would that happen? Can you provide any other instances where that has occurred? 	Written

144	SQ21-000555	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened Species Recovery Hub - publishing advice	At any time, did Dr Sally Box or any other department official, tell Dr Wintle or anyone else from the Threatened Species Recovery Hub that they should not proceed with publishing the paper?	Written
145	SQ21-000406	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Amendments to the draft policy document on the impacts of climate change on world heritage properties	<p>Senator WATERS: Based on the provisional timetable, it looks like the committee will consider what's titled Updating of the policy document on the impacts of climate change on world heritage properties quite early on in the meeting program, probably before consideration of the GBR state of conservation report. The Australian government has, reportedly, previously said that climate change should not be used as the basis for an endanger listing position, which I strongly disagree with, but that's beside the point. Is that still the government 's position?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: The government's position is not that climate change shouldn't be a consideration in a listing of IDL but, rather, that the policy doesn't provide a clear pathway as to how a property can be placed on the list and removed from the list if it was put on there for reasons relating to climate change. The reason for that is that the structure of the convention, legally, is around what a state party can do in the management of a property within its own domain; whereas, as you know, emissions are a global issue and we have no control over those sorts of things. It's really a procedural matter that we want clarified and how it would operate in practice under the convention.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I will ponder on that. I find that very amusing given that our country is doing far less than other comparable nations on climate change. I'll resist the urge to editorialise further. Will Australia be supporting that draft updated policy document or will we seek further changes?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: We haven't seen the final draft, so it's hard to speculate. Certainly we had an expert who was part of the drafting group. Australia has been an active supporter of updating the climate policy and has been actively working with the committee and other committee members and the centre to make sure that the document is able to be used under the convention. But until we see the final document it's hard for us to say whether we can support it or not.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: What sorts of changes or amendments have you sought to date?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: That document has been updated through various iterations. There has</p>	83

					been a working group set up to look at it over the past 18 months. From the 2007 version to the last version that our expert would have seen, there have been many suggested amendments that we have made. I'd have to take it on notice, to provide those in detail. It really goes to the issue that I've described previously, which is around the legal ability to implement the policy, in the sense of, 'What's the mechanism under the convention that would allow the property to be moved from the list, once it's placed on there, if it was relating to climate change?'	
146	SQ21-000382	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Adani - EPBC approval	Senator WATERS: Okay. Given their repeated breaches, has anyone in the department turned their mind to an assessment of whether the proponent meets the fit and proper person test to continue to hold an EPBC approval? Mr Singh: Not that I'm aware of. We'll take that on notice.	99
147	SQ21-000384	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Advice sought regarding Moreton Bay Ramsar site	Senator WATERS: I'll move on. Toondah Harbour is a proposed development in a Ramsar wetland, also in Queensland. There was some reporting just last week showing that the proponent, Walker Corporation, has been simultaneously lobbying both the government and the Ramsar committee in relation to, essentially, changing the boundaries of the Ramsar site. We've previously discussed how Minister Frydenberg, who was the relevant minister at the time, actually wrote to the Queensland minister to propose changing the boundaries of the Moreton Bay Ramsar site, which, thankfully, didn't proceed at the time. Is there any current plan to delist any of the Moreton Bay Ramsar wetland, by which I mean change the boundaries? Mr McNee: That reporting in the media related to an earlier referral. That's not the referral that's currently under assessment by the department. The referral under assessment by the department at the moment does not refer to or require a change to the Ramsar boundary. Senator WATERS: That's good to know, but my question was: is there any plan to do that? There's no plan to consider changing the boundary? Mr McNee: There is no intention in the referral, including the assessment of impacts on the Moreton Bay Ramsar site. They are all incorporated as part of the process. Senator WATERS: Did the department ever seek legal advice about the process of changing the boundaries of the listing in those previous referrals? Mr McNee: I'd have to take that on notice because there have been three referrals. I'll take that on notice.	100
148	SQ21-000523	Department of Agriculture,	Larissa Waters	Ramsar - delisting or	Senator WATERS: Thank you. Do you have any procedures or policies outlining when it would be appropriate to consider delisting or boundary changes?	100

		Water and the Environment		boundary changes	<p>Mr McNee: I think that's probably a question for the area of the department that looks after Ramsar, but my understanding is that the Ramsar convention sets out the framework and the process for amendments. If that were to happen, it would need to follow the course of events.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, but does the department have any additional procedures that give effect to those high-level international commitments? You can take that on notice on behalf of someone who might-</p> <p>Mr McNee: Other than the EPBC Act requirements as it relates to Ramsar, but I will take that on notice, just to be sure.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. Would the federal government ever proceed with a proposal to delist without the support of a state, which is obviously normally required?</p> <p>Mr McNee: That's a hypothetical. That's certainly not before the government at this point.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay. Likewise, if a state wanted to change the boundary, what would it take for the federal government to support an application being made to the Ramsar committee to change the boundaries?</p> <p>Mr McNee: Again, I'm not sure about that. I will take it on notice. I know that, because of the nature of Ramsar listings, they are a cooperative arrangement between the Commonwealth and the site manager, which is usually a state. So, generally, you would accept that they would need to work very closely to ensure the ongoing protection of the values of the Ramsar site.</p>	
149	SQ21-000386	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Flying foxes investigation and compliance	<p>Senator WATERS: Lastly, on flying foxes in Cairns, one of the groups that actively opposed the program to scare the flying foxes from their breeding and nesting habitat in Cairns has recently had an FOI partly rejected, apparently on the basis that it would reveal information about an ongoing investigation. Can you confirm that an investigation is underway into potential breaches of the dispersal program conditions?</p> <p>Mr Singh: As far as my advice goes, that investigation has now been completed. We received multiple allegations in this area. We inspected operations at the Cairns library site. We identified that, during that time, the approval holder remained compliant with the conditions of the EPBC-</p> <p>Senator WATERS: They did remain compliant?</p>	101

