

Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources Portfolio Questions on Notice Index Budget Estimates 2020-21

No.	Portfolio Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or Agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
1	BI-1	Carol Brown	Offshore oil and gas decommissioning framework	1.DISER has had an offshore oil and gas decommissioning framework review underway since 2018 to update the legislation dealing with the safe removal of offshore oil and gas facilities when they have ceased production. When will the framework be released for public consultation? 2.Is the Department considering a requirement that the offshore oil and gas industry introduce upfront 'decommissioning bonds' to cover the full cost of removing oil and gas facilities and restoring the environment? 3.(answer is likely to be 'no' or 'waffle'). In January 2020, the Department released a proposed framework for offshore renewable energy projects that included a requirement for offshore renewable energy projects to pay an upfront 'decommissioning bond' to cover the full cost of removing offshore renewable energy facilities and restoring the environment. Can you explain why the department might require 'decommissioning bonds' for renewable energy when they are not required for the oil and gas industry?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
2	BI-2	Carol Brown	Northern Endeavour	1.In 2019 the Department assumed control of the FPSO Northern Endeavour after it was shut down by NOPSEMA after a string of safety incidents. The Walker report commissioned by the Department reveals that Woodside paid Northern Oil and Gas Australia over \$US 20 million to take the Northern Endeavour off its hands to absolve it of any further responsibility for the facility. Woodside then reported that it gained SAUD 132 million from the deal as a result of avoiding the cost of decommissioning the facility. Northern Oil and Gas went into liquidation in February, making the Northern Endeavour, which hasn't produced since June 2019, a taxpayer problem. a.How much has the Department paid to run the Northern Endeavour since it took responsibility for the facility? How much of this has been paid to Woodside? Did the Department have any hesitation paying millions of dollars to Woodside for 'advice' about decommissioning the Northern Endeavour when Woodside is the corporation that effectively dumped the Northern Endeavour's issues and decommissioning costs onto the Australian taxpayer? Why not? b.Contracts on the Departments' website indicate that it paid \$10 million to Upstream Production Solutions to look after the vessel for the month of October 2020. How many months will it be paying this amount? c.What are the Department's plans for the future of the Northern Endeavour? 2.In late 2017 the licence for the Northern Endeavour was up for renewal. The decision to renew the licence rested with Resources Minister Matt Canavan. What advice did the Department receive from NOPSEMA and NOPTA on the renewal of the Northern Endeavour's licence? 3.How many offshore oil and gas facilities will need to be decommissioned by 2025? How many between 2025 and 2030? How does the Department plan to avoid incidents like the Northern Endeavour in the future? Does the Department have any plan to prevent large profitable companies such as Woodside from continuing to engage in flagrant corporate avoidance in plain sight and at the expense of the taxpayer? What is the Department going to do to ensure that operators maintain liability to remove their oil and gas facilities once they cease production in the future?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
3	BI-3	Carol Brown	NOPSEMA facilities and safety	1.Why did NOPSEMA fail to carry out a single in-person inspection of offshore oil and gas facilities between March 2020 and August 2020, despite NOPSEMA deeming the facilities safe for workers to work on in this period? (Note that while some facilities reduced the persons on board during this time, most did not go to the minimum number of persons on board). 2.Are offshore oil and gas operators required to put workers' rosters in their safety case? If not why not? Does NOPSEMA think the roster proposed by Woodside for offshore workers to spend 2 weeks in isolation and then 12 weeks on their offshore facilities working 12 hours per day is appropriate from a fatigue and safety perspective? 3.Why isn't the Safety Case of offshore facilities available for review by relevant unions? Why isn't the safety case available to employees other than at work where their log-in details are recorded by the Operators? 4.From time to time, unions raise complaints with NOPSEMA about occupational health and safety breaches on offshore oil and gas facilities. Why does NOPSEMA not provide information to unions about their subsequent investigations of such incidents? Does NOPSEMA not see unions as a key stakeholder in the health and safety of workers? 5.Has NOPSEMA identified any shortcomings of operators with respect to how they have managed and supported the mental health of their workforce during Covid-19? For example, how operators have handled roster changes, quarantine arrangements, relocation of employees, redundancies and what steps they have or have not taken to ensure the mental health of workers is at least maintained through these major changes in the sector. 6.Chevron has recently sacked 700 workers, INPEX 65 workers and Woodside 300 workers. Has NOPSEMA been advised by the operators of these redundancies, and reviewed the operations of the Operators to ensure they are not put workers at risk through undermanning of facilities, lack of essential maintenance, or being short of experienced and qualified personnel? 7.Since March 2020, many facilities have reduced the numbers of contractors and maintenance personnel on board, leading to a backlog of regular maintenance that has not been performed. Can NOPSEMA advise of the maintenance backlog on Woodside's Goodwyn Platform, Woodside's North Rankin Platform, Chevron's Wheatstone Platform and INPEX's Central Processing Facility and Floating Production Storage and Offtake facility? 8.Does NOPSEMA believe that operating oil and gas facilities with largely casualised contractor workforces affects safety on board those facilities? 9.Can NOPSEMA advise on the number of Health and Safety Representatives who have been trained during the period March 2020 to September 2020 compared with the number trained in the same March to September period in 2019? 10.In the event of a serious workplace incident or fatality, what steps will NOPSEMA take to facilitate union right of entry to offshore facilities to assist the affected workforce? 11.Since INPEX began operating, three members of its offshore workforce have died by suicide. What steps has NOPSEMA taken to investigate these fatalities? If an investigation is underway, when will it be publicly released? 12.Jadestone recently reported 74.3 litres of oil were split from the leaking of the intake hose from the Stag Platform. Witnesses reported a slick halfway to the horizon and tens of thousands of litres of oil being split. This was logged by the officers on the neighbouring Dampier Spirit FPSO. What steps has NOPSEMA taken to investigate this spillage and what resources will NOPSEMA commit to investigate if Jadestone has breached their reporting obligations? 13.In October 2016 NOPSEMA found extensive corrosion throughout the Northern Endeavour FPSO and made recommendations to Upstream Petroleum Solutions to fix it. It appears that that corrosion was never properly fixed until the facility was finally ordered to stop operating in July 2019. Why was the Northern Endeavour allowed to continue operating in a dangerous state for almost three years? Should extensive corrosion be found on a facility today, would NOPSEMA take the same action as it did in 2016? 14.In late 2017 the licence for the Northern Endeavour was up for renewal. The decision to renew the licence rested with Resources Minister Matt Canavan. What advice did NOPSEMA give to Minister Canavan about renewing the Northern Endeavour's licence? Did NOPSEMA address the corrosion found onboard the Northern Endeavour in its correspondence with Minister Canavan? 15.In April 2020 Woodside made an application to NOPSEMA to not remove the subsea infrastructure it installed in the Echo Yodell field off the coast of Dampier. This infrastructure included a 23km pipeline, a parallel 23km umbilical, and two 8m high wellheads and contained hundreds of tonnes of plastics and potentially other chemicals, liquids and metals. Is the default position that an operator must remove the infrastructure it installs? Has NOPSEMA made a decision about Woodside's application? When is a decision expected?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
4	BI-4	Carol Brown	Licence for the Northern Endeavour	In late 2017 the licence for the Northern Endeavour was up for renewal. The decision to renew the licence rested with Resources Minister Matt Canavan. What advice did NOPTA give to Minister Canavan about renewing the Northern Endeavour's licence? Was NOPTA aware of the extensive corrosion found by NOPSEMA in late 2016?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