					<p>Mr Singh: Yes, the approval holder remained compliant with the conditions of the EPBC Act approval.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That doesn't quite square with the rejection of the FOI on the basis that it would prejudice an ongoing investigation. What were the dates of that investigation that you've just referred to?</p> <p>Mr Singh: I will check that for you, but the site visit was made in November 2020 and the matter was finalised after that. I'll check on the FOI request that you've referred to.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I'd be interested to know if that FOI request can be revisited if, in fact, the investigation isn't underway at the relevant time. Were there any restrictions imposed on the activities while the investigation was underway?</p> <p>Mr Singh: Not that I'm aware of. As I said, Senator, staff visited the site in late 2020. They found that they were fully compliant with the conditions of approval. That's the last advice I have. In terms of the FOI, I will certainly get back to you. I'm not aware that they were told to do anything different.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you provide me, on notice, with a bit more detail about the conclusions of that investigation?</p> <p>Mr Singh: Sure.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I can't bring the detail to mind, but I recall-and I don't want to say that you've got it wrong-there were, in fact, lactating mother flying foxes found dead at the site and there was not meant to be dispersal happening during breeding season. It sounded to me that there was an obvious breach, so I'm interested to find out more about what the investigators looked at and why they formed the view that there was no noncompliance.</p> <p>Mr Singh: Sure.</p>	
150	SQ21-000403	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	World heritage outreach activities - meetings with the minister	<p>Senator WATERS: I'm specifically interested in the Great Barrier Reef, so all my questions will be in that context. Has there been a series of outreach activities undertaken, as there has been in previous times-five-odd years ago, when the endanger listing was first hanging like the sword of Damocles over the reef-a similar sort of diplomatic outreach, if I can put it so mildly, this time around?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: We are meeting at ambassador level in Paris. Her Excellency Megan Anderson, our ambassador to UNESCO in Paris, has had a number of meetings with</p>	82-83

					<p>her counterparts in Paris. I have had meetings here with ambassadors in Canberra, about committee business and so on, along with Jamie Isbister, our Ambassador for the Environment.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Is there any ministerial involvement as yet?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: No, none as yet.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Is that anticipated?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: Yes, we have reached out to members of the committee to have meetings, either in advance of the meeting or after the draft decisions come out.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: How many members of the committee have you lined meetings up with, with the minister?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: So far, only one.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: It's in process.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Which party is that one?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: That's with Nigeria.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Which others are you seeking to set up meetings with for the minister?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: I can name some off the top of my head, but I'll have to take on record all the ones we have reached out to. There are Brazil and Spain. We're interested in speaking to other members of the committee who will be continuing beyond their term. So far Nigeria is the only one we've reached out to in that context. We have also reached out to China as the chair of this current meeting.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I might ask further questions on notice about that. Do you have a date for the Nigeria meeting?</p> <p>Ms Perrett: I can't recall, offhand. I think it's next week.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We can check-</p> <p>Ms Perrett: Yes, we can take it on notice.</p>	
151	SQ21-000387	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian devil - population	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I have two quick questions. Firstly, on the save the devil fund, the federal government hasn't put any funding into that project since 2018. Is there a sense that devil populations are now stable and safe and that we're on top of the tumour disease, or does the department still consider there to be risks to their future survival?</p> <p>Mr Costello: You're correct in that the Commonwealth has not continued to fund</p>	55

					<p>the program, but there is an on going program funded by the Tasmanian government and some private funding as well. The money we put in established a lot of facilities and capacity, which they continue to use, including the vaccination program, release programs, enclosures and things like that. So the contribution we made continues to provide value to that program. In terms of the stability or otherwise of the population, I'm not really qualified to answer that other than I'm aware that the outlook is better than it was. It's no longer considered to be likely to be at threat of extinction, and there are insurance populations. Some of the earlier things that we did in that program have secured the species.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take on notice what the latest research is on their population-the estimates of their population and threats to their population. I did write to the minister about this recently and I would be quite interested in hearing about that.</p> <p>Mr Costello: Yes, we will check with our Tasmanian colleagues.</p>	
152	SQ21-000596	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Lake Malbena development	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In relation to Lake Malbena, I have a copy here of the statement of reasons for a decision on controlled action under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, where the minister required this to be referred. Can I ask a couple of updated questions. The IUCN, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, in its Tasmanian Wilderness 2020 Conservation Outlook, reports that private development in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area is considered a high threat. In section 1.1: There is potential for loss of wilderness character and other values including Aboriginal cultural values due to the development of proposed tourism infrastructure in remote locations, if not managed carefully. I was wondering what steps the department had taken to address concerns raised by the IUCN and the World Heritage committee?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Unless I have any heritage colleagues here, I'll need to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you could. On 13 April 2021 the ABC reported that in Tasmania-this is actually from the IUCN report on UNESCO concerns over Tasmanian Wilderness-fewer than half of the proposed developments inside protected areas and World Heritage areas had been disclosed to the public. The report identified that there are up to 60 proposals in the same process. The contentious Lake Malbena project that the minister required to be referred-they</p>	89

					<p>have classified there are up to 60 proposals in that category. These developments are proceeding despite there being no tourism master plan, as requested by UNESCO four years ago. Is the department aware of this report, and have you responded to it or raised your concerns with the Tasmanian government?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: We'll check on that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you can take that on notice too, thank you. I suspect my last question might be taken on notice too. The final draft of the tourism master plan for the Tasmanian World Heritage area was finished in September last year; I think it was by ERA Planning Pty Ltd. It's yet to be publicly released. The ABC broke a story on this last week, having seen a leaked copy of the report, which raised concerns around the social impacts of tourism and private developments in World Heritage areas. Has the department seen a copy of this report that's been prepared for the Tasmanian government, and were you consulted in relation to the minister's concerns?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: We'll need to take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Great. Would you require me to put in more detailed questions or are you okay with-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We can certainly respond to what you've said there. If there is any particular detail, please let us know. Otherwise we will try and respond to what you've said.</p>	
153	SQ21-000392	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	National Environment Protection Measure review	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: We've been waiting for that review for a couple of years now. Do you know when it's going to be?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: My understanding is that it's expected to be provided to environment ministers later this year, so towards the end of the 2021 calendar year.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Will it be made public? That includes state environment ministers?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: It does, yes. So I imagine it will, but I can confirm that on notice.</p>	105
154	SQ21-000391	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. I will say, in fairness, that on the other hand, based on what they announced last week, the recycled content goal is 25 per cent across the region, which may be a small increase on the national target they've set. They set for 20 per cent...Once again in relation to Senator Sheldon's question: you mentioned that a committee was being set up to look at monitoring whether APCO will meet its 2025 targets. Could you give us a little more information about that</p>	104-5

					<p>committee and who is on that committee?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Yes. It's the groups I mentioned that we use to monitor progress- essentially, who we work with APCO on. There's a government officials group and a senior industry collective action group associated with monitoring those commitments. I can take the detail of membership of those groups on notice, if you like.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes. And could you take on notice if anyone from the recycling industry or the environment movement is going to be on those groups- especially from someone like the Boomerang Alliance, which has been following this for nearly 30 years.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I can, yes.</p>	
156	SQ21-000906	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Patrick Dodson	Indigenous protected areas	<p>With reference to the government's 2017 commitment of \$15 million for Indigenous Protected Areas;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the total area covered by that commitment? 2. How much has been expensed? 3. How much has been contracted? 4. Why was only \$4.1 million been paid to grant recipients under the \$15 million IPA program as at 9 April 2021, despite the government committing this funding in 2017? 5. What is the total size of all Indigenous Protect Areas funded by the government? 6. What is the total amount of funding committed to Indigenous Protected Areas? 	Written
157	SQ21-000907	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Merger between Landcare Australia and the National Landcare Network	<p>With reference to the merger between Landcare Australia and the National Landcare Network;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide an update on progress made. 2. What steps is the government taking to facilitate the merger? 3. How often and to what extent is the Minister briefed on the status of the merger? 4. How are funds provided to the National Landcare Network? 5. How are funds provided to Landcare Australia? 6. How many meetings has the Minister had each organisation? 	Written
158	SQ21-000369	Director of National Parks	Nita Green	Oceans leadership	<p>Senator GREEN: How many staff are you going to contract?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Again, I've got to break it down against the marine parks elements of it.</p>	29

				<p>package - contractors</p>	<p>Mr Metcalfe: Senator, to grasp the total breakdown, we'll need to do a little bit of coordination between ourselves to ensure that each of those divisions that Mr Mundy has mentioned are able to account for that. I can undertake to have that done while we're talking and to come back to you during the course of the hearing today.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: But, respectfully, you've got a number in front of you right there. You put-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Mr Mundy can certainly talk right now about his division but, as he pointed out, there are a number of other elements to the administration as well.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: There are about eight contractors associated with marine parks grants with a budget in the order of \$1.16 million over the four-year life of the delivery of the Our Marine Parks Grants program.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: What I would like to know is that answer across the entire \$100 million for each administered project, including in the director of parks, to understand how much of the package is actually going to contractors?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: If we can't advise you today, we'll take that on notice, but we'll do our best to come back to you today, Senator.</p>	
159	SQ21-000368	Director of National Parks	Nita Green	<p>Oceans leadership package - \$100 million - amount allocated for grants</p>	<p>Senator GREEN: I know there's a breakdown of what those programs will be in that funding of \$100 million, perhaps we could go over the programs one-by-one. How much of it is departmental funding and how much will be administered in the form of grants. There's apparently \$39.9 million for additional marine park funding. How much of that is administered funding and how much of it is for grants?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I might give you a headline number if that's okay, and I'll come to the specifics in a moment. There's \$39.9 million for Australian Marine Parks partnerships.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, I know that.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Of that money, \$19.4 million is for two additional rounds of our marine parks grants.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So \$19.4 million is for grants?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Correct, yes.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: And the rest is for the department?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: There are three elements to the Australian Marine Parks component. The first component is our marine parks grants, which is \$19.4 million over for</p>	27-28