5	BI-5	Sarah Hanson-Young	National Radioactive Waste Management Taskforce	1We note an allocation of over \$100 million dollars for the NRWFM in the recent federal budget – can you please provide further detail on the breakdown of this figure and the priority areas it will fund? 2National Radioactive Waste Management Taskforce expenditure from July 2014 to 31 October 2019 totalled \$54,860,000. What further amount has been expended on the project since 1 November 2019? 3Can you advise on the status of the Australian Radioactive Waste Management Framework initiative? What is the status of the search for an Executive Officer/CEO of the newly announced Australian Radioactive Waste Authority (ARWA) – how is this recruitment being promoted within Australia and Internationally? What budget provisions are in place to advance ARWA? 4Does the formation of the ARWA Minister Pitt stated: "the fact it is independent of existing waste holders will give assurance" – given that ARWA is a unit based within facility proponent, the NRW Project, is headed by the NRWMP team leader and "works in close partnership with ANSTO" – the major waste producer and holder in Australia – can the Department see why for many stakeholders this claim does not provide assurance? 5Further, on the formation of the ARWA Minister Pitt stated: "...medical waste, along with Australia's historical radioactive waste holdings, is currently spread over more than 100 locations across the country, like science facilities, universities and hospitals". Can you detail how many – and which – of these locations will be able to be retired from use should a national facility be advanced at Kimba? 6ANSTO was allocated \$238 million in the recent federal budget. It was reported that \$81.6 million of this allocation was "to progressively and effectively manage associated longer-term nuclear liabilities". What does this mean and how does this allocation interact with the planned management of ANSTO origin wastes at the NRWFM? (https://www.thelad.com.au/story/6962620/anstos-budget-will/) 7In June, during the course of the recent Senate Inquiry into planned federal government changes to the national radioactive waste laws the CEO of ARPAUSA – the national nuclear regulator – stated that ILW "can be safely stored at Lucas Heights for decades to come" and further stated that "current storage at the Lucas heights site is fully aligned with International Best Practice" – what is the Department's view of these comments in relation to the perceived need for urgent action in relation to the management of ILW at ANSTO? 8Speaking to the Senate Inquiry in June ANSTO's CEO stated that there are "proposals under development with the government for the pre 2027 construction of new storage" for ILW solid waste. Can you detail these proposals, especially in relation to the planned management of ANSTO origin wastes at the NRWFM? 9How does the Department intend to respond to the growing calls from the wider South Australian community for consultation on the NRWFM? In two recent polls this is the most advanced without Australia and Internationally? 10What is the status of the Adnyamathanha case in the Australian Human Rights Commission in relation to cultural issues in relation to the withdrawn Barndioota site? 11Does the Department accept that the Barngarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation are opposed to the proposed Kimba facility and have not given any consent for the project to advance? 12What is the status of the radioactive waste categorisation and re-containment process currently underway at Woomera? We understand that this is CSIRO waste and the work has been contracted to CH2M Hill-Jacobs but the Department must be in close liaison given this material is related to the national plan. What is the current revised figure for both LLW and ILW wastes that would ultimately be managed at any future federal waste facility following these reclassification and re-containment works? 13Will the Regional Consultative Committees continue in 2020? Given the Barndioota proposal has been abandoned has the Department conducted any internal or external review of the operations and outcomes of the Barndioota Consultative Committee? If so what were the key findings, if not is such a review being considered?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
6	BI-6	Sarah Hanson-Young	ANSTO	1.Comprehensive cost vs income breakdown of radiopharmaceutical production of Molybdenum 99 currently and anticipated at peak production, including all costs including insurance, security (including physical and cyber) reactor decommissioning and disposal of the waste. 2.What plans are underway to explore non-reactor based production for any current reactor produced isotopes and if no plans why not? 3.Current cost of maintaining security at the site; the number, nature and source of known threats made on any part of the ANSTO facility at Lucas Heights over the last ten years; and any additional physical and cyber security measures introduced over the last decade as a result of threats made. 4.Given accidents at Lucas Heights in recent years involving exposure of some staff to radioactive materials, what is the breakdown of occupational radiation doses for staff working at Lucas Heights over the last 5 years? 5.ANSTO – home of 95% of Australia's radioactive waste (measured by activity, not simply volume) – was allocated over \$80 million in public funds (\$81.6 mill) in the recent budget "to progressively and effectively manage associated longer-term nuclear liabilities" – what is the money to be used for? 6.In June, during the course of the recent Senate Inquiry into planned federal government changes to the national radioactive waste laws the CEO of ARPAUSA – the national nuclear regulator – stated that ILW "can be safely stored at Lucas Heights for decades to come" and further stated that "current storage at the Lucas heights site is fully aligned with International Best Practice" – does ANSTO have an agency response to this? 7.Speaking to the Senate Inquiry ANSTO's then CEO stated that there are "proposals under development with the government for the pre 2027 construction of new storage" for ILW solid waste – could you elaborate on what proposals are under development and the status of these? 8.Critics of the current moves for a national radioactive waste facility at Kimba argue that in the absence of a longer term plan for what to do with the ILW it makes no sense to duck shove, shirk the harder questions and kick the can down the road to Kimba. ANSTO is simply the best place to keep this material until a one-touch plan has been agreed. ANSTO has the best security, radiation monitoring and response capacity, is the home of Australia's nuclear industry expertise and most of the staff is already there. Keeping the ILW in extended interim storage at ANSTO also acts as a spur to both ANSTO and the government to properly address this issue – and greatly reduces the chances of stranded ILW at Kimba. Does ANSTO have an agency response to such a perspective? 9.On September 9 the ANSTO Chair Annabelle Bennet advised that Dr Aid Patterson had taken early retirement from his role since 2009 as CEO of ANSTO? Can you provide any details or explanation of this development at this time? What is the timeline and status of moves to identify a new CEO? 10.What relationship and interactions have or will ANSTO have with the new Australian Radioactive Waste Agency? 11.ANSTO is involved in the Generation IV International Forum (GIF) into advanced reactor technology – what is the current status and focus of this work? 12.What is ANSTO's understanding of the number of sites currently holding radioactive waste that will no longer do so should a national radioactive waste facility be advanced?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
7	BI-7	Sarah Hanson-Young	Scarborough gas field development	1.In April 2020, NOPSEMA accepted Woodside's Offshore Project Proposal for the Scarborough gas field development. NOPSEMA's media release at the time explained the decision had accepted Woodside's project would contribute to reducing global greenhouse levels. Can you explain how the Scarborough project will contribute to reducing global greenhouse levels? 2Do you factor in renewable energy and storage in your statements on energy displacement? 3So you are of the view that the impacts on climate change will be better off if the project had not been developed? 4Is it appropriate for a regulator to be speaking questionable claims as to the climate 'benefits' of a project contribute significantly to climate change impacts? 5Can you give me a run down on the projected fugitive emissions from the scrubbing? Were these factored into how does the acceptance of Woodside's Offshore Project Proposal for the Scarborough project take into account the EPBC Act Policy Statement - 'Indirect consequences' of an action: Section 527E of the EPBC Act?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
8	BI-8	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home	1.What is the number of public servants working from home for each month from the Department? 2.How has the Department measured increased, static or declining productivity and what are the conclusions from that measure? 3.What is the number of sick days from the Department with a work-from-home workforce for each month of the lockdown and the corresponding sick days for the corresponding months in 2019?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
9	BI-9	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
10	BI-10	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Australian Institute of Marine Science Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
11	BI-11	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