				<p>years; the second is support for the new Indian Ocean territory marine parks, which is \$5.4 million; and the third is ocean discovery and restoration projects, which is \$15 million. Together they come to the \$39.9 million total for the marine parks element of the \$100 million package.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: In the other headings, we've got another \$30.6 million for the global exploitation of Australia's expertise. How is that funding being administered? Is that through the department or is that passed on to another agency?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Similarly, I might describe a breakdown of three separate components for that part of the package.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Please.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: The first of that is \$19.4 million for on-ground projects in Australia to restore coastal ecosystems.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay, on-ground projects. Again, I'm interested in the departmental funding versus grant administered funding, or are we giving it to the states? What's happening with that?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Because these projects measures have just been recently announced, there is going to be a process necessary to come up with the prioritisation and selection of partners. So, for some components of the overall package, there will still be methods to be developed as to whom the funding goes to.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: But you already know how much of that money is going to the department, don't you?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes. I'll take a moment because there are four separate components of the overall package, and each of them will have its own funding. So I'll take a moment just to pick through and get you some answers to the specific funding line. Would it be helpful to complete the three separate elements for that first component we were just speaking about, the practical action to restore blue carbon ecosystems?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I'm interested in the numbers. I'm sure there's a very nice explanation that goes with it, but I want to know how much is going to be in grants. You might be assisted by your colleague.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: That's all departmental.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: It's all departmental.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: It is.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Senator GREEN: Then there's a further \$18.1 million for four years for the sustainable ocean action plan. Is that being administered by the department as well?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes, and, again, colleagues from the biodiversity conservation division will be able to help with greater detail on that one. That is \$18 million-\$4 million of that is going to Parks Australia, and almost all of the remainder is going to the department.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: There's \$11.6 million for Indigenous protected areas. Is that a program administered by the department or the director of parks?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: No. That one's administered by the department, in collaboration with the NIAA, the National Indigenous Australians Agency.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: What's the plan with that one?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: The \$11.6 million is to create new or expand existing Indigenous protected areas to nine new locations through the existing mechanisms for creating and expanding Indigenous protected areas.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: In regard to the marine park funding, is that going to be used to clean up the ocean and remove plastics? Is there any portion of this funding that relates to the reduction and removal of plastic from the ocean?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: The \$19.4 million of the program is to be dedicated through new rounds of our marine parks grants. So it's possible that we may have proponents come forward to propose those types of projects through that component, but there's no specific dedicated element. There is a separate pre-existing program, being administered by the Director of National Parks, to address ghost nets and associated ocean plastics issues, which is \$40 million over four years.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I will have questions later on about that. Part of the breakdown you gave me for the \$39.9 million, which was also available in the media release, is \$19 million for four major on-ground projects restoring coastal ecosystems around the country.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: That's from the \$30.6 million for practical action to restore and account for blue carbon ecosystems.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Sorry; yes, that's correct. Have those four major on-ground projects been selected yet?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: No, there'll be a selection process to determine the location for those.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Senator GREEN: What's the process, the selection?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I'll defer to colleagues from the Climate Adaptation and Resilience division on the methodology. But I'm pretty confident in saying that it's early days for looking at the priorities for the funds and that there'll be a bit more work done to identify the best locations for achieving the best outcome, in terms of blue carbon restoration, the most prospective partners to be delivering those with and the best co-leverage that we'd be able to achieve from the spend of the federal money.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: There's also, I think, \$10 million, in one of the packages you outlined, for at least 25 targeted projects to restore and protect threatened marine species. Do you know yet if those 25 projects have been selected or do we have any details on those?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: No. Again, I'll defer to colleagues for details, if you want to dive deeper. At a headline level, some priorities for the funding have been identified, including turtles habitat restoration projects, handfish habitat restoration and seabird habitat restoration. My understanding is that the exact process for identifying the partners to deliver those projects is still underway.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: That may end up being grants with organisations? I can think of a few where I live that might do that type of work with turtles.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So some of that might be grant money?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes, I believe so. I stand to be corrected by colleagues if I'm not right there, but I'm pretty sure some of that's-</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can you take on notice, because it will take too long to do it now, how much of the \$105 million will be grant money and how much of it will possibly be grant money once you've identified partners? I'd like to understand that.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Sure.</p>	
160	SQ21-000417	Director of National Parks	Jenny McAllister	Indigenous advancement strategy - profiling of \$35 million funding	<p>Senator McALLISTER: I asked this question earlier this morning, and it was suggested that it would be better asked this evening. The portfolio budget statement, on page 232, indicates that there's a related program initiative, where the Director of National Parks will work with the National Indigenous Australians Agency-I can never remember what its new name is-to grow tourism with funding of \$35 million. What does that represent?</p>	108

					<p>Ms Swirepik: I think it's a program under their Jobs, Lands and Economy Program, under the Indigenous Advancement Strategy. I'm just reading from a part of the PBS in my notes. The objectives of the program are to get Indigenous Australians into work, get remote jobseekers work-ready through community activities and work experience, and foster Indigenous business. The method of drawing on those funds is that the DNP will need to put a business case to the National Indigenous Australians Agency to draw on that money.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So it's IAS funding; it's not the Indigenous rangers program?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I think that it is. Those can be the types of jobs that are drawn on with this money, but they run, as you know, a separately funded Indigenous rangers program. My understanding is that these would be additional initiatives. So we'd probably have to take that on notice to ask that question to NIAA.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Do you have visibility on the profiling of that \$35 million, Ms Swirepik?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: No, we don't have a lot of visibility yet. Let me just check if I have any further information, but I don't think we have a breakdown of when that might occur. Sorry, I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	
161	SQ21-000396	Director of National Parks	Jenny McAllister	Projects associated with Gunlom	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Is any of the \$216 million package that we were talking about earlier earmarked for Gunlom?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: No, we will draw that from our general capital budget. My understanding is they're new works. I will correct that on notice, if I find out otherwise.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Thanks, Ms Swirepik. I think, in answering, you're referring to this particular matter that I'm asking you about. More generally, is any of the \$216 million allocation allocated to projects associated with Gunlom visitation?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: There could be, I think, upgrades to the campgrounds and other facilities around the camping ground and to the access road to the site. Again, I'd have to provide the specifics on notice, but I think that is part of the broader infrastructure program.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: You're obviously quite entitled to take it on notice. In doing so, are you communicating that a decision may not have been taken in regard to that allocation or simply that you don't have the information with you here at the table?</p>	109

					<p>Ms Swirepik: I think, for most of the projects, a decision has been made. In terms of the expenditure at Kakadu, there's 216 from the Growing Tourism NPP and then there's a further 57 to come across from the general parks infrastructure NPP that we were successful in getting up. I think the Gunlom campground and access road is in the general infrastructure funding, which is additional to the 216, but I would need to take that on notice to definitely know which bucket it's coming under. So I think a decision has been made; I don't have the breakdown of every project in that set.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Thanks very much. That's all I have, Chair.</p>	
162	SQ21-000598	Director of National Parks	Samantha McMahan	Number of closed sites in Kakadu National Park	<p>Senator McMAHON: Could you tell me, and you may not have this information immediately available, how many of the sites in Kakadu are currently open to the public versus how many are closed?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I wouldn't have the full list because there is a very long list. We do publish information on that. In fact, we've published two updates over the last two or three weeks because it is at the point of time where a lot of the sites now can reopen after the wet season. So those windows of opportunity are actually happening now. I think two further sites were opened today that were published. But I can get you a listing.</p> <p>Senator McMAHON: Yes if you wouldn't mind taking that on notice and getting a list of what's open and what's closed, as of today.</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I'm very happy to do that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Page 111]</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I was just going to offer the Senator one little piece of follow-up on access to Kakadu. The access arrangements for Kakadu are published online from time to time at the Kakadu Access Report. That would be available right now if you wish to access it and perhaps obviate the need for taking that one on notice. That was all I wanted to propose.</p> <p>Senator McMAHON: I was just hoping to get that on the record.</p>	110
163	SQ21-000395	Director of National Parks	Anthony Sheldon	Effects of ghost nets on threatened marine species	<p>Senator SHELDON: You mentioned a couple of examples of specific threats to marine species, and you mentioned the size of those nets that have recently been hauled in. Have you got any other specific data or other evidence regarding the effects of ghost nets on the threatened marine species?</p>	107

					<p>Mr Mundy: We know that ghost nets have a disproportionately high impact compared to other forms of marine debris, because their intended purpose is to catch marine creatures, and even when they're not attended-when they're floating through the water-they continue to do that. The estimates of the number of species caught vary wildly enough that I won't hazard to enter some now, but we know that they have adversely affected key species, particularly in the Gulf of Carpentaria region, including dugongs, crocodiles, sawtooth fish and other threatened species in that part of the world.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: I appreciate you saying there's different data. Is there data you're able to share with us?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I might do that on notice if that's okay.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: On notice is fine. Thanks, Chair.</p>	
164	SQ21-000393	Director of National Parks	Anthony Sheldon	<p>Consultation with Traditional Owners regarding the removal of ghost nets</p>	<p>Senator SHELDON: What work has Parks completed to consult traditional owners and to ensure their feedback has been considered?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: There was an online stakeholder workshop in late March 2021 which had over 30 participants from science and Indigenous organisations, industry and environmental organisations. We've been looking to use existing ranger relationships, an arrangement that the Department of Agriculture-</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: When you say 'online', is that like Zoom or something?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes-a sign of the times. We've been seeking to use existing relationships that are established, through our biosecurity area, with the departments to deliver the actual ranger relationships and contracts so that we'll be entering into, hopefully, well-established relationships and dialogues with partners that we've worked with across the portfolio previously.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: Have you got any more set Zoom meetings or face-to-face discussions planned?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I know that there are further stakeholder consultations planned, but I don't have specific dates for them at this point.</p> <p>Senator SHELDON: There are no specific dates at this point? Have you got a rough estimate for those rather than specific dates? Are there one or two or several meetings you want to have within a certain period of time?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I don't have a schedule to hand. I do know that we have stakeholder engagement with that large group of people scheduled at regular intervals and</p>	107