12	BI-12	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks	1.On Friday 19th June 2020 the Prime Minister held a press conference to tell the nation that a "sophisticated state-based cyber actor" was "targeting Australian organisations across a range of sectors including all levels of government, industry, political organisations, education, health, essential service providers and operators of other critical infrastructure." He further indicated that the purpose of this press conference was to "raise awareness of these specific risks and targeted activities and tell you how you can take action to protect yourself... It is vital that Australian organisations are alert to this threat and take steps to enhance the resilience of their networks." What steps did the Department/Commonwealth Entity take "to enhance the resilience of their networks" after the Prime Minister's warning? 2.The Prime Minister's media release about this state sponsored campaign encouraged organisations to "take expert advice, and implement technical defences to thwart this malicious cyber activity." Were any additional technical defences implemented within the Department/Commonwealth Entity to enhance the resilience of its networks in the face of the specific threat identified by the Prime Minister? 3.Were any additional controls or mitigations implemented within the Department/Commonwealth Entity to enhance the resilience of its networks in the face of the specific threat identified by the Prime Minister? 4.Was any new staff training initiated to enhance resilience against any phishing attacks targeting staff that may accompany this state sponsored campaign? If so, please provide them to the committee. 5.Were any internal communications prepared for staff about the threat of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference and what staff could do to maximise the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's networks? a.If so, please provide them to the committee. 6.Was any additional funding allocated to support additional technical defences, controls, mitigations or training within the Department/Commonwealth Entity in response to the Prime Minister's press conference? 7.Was	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
13	BI-13	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	Written
14	BI-14	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		IP Australia	28/10/2020	Written

				advice sought from the Australian Signals Directorate about the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's networks in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference? 8. Was the Minister briefed on the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's networks in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference? 9. Was the Minister briefed on any additional steps to enhance the resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's networks needed in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference? 10. Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity compliant with the Australian Signals Directorate's 'Top Four' mitigations as mandated under the Protective Security Policy Framework? 11. Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity compliant with the Australian Signals Directorate's 'Essential Eight' mitigations as recommended under the Protective Security Policy Framework? 12. What was the Department/Commonwealth Entity's total spend on the cyber security of its networks during the 2019-2020 financial year? 13. What is the cyber security spend as a proportion of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's total IT spend? 14. What is the Department/Commonwealth Entity's forecast total spend on the cyber security of its networks during the 2020-2021 financial year? 15. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity's total spend on cyber security increased proportionately to the increased threat identified in the Prime Minister's press conference? 16. On Tuesday 30th June 2020, the Government announced a \$1.35 billion 10-year investment in cyber security. Was any of this funding allocated to the Department/Commonwealth Entity in order to take steps to enhance the cyber resilience of its own networks in the face of the specific threats identified by the Prime Minister in his press conference on 19 June 2020?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
15	BI-15	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	29/10/2020	Written
16	BI-16	Alex Gallacher	State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks		Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
17	BI-17	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	Written
18	BI-18	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
19	BI-19	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
20	BI-20	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	Written
21	BI-21	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		IP Australia	28/10/2020	Written
22	BI-22	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
23	BI-23	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation	1. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity fully implemented Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting and Conformance (DMARC) on its email domains? 2. Does the full implementation of Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting and Conformance (DMARC) provide the most effective email domain mitigation against the threat of phishing emails? 3. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity worked with the Australian Cyber Security Centre to progress its implementation of DMARC? 4. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity received an appropriation for the implementation of DMARC? 5. Does the Information Security Manual guidance for email gateways and servers recommend "DMARC records are configured for all domains such that emails are rejected if they fail SPF or DKIM checks"? 6. The ACSC's "Malicious Email Mitigation Strategies" provides that "Socially engineered emails containing malicious attachments and embedded links are routinely used in targeted cyber intrusions against organisations." Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity concerned that the low levels of DMARC implementation within Commonwealth government departments revealed by Proofpoint leaves Australians unnecessarily vulnerable to phishing campaigns spoofing Commonwealth government agency domains?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	29/10/2020	Written
24	BI-24	Alex Gallacher	DMARC Implementation		Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
25	BI-25	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	Written
26	BI-26	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
27	BI-27	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
28	BI-28	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	Written
29	BI-29	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		IP Australia	28/10/2020	Written
30	BI-30	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
31	BI-31	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training	1. Have APS staff in the Department/Commonwealth Entity received cyber security training? 2. How many APS staff in the Department/Commonwealth Entity have attended in person cyber security training sessions? 3. Who administers and conducts this training? 4. Does the Department/Commonwealth Entity have a target for the proportion of active users of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's Network that have completed in-person cyber security training sessions? 5. Has consideration been given to making cyber security training mandatory for users of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's Network? a. If so, what was the outcome of those considerations? 6. What other forms of cyber security training does the Department/Commonwealth Entity provide?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	29/10/2020	Written
32	BI-32	Alex Gallacher	Staff Cyber Security Training		National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
33	BI-33	Rachel Siewert	Oil spill at Jadestone's Stag oilfield platform	Is NOPSEMA investigating the recent oil spill at Jadestone's Stag oilfield platform? If not, why not?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
34	BI-34	Gerard Rennick	Climate Change	1. What research does CSIRO undertake in regards to developing new crops to help diversify away from sugar cane in Northern Australia? 2. How difficult is it to calculate downward welling infrared radiation? I note that an energy budget from the Australian Academy of Science shows a downwelling radiation 342 watts per square metre from GHG whereas a model provided by the CSIRO shows a downwelling radiation of 333 watts per square meter. The IPCC says the increase in downwelling radiation is 2 watts per square metre due to the increase in atmospheric CO2. Given the total measurements of welling radiation are so different how can we be confident that the much smaller 2 watts per square metre calculation is correct? 3. What would the temperature of the earth be if Greenhouse gases didn't exist? 4. Some sources say that the temperature of the earth without GHG would be negative 18 degrees Celsius or 255 Kelvins or that GHG contribute increase the temperature of the earth's atmosphere by 33 degrees. If that is the case, then why is it that energy budget models show that GHG have a downwelling radiation of around 330-340 watts per square meter, about the same downwelling radiation of the sun which contributes most of the other 255 degrees of heat into the atmosphere? I.e. how is it that the 340 watts per square meter from GHG contributes 35 degrees while the circa 340 watts per square meter from the sun contributes almost 255 degrees. 5. Is the adiabatic lapse rate of the atmosphere the same at the equator as it is at the poles for any given altitude? I.e. is the rate of temperature loss in the atmosphere the same at the equator as it is at the poles? 6. Why do energy budgets exclude the impact of gravity on photons? 7. Most energy budgets seem to indicate that greenhouse gases emit more radiation downwards as downwelling radiation than upwards as outgoing long wave radiation. Given radiation is emitted in all directions how is it that the amount of radiation emitted downwards exceeds that amount radiated upwards? 8. What is the algorithm used in climate change models that is used by the CSIRO? 9. Is there an actual algorithm that explains how the emissivity of a molecule changes regarding pressure, temperature and wavelength? I note the answer to my previous QoN asking for the emissivity of CO2. The CSIRO didn't specify an algorithm between pressure/temperature/wavelength and emissivity. 10. CO2 in the atmosphere has been much higher in the past. What caused CO2 emissions to rise and fall in the past? 11. What has been driving the earth's warming period known as the Holocene? 12. Given the atmosphere is almost saturated by water vapor at around 15 microns, what is the relationship between the increase in CO2 in the atmosphere which absorbs and emits around 15 microns and total heat absorbed at that band? If water vapor already absorbs and emits most of the photons at that wavelength how will increasing CO2 increase the rate of absorption if all the photons in that wavelength are already being absorbed and emitted? 13. Would the rate of increase in heat from increasing CO2 concentrations be described as increasing in a negative logarithmic scale or a linear scale? 14. How well understood is the role of convection in acting as a thermostat to regulate the earth's temperature? I note the CSIRO reply to a previous QoN regarding the impacts of clouds and I quote: "the net feedback of an increase in clouds due to global warming is uncertain and results from a combination of positive and negative feedbacks". 15. Do climate models that predict global warming also assume that the higher kinetic energy of CO2 (from the increased heat) will increase the atmospheric escape rate of CO2 (as the higher kinetic energy exceeds the gravitational downwards pull) offsetting the higher concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere? If so, what is assumed algorithm? 16. How do scientists calculate the transfer of heat via radiation, convection, clouds and evaporative cooling? For example, is it possible to calculate that for every extra photon trapped by CO2 how much of heat carried by that photon is offset by rising air (which cools), increased cloud cover (which can cool and heat), or a higher atmospheric escape velocity (which will reduce CO2 levels)? 17. Isn't convection driven by temperature differentials and as such it is a form of heat transfer than can offset increased heat from radiation? 18. Solar panels contain the greenhouse gas Nitrogen Trifluoride which has a global warming potential 17,000 times greater than CO2 and absorbs and emits photons in the 10.4 to 11.9-micron wavelength which is in the atmospheric window. Why isn't the CSIRO highlighting the risks of NF3 to global warming given that it stays in the atmosphere for up to 700 years and it will contribute to closing the atmospheric window? 19. Sulphur Hexafluoride is absorbed between the 10.4 to 11.9-micron wavelength and has a global warming potential 23,000 times greater than CO2. Why isn't the CSIRO highlighting the risks of this gas given its role in switching gear used in energy transmission and it will also contribute to closing the atmospheric window? 20. Are NF3 and SF6 concentrations tracked in the atmosphere? Is so could the levels please be provided for the last 20 years? If not, why not given their greenhouse warming potential? 21. Does CO2 absorb incoming near infrared spectra in the 2.8-micron and 4.3-micron range and if so, how much?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
35	BI-35	Gerard Rennick	Coral growth and decay	1. Could AIMS please provide available data on coral growth rates since 2005? 2. Could AIMS explain the difference between the study conducted by the ARC Centre of Excellence showing coral cover has reduced by 50% and the data on the AIMS website showing coral declining by a much smaller amount? 3. What steps is AIMS taking to consolidate, standardise and report datasets so that like for like comparisons can be made on a range of KPI's regarding the health of the reef? 4. In terms of coral bleaching, the GBRMPA website says that only 1036 of the 3000 reefs are used in the aerial survey. How are these 1036 reef selected for survey? i.e. What makes these 1036 representative of the entire reef more so than the other approximately 2000 reefs not a part of the survey? 5. If there are criteria, could you please provide this? 6. Are the reefs similar in size? Or do they greatly vary? 7. When a small part of one of these selected reefs is identified as having moderate-severe bleaching is the whole reef then used as part of the claim on the GBRMPA website that 60% of the GBR is bleached? For example, if moderate-severe bleaching is noticed in a small portion of the reef being surveyed that reef then forms part of the 60% figure in the same way a reef experiencing large amounts of moderate-severe bleaching is reported? 8. Is it accurate to state that the extent (the amount of these individual reefs that are bleached) and the severity are independent from each other? 9. If the either of the above answers are no does the 60% value recorded, then refer to the actual amount of the coral within the Great Barrier Reef that is bleached? 10. Does AIMS have access to the data about the amount of coral within these 1036 reefs that are bleached (the extent of bleaching not the severity) or is this data a part of the ARC centre of excellence coral reef studies dataset? 11. If AIMS does have access could it please provide a link? 12. What is the scale used to determine the severity of the bleaching on the coral?	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	Written
36	BI-36	Gerard Rennick	Nuclear Power	1. Is ANSTO researching chirped pulse amplification as a way to reduce the half-life of radioactive waste? If not, why not? 2. What other forms of Nuclear technology is ANSTO researching in order to make Nuclear power safer and therefore more acceptable for use in Australia?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written

37	Bl-37	Bridget McKenzie	Anti-Dumping Measures	<p>1.The Productivity Commission Trade Assistance Review 2018-2019 states there are no convincing justifications for anti-dumping measures, and raises that Australia is one of the most "prolific users of anti-dumping measures in the world". a.Are these claims factually correct? b.Has the Anti-Dumping Commission challenged the Productivity Commission on these claims? 2.In 2016, SPC Ardmona won an appeal against Italian tinned tomato importers after the Anti-Dumping Commission and the Federal Government ruled that La Doria and Feger were dumping their produce in Australia. The outcomes of this ruling saw increased confidence from tomato growers to invest in the industry, and calls for other manufacturers to do the same. However, the Productivity Commission's Review claims anti-dumping measures reduce the wellbeing of the Australian community a. Has the Anti-Dumping Commission challenged this particular claim made by the Productivity Commission? b. Did the Productivity Commission respond to this challenge? (If yes) Is the response public? 3.Given the SPC Ardmona case, can the Commission explain how Australia's use of anti-dumping measures protects our industries and ensures they are able to operate fairly and competitively in global markets? 4.Can the Commission explain how these measures deliver benefits for the Australian community? 4.The Review makes reference to the A4 copy paper dispute which Indonesia successfully challenged at the WTO's dispute settlement body in December 2019. The ruling claimed that the Anti-Dumping Commission "had not made the required calculations in line with the appropriate methodology used to determine whether dumping had occurred". Has the Commission reviewed this finding and if so, what were the Anti-Dumping Commission's findings? 1.Has the Anti-Dumping Commission responded to this claim by the Productivity Commission? 1.(If yes) Was there a response provided by the Productivity Commission to the Anti-Dumping Commission on this matter? 2.(continued) What was this response? 5.Has the COVID-19 pandemic caused investigation timeframes to increase? a.(If yes) What has the effect of these increased lengths been on industry? b.(Continued) How has the Commission worked to overcome issues associated with increased timeframes for investigations, and the effects that may be experienced by industry if this duration is extended?</p>	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
38	Bl-38	Kim Carr	Reforms to the R&D Tax Incentive	<p>1.How is the "\$2 billion in additional Research and Development incentives" announced in the Treasurer's Budget speech derived: a. Is the amount additional to the existing funds allocated to the R&amp;D Tax Incentive? b.Or does it include the \$1.8 billion the Government had previously planned to save under the provisions of the Treasury Laws Amendment (Research and Development Tax Incentive) Bill 2019? 2.What will the annual budgeted cost of the incentive now be? 3.Does the Government's cost estimate take into account the reduced cost to the R&amp;D TI of jobkeeper payments? 4.Does the new 18.5 per cent rate for refundables effectively mean that the R&amp;D offset stays at 43.5 per cent, because the corporate tax rate for small business will be 25 per cent in FY22? 5.Is it correct that under the provisions of the TLA (A Tax Plan for Covid-19 Economic Recovery) Bill 2020 a company with a turnover above \$20m and an R&amp;D intensity of less than 2 per cent would get a permanent benefit of 8.5 per cent? 6.Is it correct that under the previous law these companies would have received a benefit of 13.5 per cent because of the reduction in the corporate tax rate? 7.Is it correct that under the new law, a company would need to have an R&amp;D intensity of at least 5.5 per cent to get a permanent benefit of 13.5 per cent or more? 8.How many companies with turnovers of \$20m-\$50m would have an R&amp;D intensity that high? 9.How many companies with turnovers above \$50m would have an intensity that high? 10.How many manufacturers would have an intensity that high? 11.What is the Government's estimate of the cost of the 16.5 premium offset? 12.How many companies can be expected to access this each year? 13.How many manufacturers can be expected to access this each year? 14.How many companies can be expected to claim annual R&amp;D expenditure of \$100m-\$150m each year? 15.How many of these would be manufacturers? 16.Did the Government consult stakeholders before drafting the Treasury Laws Amendment (A Tax Plan for Covid-19 Economic Recovery) Bill 2020? 17.On what basis has the Government retained the intensity scale in the new law? 18.Will multinational firms that manufacture offshore and conduct R&amp;D be more likely than Australian manufacturers to obtain the premium rate? 19.Was a possible advantage for multinationals manufacturing offshore taken into consideration in devising the new tiers? 20.On what basis did the Government retain the \$150m cap on claims? 21.Did the Government consider including a premium rate of the incentive for collaboration between industry and research institutions in the provisions of the Treasury Laws Amendment (A Tax Plan for Covid-19 Economic Recovery) Bill 2020? 22.The new accelerated depreciation rules mean preclude any R&amp;D value attaching to a new asset. What effect the Government expect this will have on companies intending to make large investments on assets needed for R&amp;D? 23.What is the most recent estimate of Australia's Gross Expenditure on R&amp;D (GERD) as a percentage of GDP? 24.Does the estimate take into account the economic impact of the pandemic? 25.How does this estimate rank Australia among OECD nations for GERD? 26.What is the most recent estimate of Australia's Business Expenditure on R&amp;D (BERD) as a percentage of GDP? 27.How does this estimate rank Australia among OECD nations for BERD? 28.What is the total value of Australia's BERD, in dollar terms? 29.What percentage of small and medium-size enterprises collaborate with a university or research agency in conducting their R&amp;D? 30.What percentage of larger firms collaborate? 31.What percentage of all Australian firms are innovation-active?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