					intended at regular intervals through the life of the project, but I just don't have forward-looking dates for those meetings at this point. Sorry. I can seek that on notice if that's helpful. Senator SHELDON: Yes, if you could respond on notice, that would be helpful.	
165	SQ21-000733	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Don Farrell	\$14.1 million funding	1. In the recent budget, the Government committed \$14.1m over three years to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, are you able to detail what this funding is for? Is this new money? 2. What is the genesis of this funding? Has there been an issue with the charging structure?	Written
166	SQ21-000400	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Nita Green	Reef Trust Partnership	Senator GREEN: The ANAO report identified that subcontractors through the grants program are doing two things. One is using part of that money, in some circumstances, for administration costs. So, would you take on notice, regarding the partnerships you have with the Reef Trust Partnership-do they give you money, or is it just a collaboration of ideas? Let's start there. Mr Thomas: Money flows through us, and we use that to subcontract to other vessels in the marine park. Senator GREEN: Can I get, on notice, how much and for what programs, and also whether there's any portion of that money that GBRMPA is using for administration matters, whether that's employing people-well, anything that's described in the ANAO report? I'd also like to know whether GBRMPA is providing any in-kind support to the Reef Trust Partnership. Mr Thomas: Certainly. Senator GREEN: Do you know of anything that you've provided in kind? Mr Thomas: We provide a lot of knowledge. We attend meetings. We're connected with the governance and delivery of some components of that program. It will take us some time to account for what that time looks like. Senator GREEN: No, sorry: it's not just general assistance; they have a record of what they say is in-kind support, and they're using that number against what was meant to be a huge corporate and individual funding process. So, I wanted to know whether any of the funding that they say they're received in kind is actually coming from GBRMPA. Mr Thomas: I understand. Mr Quincey? Mr Quincey: The subgrant agreement we have for the crown-of-thorns starfish	113

					control program does have some detail in it of what some of our in-kind contributions are. I'd still have to take on notice the detail of that. But it does specifically cover some of those arrangements that you're talking about.	
167	SQ21-000401	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Nita Green	COTS program	<p>Senator GREEN: In terms of the COTS program, can you, on notice, provide us with a list of the proponents that are involved in that program?</p> <p>Mrs Callister: The main two proponents for that are the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre, the RRRRC. They're the two main delivery partners, and then they subcontract out to a number of other boat operators and things that do the on ground works. I'm happy to take that detail on notice and provide it to you</p> <p>....</p> <p>Senator GREEN: What I'm asking is not for the list right now, but does the department have information about who it's being subcontracted to? Mr Thomas, do you have a list of who you're subcontracting your part of the COTS funding to?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Yes, we do.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can we please have that list?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Right now?</p> <p>Senator GREEN: You can table it or provide it on notice, but quickly. The department doesn't have that information unless it goes through GBRMPA. What about the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: The subcontractor is a Pacific Marine Group and Blue Planet Marine. For the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre, it's a company called INLOC.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: So it's only going to two companies.</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Three. Two through us and one through the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Where are they based?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I might get this wrong. One is based in Townsville and one is based- we're not sure; we'll come back to you on notice on that.</p>	114
168	SQ21-000404	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Gerard Rennick	Carbonate chemistry of the ocean	<p>Senator RENNICK: It's just a straight up question. The outer shell of coral is made from calcium carbonate. Does that rely on the carbon dioxide in the ocean? I know that when it breaks down it emits carbon dioxide, but do corals need carbon dioxide in the ocean to make their hard shell?</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: The carbonate chemistry of the ocean is fairly complicated. The</p>	118

					<p>main issue is that, as carbon dioxide in the atmosphere dissolves in the ocean, the consequent chemical reaction makes the ocean more acidic. That changes the carbonate chemistry of the ocean and makes the chemicals that corals need to form their skeletons lower in concentration. Therefore it's more difficult for corals and other calcifying organisms to form their skeletons.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Right. So do you need carbon dioxide to form calcium carbonate?</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: I'm not sure-</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: You can take it on notice. You don't have to answer it now.</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: I'm not sure what you mean by that question, but the point is that increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere changes ocean chemistry-</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Yes, I accept that.</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: and makes it harder for corals to form a skeleton.</p> <p>CHAIR: If you could take that on notice, that would be great.</p>	
169	SQ21-000402	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Malcolm Roberts	Human activity and climate factors affecting the Great Barrier Reef	<p>Senator ROBERTS: Thank you for repeating it again. Mr Thomas just told me your position statement says that carbon dioxide from human activity is the greatest threat to the Great Barrier Reef. I want to know what, specifically, you rely on? Pinpoint it; where's the specific scientific data-within a logical, scientific framework-that proves that carbon dioxide from human activity affects the Great Barrier Reef, and is, to quote Mr Thomas, 'the greatest threat to the Great Barrier Reef'?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: As Dr Wachenfeld is trying to explain, there are thousands of sources-</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: I just want one.</p> <p>Mr Thomas: that we consider and digest. We'd be happy to provide you a summary or a list of some of the sources that we rely on heavily.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: What I would like-I'll make it very clear-is the empirical scientific data-within a logical, scientific framework-that proves cause and effect, that specifically states the link between carbon dioxide and various climate factors, such as water temperature, ocean temperature, air temperature, rainfall, droughts, winds, currents and ocean alkalinity. That's what I would like. Until you have that, there's no basis for policy, no basis for your statement...</p> <p>Mr Thomas: Dr Wachenfeld has tried to answer your question. The outlook report is our best digest of the information available to us about the pressures on the Great Barrier Reef, of which we see climate change as being the greatest. That report has some 1,400 citations in it. We'd be very happy to point them out to you</p>	116-7