39	Bl-39	Deborah O'Neill	National Innovation Games	<p>Senator O'NEILL: Great, thank you very much. I am interested in that concept. I understand that the National Innovation Games has been funded in a way that is the process of awarding funding, and I understand that the government's funded the delivery of the games to the amount of \$3.5 million—not by competitive tender, is my understanding. Can you confirm that funding was created for the National Innovation Games by legislative instrument, under the Industry Research and Development Act 1986? Mr Luchetti: I can confirm that \$3.5 million was announced in the 2019-20 budget for the National Innovation Games. In regard to whether it's been provided under the Industry Research and Development Act, I will need to take that on notice. I just don't seem to have that information before me, but we should be able to provide that to you. Senator O'NEILL: If you can't declare the act that it was provided under, can you confirm for me that it was actually created by legislative instrument? Mr Luchetti: No; I will need to take that on notice too.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	6
40	Bl-40	Murray Watt	Decision to engage COSBOA	<p>Ms Kelly: The decision was made that COSBOA was best placed to deliver the product, so government engaged COSBOA directly. Senator WATT: How was that decision made if there wasn't a tender process? Was it advice from— Senator Cash: It was an ad hoc grant. Senator WATT: Was it advice from department or was it a ministerial decision? Ms Kelly: Any further detail I might need to take on notice because I don't have the officers here and I don't have my papers in relation to that. Senator WATT: Do you know who originally brought the parties together to run the campaign, whether it was ministers, COSBOA or whoever else was involved in devising it? Ms Kelly: Again, for any further detail, I'm going to have to take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	10
41	Bl-41	Murray Watt	Engagement of Crosby Textor	<p>Senator WATT: When did the department first learn that COSBOA had engaged Crosby Textor, the Liberal Party pollster, to help them with this campaign? Ms Kelly: We'll have to take that on notice. As I said, I just don't have the staff. They appeared last night, but I don't have the staff who were involved in that— Senator WATT: Sure, and I appreciate you allowing us to ask some questions about this. Do you know whether the department learned that Crosby Textor were being engaged before they were engaged or was it after the event? Ms Kelly: I actually don't know the circumstances by which we came to know that. Senator WATT: Minister, do you know when the relevant minister or her office became aware that Crosby Textor had been engaged? Senator Cash: No, I don't. Senator WATT: Can you take that on notice for us, please. Senator Cash: I can take it on notice, yes. Senator WATT: What exactly is the role of Crosby Textor with this campaign being funded by \$5 million? Senator Cash: I'd need to take that on notice. Ms Kelly: My understanding is it was in relation to generating creative content. COSBOA have three staff, I think, but, as you would understand, they obviously don't have specialist expertise of the type that you would need for a national campaign. That's my understanding. I can certainly provide you on notice with what further detail we have available. Senator WATT: Do you know whether Crosby Textor is undertaking any market research or opinion polling as part of the work it's doing for this campaign? Ms Kelly: No, I don't know that. Senator WATT: You don't know. Do you know, Mr Fredericks? Mr Fredericks: I don't. I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	11
42	Bl-42	Murray Watt	COSBOA report	<p>Senator WATT: Have any measures been put in place by the department to ensure that any market research being conducted by Crosby Textor as part of this campaign, which is funded by taxpayers, is not then finding its way into ministerial offices or the Liberal Party given the very close connections of the people involved? Mr Fredericks: I think the point then is we go back to the fact that this is a contract with COSBOA. Senator WATT: I know. But surely COSBOA report back to you in some way given they're receiving \$5 million of public funding? Mr Fredericks: Again I'll take it on notice, but the expectation would be COSBOA, of course, would report back in accordance with the milestones that are required to meet in the completion of the contract. Again, there's nothing unusual about this; this is garden variety governance.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	12
43	Bl-43	Murray Watt	Go Local First campaign	<p>Senator WATT: Has the department attached a requirement that the Go Local First campaign and any research it commissions—for instance, through Crosby Textor—be shared with all parties and crossbenches in this parliament? Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	14
44	Bl-44	Murray Watt	Crosby Textor involvement in campaign	<p>Senator WATT: So, Minister, you can unequivocally state that neither the minister nor her office were involved in bringing together Crosby Textor and this taxpayer funded campaign? Senator Cash: I have no knowledge of that, but I'll take it on notice. Senator WATT: And you can unequivocally say that Mr Textor, the long-term Liberal Party pollster, had no involvement in suggesting this campaign and bringing the parties together? Senator Cash: We've said that we will take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	15
45	Bl-45	Deborah O'Neill	Entrepreneurs Program delivery partners	<p>Senator O'NEILL: I understand the need to have industry partners. What I don't understand is something as nebulous as 'management advisory services' as the identifier for a spend of \$33 million. Ms Greenwood: It is the contract for the Entrepreneurs Program for the delivery partners. Those delivery partners engage facilitators on behalf of the department, and then they deliver a range of advice to small and medium enterprises which is generally categorised as management advice. It goes to things like how to commercialise a new product, how to innovate and solve a research problem in a commercial context that can help that small business expand, how to strategise your business, how to digitise a business, and incubator support for early start-ups. Senator O'NEILL: What was the process of the awarding of this tender to the Australian Industry Group? Ms Greenwood: It was awarded to a number of different businesses, and it was an open tender process. Senator O'NEILL: Which businesses shared in the \$33 million? Ms Greenwood: There were seven delivery partners. Sorry, I will just find the actual— Senator Cash: Can I confirm that this is delivery of the Entrepreneurs Program. It's not advice to government; they provide direct advice to business. Senator O'NEILL: Did you come up with the idea for this program, Senator Cash? Who came up with the idea? Senator Cash: I'd need to take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	18-19
46	Bl-46	Deborah O'Neill	AIG funding	<p>Senator O'NEILL: It states \$31 million here for AIG. Is that correct? Ms Greenwood: I'll have to check that. I don't have the detail per provider in front of me at the moment. Senator O'NEILL: It indicates \$21 million to the New South Wales business chamber. Ms Kelly: We'll get that information. We don't have it in the papers in front of us, but we'll get that information. I'm just reluctant to confirm any numbers from a media report without having that information in front of us. Senator O'NEILL: Okay.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	20
47	Bl-47	Deborah O'Neill	Contracts fully expended	<p>Senator O'NEILL: That's alright. It's helpful to understand this. This actually matters to small businesses, that when there's a gap in their knowledge they can go and get some help from somebody reputable. My concern is about the government making a great headline announcement about support for small business, then money going to support friends of theirs and not necessarily getting to the source that needs it. My next question is, of the \$135.5 million, or throughout the program, the completion lines for expenditure, how much of the money that was announced has been expended in previous financial years? The money that was announced, how much of it has been expended? Ms Kelly: The \$135.5 million relates to the contracts that are in place with the seven delivery partners that extend from 1 July 2020 until 30 June, 2023. Senator O'NEILL: This is an allocation of funding that's yet to be expended? Ms Kelly: Some will have been expended in relation to work done since 1 July this year. But they're three-year contracts. That's the total value of the three-year contracts that begin on 1 July this year. Senator O'NEILL: In previous financial years, how much of the money allocated was fully expended? Ms Kelly: We'll take it on notice. My expectation is that it would be fully expended with industry partners. They're commercial contracts, and we monitor those contracts. In the usual course they would be fully expended.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	21
48	Bl-48	Andrew Bragg	Early Stage Venture Capital Limited Partnership program	<p>Senator BRAGG: That's very good. I have one more question which you can probably take on notice. I'm sure I'm asking it of the wrong person, so I apologise in advance. I wonder if you could take on notice the flows into this—always get this acronym wrong—Early Stage Venture Capital Limited Partnership program. ESVCPLP? Mr Luchetti: That's not something that I'm responsible for. I think that might be I.27 Mr Williamson: Yes. We'll take it on notice. Senator BRAGG: You can take it on notice. I'd be keen to get a sense of how the flows are going, probably since inception. I think it started about two years ago. Mr Williamson: Yes, I think that's right. Sorry—my colleague might be able to answer— Ms Kelly: Yes, those funds are growing quite significantly each year. Senator BRAGG: You have the information with you? Ms Kelly: I will get the information for you. I don't have it in front of me, but there is an officer who is coming for the later programs who will have that information, and they are growing.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	24
49	Bl-49	Louise Pratt	Loan to Rio Tinto	<p>Senator PRATT: Thank you very much, Chair. I had a question about the loan made to Rio Tinto. Mr Fredericks: I'll have to wait and see what the program is. There's every chance this is in program 1.3, which is tomorrow afternoon. Senator PRATT: Okay. Let me just see the context of my question. I would have thought, from a governance point of view, it would have belonged here. Can I ask, from a corporate point of view, if such loans are common practice within the department? Mr Fredericks: At this stage, I don't know what loan you're referring to— Senator PRATT: In the department's annual report, there's a mention that an interest-free loan of \$137 million was made to Rio Tinto Aluminium. Mr Fredericks: Would you indulge us—do you have a page reference for that? Senator PRATT: I'm sorry, I don't have it, but it's the 2019-20 annual report. It is not this year's. Mr Fredericks: I think we might have to take that on notice, but only until we get to outcome 1.3 tomorrow. Mr Sullivan? Mr Sullivan: We can take that on notice. We'll do the work and provide you with some answers tomorrow under outcome 1.3. Senator PRATT: Outcome 1.3. That's where we deal with mines, is that right? Mr Fredericks: That's right. That's in resources tomorrow. Senator PRATT: So you can't tell me, from a corporate point of view, whether this loan was appropriate? We'll have to wait— Senator O'NEILL: Page 127 might help. Mr Fredericks: The relevant officers who will be able to deal with that in the detail you deserve are on tomorrow. Senator PRATT: So you can rule out that there are these kinds of loans in other areas of the department? Mr Fredericks: I'll just have to take that on notice. Senator PRATT: Yes, if you could take on notice any loans made to any corporate entities across the whole department— Mr Fredericks: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	24-25
50	Bl-50	Deborah O'Neill	Boosting Female Founders Initiative	<p>Senator O'NEILL: What I'm concerned about is continuing the gap in announcement and delivery of funds and allocations. In terms of the design of this program, when the government says they're going to be doing something immediately, I'm sure that there should have been consultation. So what consultations were undertaken in developing the initiative in the first place? Mr Luchetti: In regard to the policy initiative prior to the 2018 announcement? Senator O'NEILL: Yes. Mr Luchetti: I need to consult with a colleague, but my understanding is that it's based on feedback that we have received that female leads—such as CEOs et cetera—in regard to businesses are underrepresented and that they find it extremely difficult to secure funding. Therefore, the thinking behind the program is to provide women entrepreneurs with the opportunity to actually secure funding to grow businesses, to employ people and to explore export markets. Senator O'NEILL: And that initial consultation would have been a key factor in your determining the scope and size of the program, I'm sure. So why was \$24 million considered the appropriate amount for the initial investment? Mr Luchetti: I wasn't involved at the time, Senator, so I'd need to take that on notice in order to get you an answer.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	27

51	BI-51	Deborah O'Neill	Boosting Female Founders Initiative departmental costs	<p>Senator O'NEILL: The next announcement that we have is what you were discussing with Senator Bragg, which was a further \$35.9 million. I'm trying to figure out how we get to a further \$35.9 million. Can you help me understand that, Mr Luchetti: The additional funding is to assist the department with administrative costs associated with the program. The amounts I just ran through with you were administered funding for the program, and the outstanding amounts that take it to \$35 million are additional funds for departmental costs. Senator O'NEILL: So, to be clear, there is not an additional \$35.9 million? Mr Luchetti: No, there is. In total—Senator O'NEILL: There's 24 plus 35? Mr Luchetti: Yes—24 plus 35 has been provided to the program. Of that 35, in the second announcement, 29.9 is program funding. Senator O'NEILL: And the other six is for you? Mr Luchetti: The \$6 million is departmental costs over that period. Senator O'NEILL: Given that the program has not rolled out in the two years since it was announced, no money has been expended, no reviews have been undertaken and no evaluation is possible, because it hasn't been implemented, and regardless of the excitement and interest that it has generated, which I acknowledge—I think promoting female founders in business is a fantastic thing; I'm all for it. What process did you use to determine this extra funding allocation across each of the years, and where did the estimate of \$6 million for the department to administer the program come from? What's the rationale for that? Where did all that data come from? Mr Luchetti: With regard to the \$6 million for departmental costs, I'd need to take that on notice to understand exactly what the breakdown reflected. I suspect there's some cost for officers in administering the program. There's probably some marketing costs. There would be evaluation costs associated with that amount, but I just couldn't tell you exactly what the various elements are.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	28
52	BI-52	Deborah O'Neill	Awareness of COSBOA program	<p>Senator Cash: I have a slight correction to some evidence. I didn't make a mistake in providing the evidence, but I want to clarify a statement that I made in terms of the National Innovation Games. I referred to the pilot in Victoria and I said how successful it was and, on that basis, the federal government determined that it would enter into the agreement with COSBOA. Can I just confirm that the pilot was actually funded by the Victorian Labor government and that was actually an agreement that COSBOA and Paddl were already doing under the work under the Victorian pilot. I wanted to confirm that for the record. Senator O'NEILL: Can I ask a little clarifying question? ACTING CHAIR: You may, Senator O'NEILL: Minister, could you recall if it was from the provider of the program there that you heard about the program? Senator Cash: Do you mean personally heard? Senator O'NEILL: How did the government come to be aware of that? Senator Cash: I will take that on notice. It is quite a well-known program, though, as you now know. But I'll take that on notice for you. Senator O'NEILL: Who advised the department of it? Was it outreach from the department to the provider or did the provider reach in and via what method? Mr Fredericks: The department will take it on notice. Senator Cash: Yes, we will take that on notice. Senator O'NEILL: And I have the same line of questioning that was pursued by Senator Watt. Was the department approached with the idea and by whom and when? Mr Fredericks: We will take it on notice. Senator O'NEILL: Thank you.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	30
53	BI-54	David Van	R&D Tax Incentive program approvals	<p>Mr McIntyre: I look after the R&amp;D Tax Incentive program. You were asking about the 2018-19 income year? Senator VAN: Whichever year is the latest you have. Mr McIntyre: The 2018-19 income year is the latest one that we have, because of the delay between when tax returns are due and when income years finish. In that year, \$11.4 billion of expenditure was registered. Senator VAN: How many applications were there? First, how many were received? Mr McIntyre: Eleven thousand, four hundred and sixty-nine applications were received. Senator VAN: And how many were approved? Mr McIntyre: I don't have the number of those that were approved. However, the way the process works is that registrations are evaluated and generally approved unless there's very substantial risk associated with their approval. The number of approvals is usually similar to the number received. Senator VAN: But you said there was \$11.4 billion? Mr McIntyre: Eleven thousand, four hundred and sixty-nine, and I can take on notice the numbers that were approved.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	38