					<p>here this evening in the back of that document or separately provide them on notice to you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: On notice you're going to provide the evidence? What I highlight is that I need the specific quantified relationship between human carbon dioxide production and climate factors, including air temperature, ocean temperature, ocean alkalinity, winds and currents. Is that clear?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I should point out here that-we will provide that information to you-we may need to consult other portfolios and experts who have the Commonwealth lead on climate policy.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: I'm happy for you to do that.</p>	
170	SQ21-000520	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Larissa Waters	Tourism charges	<p>The Budget provides \$14.1M over three years to GBRMPA to "support tourism and to conduct a review of the Authority's current charging structure."</p> <p>1. Is that money that GBRMPA asked for? What work is involved in the review? Is the aim to reduce charges to industry, and is there any assurance from govt that any shortfall in GBRMPA's operating costs from reduced charges would be met?</p> <p>2. The Budget Papers show a projected decline in externally generated revenue over the forward estimates (DAWE PBS, p298). The figures for Total Own-Sourced Revenue also decline steadily over the forwards (p303) - does this relate to expected lower charges? Is anything planned to make up the revenue shortfall?</p> <p>3. Are there other programs / services that you requested additional funding for? What was the response to that request?</p>	Written
171	SQ21-000522	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Larissa Waters	Hopevale congress - environmental management grant	<p>In 2019, GBRMPA provided funding to the Hopevale Congress Aboriginal Corporation for environmental management (CN3581777).</p> <p>1. What assessment was done prior to awarding the funding to satisfy GBRMPA that the recipient was compliant with relevant regulatory obligations? Did you check with the Office of Registration of Indigenous Corporations to determine whether there were any outstanding compliance issues? Does GBRMPA check with ORIC</p>	Written

					<p>2. At the time that the funding was awarded, was GBRMPA aware of any resource and extraction proposals on land under the control of the HCAC?</p> <p>3. Given the potential for those projects to adversely impact on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, was any consideration given to the suitability of HCAC to be awarded funding designed to manage environmental impacts on the Reef? Were any conditions attached to the funding that would restrict direct or indirect approval of extractive activities on the relevant land?</p> <p>4. Did HCAC apply for a particular quantum of funding? a. If so, what assessment was undertaken to satisfy GBRMPA that the amount requested was appropriate? b. If not, how was the quantum determined?</p> <p>5. How were members of the TUMRA selected?</p>	
172	SQ21-000521	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Larissa Waters	Run for the Reef	<p>The Budget allocated \$1.5M in 2020-21 to support the national running event "Run for the Reef". That event is a fundraiser for the GBR Research Fund at JCU.</p> <p>1. Does GBRMPA have any input into how funds raised are used?</p> <p>2. Would the allocation of \$1.5M directly to the GBR Research Fund deliver more value for money?</p>	Written
173	SQ21-000372	Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Jenny McAllister	Protections offered by a recovery plan compared to conservation advice	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Professor Marsh, I understand what you're saying, which is that you consider that the distinction between the enforceability of each instrument is immaterial or at least not so significant that it should shape a preference over which one you use. I would appreciate, on notice, a plain English explanation of the legal interpretation that is guiding the recommendations and decisions of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee. My understanding of the act, I think, is different to yours-and I'm perfectly happy to be corrected-but I would like to understand what the committee considers is enforceable in relation to conservation advice and how that compares to the protection offered by a recovery</p>	39