54	BI-55	David Van	R&D Tax Incentive program referrals	<p>Senator VAN: Thank you. As I understand it, the department works in partnership with the Australian tax office for the application of the incentive, with the ATO recognising it under the scheme as part of the company's tax lodgement. Is that correct? Mr McIntyre: Yes. Our department, the department of industry, is responsible for registration and for assessing whether work done by companies meets the definition of R&amp;D in the act, and the tax office is responsible for ensuring that expenditure under those projects meets the appropriate standards to be taken as a tax concession. Senator VAN: And, if it doesn't meet the ATO's standard, it's then referred back to your department? Mr McIntyre: In cases where the tax office questions the expenditure, it depends on the reasons why they're questioning it. If they're questioning it because of the documentation around it, that would be a matter that would be dealt with within the ATO. If they're questioning it because it does not appear to fit within the registration of R&amp;D as described in the application, then they can refer the matter to our department to assess whether the registration was valid. Senator VAN: In the last statistics you have, how many of those were referred back to you? Mr McIntyre: I don't believe I have referrals on me. I will double-check the statistics I have. I certainly have the number of matters that we have had findings on. Let me find it. Senator VAN: You can take that one on notice. How many of the approvals were settled and how many remain in dispute? Mr McIntyre: I can certainly give you the number in the 2018-19 or 2019-20, to date, years. We do a range of different kinds of reviews. In particular, we had 31 findings in the 2019-20 year, 43 internal reviews, 129 advanced and overseas findings, and 203 overall statutory assessments. Senator VAN: How many of those of those still remain in dispute? Mr McIntyre: I'll have to take on notice the number currently on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	38
55	BI-56	David Van	Department legal team	<p>Senator VAN: I'm pleased to hear that you try to work with them. In some correspondence I get, that's seemingly not what I'm reading. You mentioned the pointy end, where that doesn't happen. I might come to that next, which would be the questions around outcome 1.2. You might need to swap people. I assume the department has an in-house legal team? Is that correct? Mr McIntyre: Yes, Senator. Indeed, R&amp;D claims are a common source of work for our legal department. There are a number of matters that are with the AAT at any one time related to the R&amp;D tax incentive. Senator VAN: How many are in that team? Mr McIntyre: I would have to have our legal—Ms Kelly: We don't have our corporate people at hand at the moment. Mr Fredericks: We're seeing if we can get someone. Our chief operating officer is still here. She's just coming from the waiting room. Senator VAN: I can come back. ACTING CHAIR: She's joining us now, so it probably makes sense to exhaust your questions now rather than having the disruption of coming in and out. Senator VAN: Sure. These are quite general questions. I don't think they need too much specialist knowledge. I was just asking how many were in the in-house legal team. A rough number will do, or you can take it on notice. Ms Richards: I can take the specifics on notice. There are about 50 people in our legal team, but they work across a number of functions, not just providing legal advice. We have our fraud investigation function there and our FOI function. We also provide some support to the anti-dumping program out of that team. Out of the roughly 50 head count, there's a lesser number than that that are legal advisers.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	39
56	BI-57	David Van	R&D Tax Incentive common legal issues	<p>Senator VAN: Obviously I don't want you to go into specific legal cases, but are there some common legal issues that frequently come up in matters that go before judicial or administrative review? Mr McIntyre: The most common matters related to the RDTI are with the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. There have been a couple of Federal Court matters. The AAT matters do vary, but in the main they relate to a review of the decisions made by industry innovation and science Australia, who are responsible for making the decisions with regard to registration for the RDTI. The way it works is that when a company puts in an application that application is therefore decided by the ISA board, but they delegate their decision-making on most matters to the department. We in the department do the assessments, but cases that are complex or that have elements of law that require a decision are elevated to a subcommittee of ISA or ultimately to the board. If a company has a negative finding—in other words, if the decision is that the application does not represent R&amp;D in accordance with the act—the company is entitled to a review. We do internal reviews of those matters. Then, further, if the company is still dissatisfied with the response, the company is entitled to take the matter to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. That is the reason for most of those cases. The department has a very strong record in having the findings of the department upheld. In cases where the AAT make a decision that varies from the one that was made in the department, the most common reason for that is that the company has been able to provide additional information that clarifies the situation in a way that allows it to be clear that it was R&amp;D, rather than it having been an error of interpretation. Senator VAN: Could you come back to me with how much time and the costs involved with litigating those disputes. You can take that one on notice. Mr McIntyre: I think we'll have to take that one on notice, yes.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	49
57	BI-58	David Van	Cases taken to tribunal	<p>Senator VAN: Have there been any occasions where the company has provided that evidence to you beforehand and then it's still upheld by the AAT—that is, you had the evidence, you've still taken it to a tribunal, and the tribunal has found against you? Mr McIntyre: Without talking to individual cases, generally speaking the approach the department has is that if a company is able to present additional information that clarifies their position we would consider that information, if, as a consequence, our view is that a different decision would be taken then we would seek to work with the company to resolve the matter out of court. Those things are often described as a settlement, but it is a settlement in the context of a company providing us with additional information that clarifies their position and as a consequence we can then change the outcome of their registration. But I'd have to get to you on notice as to whether there are cases where we have nonetheless taken it to the AAT and then the AAT has found in a way that is at odds with the original decision.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	40
58	BI-59	David Van	Model litigant obligations	<p>Senator VAN: I'm not so much interested in what the press has to say on these matters. Can you take on notice how many times this occurred—that you've been criticised for not being a model litigant? Ms Richards: Under the Legal Services Directions, the department is required to report to the Office of Legal Services Coordination in the Attorney-General's Department on an annual basis in relation to our compliance with the directions generally. But the model litigant obligation is one of those that we comply on annually. In the last two years, we haven't had any significant breaches of the Legal Services Directions or model litigant obligations that we've been required to report to that office. In terms of complaints or issues that may have been raised in individual applications, we could take that on notice. Senator VAN: What do you mean by substantial breaches? Ms Richards: There was a minor issue of noncompliance with the Legal Services Directions, very technical, that concerned our request for constitutional legal advice. We're required to get that advice from the Australian Government Solicitor, which we always do. We're also required to copy a request for that advice to the Attorney-General's Department. AGS, as you might know, is part of the Attorney-General's Department. There were a number of minor occasions where we omitted to copy the Attorney-General's Department on a request for advice, and that's why I describe them as insufficient or rather technical. Senator VAN: Can you provide those on notice, the last two years worth? And I hope that we don't see any more of those in the near future.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	41
59	BI-60	Louise Pratt	Modernising Manufacturing Fund jobs	<p>Senator PRATT: I was looking at the number of jobs forecast to be created from round 2 of the Modernising Manufacturing Fund. We've had confirmed that round 2 goes to 0.1 per cent of manufacturing businesses. When will round 2 investments be complete by? Ms Greenwood: Round 1 funding profile? Senator PRATT: Round 1 and round 2. Ms Greenwood: I can give you round 1. Senator PRATT: When will they be completed by? Ms Greenwood: They're currently due for completion in 2021-22. Senator PRATT: When do you expect the jobs flowing from that to eventuate? Ms Greenwood: We've had a couple of small projects already that have completed, so we're already beginning to see jobs flow from the initial—Senator PRATT: How many jobs by 2024? Ms Greenwood: I don't know that I have that figure. Senator PRATT: Okay. My understanding is that there are 2,600 jobs associated with round 1. Over what time period are those to be generated? Ms Greenwood: They were the jobs that were meant to be generated at the completion of the various projects that run across this program. For MMF 1, some of those projects run over a three-year period, or a three-year horizon. Some of them run over a shorter horizon. The job figures are those that come at the completion of those particular projects. Senator PRATT: And what date is that? Ms Greenwood: It varies by program. I'd have to look at—Senator PRATT: In general terms? Ms Greenwood: In general terms, small projects will finish earlier, so the small projects should take less time than the larger projects. I would still have to take on notice or look to get more for you to give you a strong sense of when they would fall. But we're seeing employment in the smaller projects completed. Over the next year, two years, two and a bit year horizon, we would start to see more jobs.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	42