					plan? I'm happy for you to take that on notice and provide it at another time. Prof. Marsh: Thank you.	
174		Australian National Audit Office	Nita Green	ANAO work regarding the Environment Restoration Fund	<p>Senator GREEN: I'll just move onto another matter so we can move on. Senator Urquhart sent either you or the department a question on notice about the department's progress on each of the recommendations from Auditor-General reports from 2014 onwards. There have been quite a lot of Auditor-General reports in relation to the department for the environment since 2015. The question on notice ran through how many of those recommendations have been implemented. The department said that all but 24 of 104 recommendations have been closed. What does 'closed' mean? Does that mean they have been implemented or you're not dealing with them anymore?</p> <p>Ms Jago: I don't think that's a response from us. That is a response from the department, I think. I am not aware that it is our response.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: On your website, though, in relation to the department it says: "Previous audit work has identified weaknesses in the department's encouragement of competition, establishment of clear performance targets, and the use of assessment criteria to support value for money for grants." I think that was in regard to the Environment Restoration Fund and the Regional Land Partnerships. Why are you concerned about those programs?</p> <p>Mr White: I'm not aware of the material you're referring to exactly. We currently have an audit of the Regional Land Partnerships underway. What's on the website is the scope of the audit that we will be responding to in our report.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Is the Environment Restoration Fund one that you've raised concerns about or you're looking into?</p> <p>Ms Jago: I am not aware of that. We can check on that.</p>	73-74
175	SQ21-001103	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Antarctica	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to the Heard and McDonald Islands Marine Park, when is the review of the management plans due? Has any preliminary worked commenced on those reviews? 2. What led to the decision by the Government to cancel its plans for a full rebuild of the infrastructure on Macquarie Island and instead go with renovation of existing buildings? Was this decision based on a recommendation from the AAD? 3. Can you please provide an update on the infrastructure upgrades to our research bases on Macquarie Island? How much has been spend to date? 	Written

					<p>4. In Minister Ley’s media release from 28 November 2020 she announced \$450 million over the next ten years to upgrade Australia’s Antarctic research stations and supporting infrastructure. Apart from Macquarie Island, what work has been done to progress this, what is each project and over what timeframe will the works be carried out?</p> <p>5. What are the contingency plans if the Nuyina is not ready for the 2021-22 seas? I’m aware that the foreign flagged vessel the MPV Everest was commissioned for last season, however given there was a fire onboard the Everest during last season does this vessel remain an option for next season if the Nuyina is not ready?</p> <p>6. If the Nuyina is not ready and a foreign flagged vessel (such as the MPV Everest) is commissioned again for the task, will the Department ensure there are at least trainee Australian seafarers on the vessel, given that its crew previously involved no Australian seafarers?</p>	
176	SQ21-001102	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Waste and recycling	<p>1. Please provide the Departmental staffing levels for the areas responsible for waste policy, planning and stewardship over the last 8 financial years?</p> <p>2. How much does the National Television and Computer Recycling Scheme cost the Department to administer each year?</p> <p>3. In the 2021 Budget is \$67 million allocated to support new food and garden organic waste initiatives and divert waste going to landfill. How will that work; are we talking about grants to industry for new ways to process organic waste or is this about funding a roll out of FOGO services to households and businesses?</p> <p>4. Can you provide some detail as to what the funding commitment of \$5 million to assist small business to adopt the Australasian recycling label relates to? Is your assessment that it’s mainly small operators who don’t use proper recycled labelling on their packaging?</p> <p>5. In the 2020 Budget the Government promised \$249.6 million to transform Australia’s waste and recycling industry, and of that figure \$75.2 million was predicted to be spent in this financial year. How much has been spent?</p> <p>6. Do you expect to get close to \$75 million by the end of the financial year? If not, why?</p> <p>7. In relation to attachment A from question no 23 ‘waste infrastructure investment program’ lodged on 22 March 2021, can you please provide an updated table that also captures any revisions to the data provided in March.</p>	Written

					<p>8. In relation to expenditure program 'Community campaigns to reduce waste, improve recycling and clean up beaches and waterways' for which there is \$5.8 million remaining in the fund, when will these funds will be spent?</p> <p>9. On procurement, since the Government updated the Commonwealth Procurement Rules last December, which Government agencies have set targets for the purchase of recycled content? Will your Department monitor the outcomes of these targets?</p> <p>10. Of the infrastructure commitments contained in this year's budget and the forward estimates, how much money is being spent on projects using recycled content?</p> <p>11. In the National Plastics Plan the Government has made a commitment to phase out PVC packaging levels and expanded polystyrene by December 2022. What work has been progressed so far and are you on track to meet the deadline?</p> <p>12. What percentage of Australian products currently use the Australasian Recycling Label?</p> <p>13. The National Plastics Plan includes a commitment that the Government will refer any businesses to the ACCC that aren't using appropriate recycling labelling. When a question was asked of the Department the March round of estimates the Department responded by saying "No specific monitoring program has been established". If it's the case that the Government is simply hoping that any such misleading labelling will be brought to your attention, how confident are you that this will address the issue?</p>	
177	SQ21-001101	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Ocean Leadership Package	<p>1. There is approximately \$16 million across the forwards for a 'Sustainable Ocean Economy Strategy and Action Plan'. Can you please outline what this is and what it will achieve? I'm specifically interested to understand what work has been done and what work will be done over the forwards?</p> <p>2. The government's 2015 Threatened Species Strategy did not include marine species – has there been any improvement in the population trajectories of the 8 critically endangered and 20 endangered species of fish, and any of the endangered marine mammals such as the Australian Sea-lion, whose population is reported to have declined 60% in recent decades?</p> <p>3. The Australian Sea-Lion was listed as endangered in January this year. The 2013</p>	Written

					Recovery Plan for the Australian Sea-Lion was supposed to be reviewed after 5 years – in 2018 – has that occurred?	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--