60	BI-61	Louise Pratt	Modernising manufacturing strategy documents	<p>Senator PRATT: ... The priority areas of the modernising manufacturing strategy were identified in Labor's 2013 plan for Australian jobs. These documents are no longer available on government websites. Why were they taken down and when? Mr Williamson: We have no idea. We'll have to take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	45
61	BI-62	Deborah O'Neill	SME Export Hubs program	<p>Senator O'NEILL: Minister Cash has the opportunity to ask for clarification of these processes in her own time. My questions are not about a detailed repeat of the processes. I'm happy to receive that information that the Senator has asked for on notice. In the limited time that I have I want some clear and clean answers to the questions that I want to ask as a representative of the Australian people. Senator Cash: Senator O'NEILL—ACTING CHAIR: Minister, is this on the point of order? Senator Cash: It is an unfair question to put to the officials based on the fact that there is no consideration of which electorates the projects would be based or conducted, and in any event the hubs themselves don't service an electorate but a region, which in some cases could be a state. So perhaps it is worth Ms Kelly taking the committee through how this is actually determined. ACTING CHAIR: Thank you, Minister Cash. Senator O'NEILL: I think you have clarified the intent behind your question. Could I ask, though, that you don't interrupt officials while they're seeking to assist. If you're unsatisfied with the answer they give you, please of course feel free to ask as many follow-up questions as you wish, but don't interrupt them. Senator O'NEILL: Thank you. I will endeavour to do that. I am happy to take additional information on notice, but I am mindful of the time that we have allocated. I simply want a clean answer to my question as a matter of fact, regardless of the processes that you are going to provide for me on notice. Round 1 of the SME Export Hubs program saw nine projects and delivered \$4.4 million. Eight of those projects were in coalition-held seats—is that correct?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	46-47
62	BI-63	Deborah O'Neill	Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise	<p>Senator O'NEILL: The Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise was given \$839,000 as an export hub grant. I remind you again. Could you confirm if director Tom McVeigh is the brother of recently retired federal LNP MP John McVeigh? Senator Cash: No, I can't confirm that. Senator O'NEILL: In his inaugural speech, he did say thanks to his sibling Tom. Could you confirm that Stewart Morland, also a director, is the same Stewart Morland who donated \$24,400 to the LNP? Senator Cash: No, I can't confirm that. Senator O'NEILL: Would you take that on notice? Senator Cash: I could take it on notice, but I can't confirm it.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	50
63	BI-64	Perin Davey	Country-of-origin labelling submissions	<p>Senator DAVEY: We brought in country-of-origin labelling, which came into effect in July 2018, and at the time we committed to an evaluation of the reforms after two years. On 31 July this year, consistent with that promise to evaluate, we announced that the review would commence. I believe that submissions opened on 31 July and closed on 11 September. Can you give us a broad overview of how the review will be undertaken, how many submissions you may have had, and what areas of the country-of-origin labelling you're looking at? Mr B Wilson: The review is to look at the country-of-origin labelling program and changes that were made. It's looking at the impact of the program on those areas and how it's been delivered on the areas that are required to be labelled under country-of-origin labelling. The review also allows for stakeholders to raise other matters that they may wish to be considered by the review, including areas outside the current regulatory scope. We know that there are some sections of the community that are interested in matters relating to seafood, cut flowers and pork products—and there's a range of other issues that are well known. The evaluation will be conducted by Deloitte. That's the contract that's been let. The consultation process is staged. The period you refer to, July to September, was a general public submission invitation to allow everyone in the community an opportunity to put forward the issues they wanted to be considered. Deloitte will then undertake a series of targeted consultations, drawing on that feedback as well as what we know from other stakeholder interest groups who come to us or we know are particularly interested. That staged targeted consultation process will run from November to about January, with a view to having the evaluation completed by the middle of 2021. Senator DAVEY: Have you any indication at this stage how many submissions have been received? Mr B Wilson: I don't have that information on me. I could take that on notice for you.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	54
64	BI-65	Rex Patrick	Facility licence	<p>Senator PATRICK: I go to cost. You went through a consultation process in respect of cost. I've got the document here that talks about what you think is reasonable. People have to basically contribute considerable cost to get a permit. How long does a facility licence last for if you go through an application process? Dr Clark: Can we take that on notice? But I'm happy to answer any question on the cost recovery.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	63

65	BI-66	Louise Pratt	PPE report	Senator PRATT: The question was: when did you commission this modelling and how much was the tender for? Ms Urquhart: We undertook work with McKinsey as part of a broader stream of work. The work that McKinsey undertook was \$5.5 million in value. The services provided were between 6 April and 29 May. McKinsey & Company provided two key inputs to the work that we undertook in the department. They provided us with an integrated and risk adjusted perspective on demand and supply outlook for medical PPE over time, to support government decision-making and prioritisation. They also assisted us with supply chain analysis for non-medical PPE. Senator PRATT: So you've received that report—if it was completed in May. Can it be provided to the committee? Ms Urquhart: I could take that on notice?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	64-65
66	BI-67	Louise Pratt	PPE manufacturing contracts	Senator PRATT: Thank you. I note that Minister Andrews, during this period, talked about opportunities for local manufacturing. How do we track the extent to which that ultimate procurement was local or overseas? Ms Urquhart: So it was local producers and importers and their returns that were forwarded through to the Department of Health for its consideration as part of the process. You would have to ask the Department of Health on the current status of contracts of Australian manufacturers for the stockpile. What I can tell you is that the overall value of contracts with Australian companies prepared for Health was \$659 million for a range of products including ventilators, gloves, gowns and masks, but that represents a mix of Australian manufacturers and companies with manufacturing operations overseas. I do need to be clear about that. Senator PRATT: In that context, is there any way we could break down, in the value of those contracts, what was manufactured locally and what was manufactured overseas? Ms Urquhart: We would need to begin by asking the Department of Health, because— Senator PRATT: But would they have tracked that? Ms Urquhart: I don't imagine so, because I guess their first priority would be about sourcing the supplies in a timely fashion. Senator PRATT: So how do we know if— Mr Fredericks: I think we can take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	66-67
67	BI-68	Louise Pratt	Applications for Anti-Dumping Commissioner	Senator PRATT: Thank you, Ms Urquhart. I do have an understanding of the wide range of manufacturing capability in the health space. I'm able to conclude those questions now. I'm now going to ask some questions about the antidumping commissioner. Just while I wait for the appropriate official, I'll begin the opening part of my question. The antidumping system depends very heavily on the capability of the commissioner. It's a very critical appointment. In August this year, when Watermark Search International published the job advertisement for that role, how many applications were received and how many applications were short-listed and interviewed? Where is that process up to? Ms McCulloch: I don't know how many applications were received—I'd have to take that on notice; I don't have that information with me—but I can tell you that the process is ongoing. To date we have interviewed 11 applicants, but the process is ongoing.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	67
68	BI-69	Louise Pratt	Anti-Dumping Commissioner appointment panel	Senator PRATT: I do understand that. What I'm trying to work through is the panel that is assessing this. I would like to know what experience—and you can take this on notice—they have in the oversight of dumping provisions and their effectiveness. I want to know that the panel is able to make good judgment of who is recruited. Is that something you can take on notice, please? Ms McCulloch: We can take that on notice, but I would point out that this is a merit based selection process with clear criteria, clear job specifications, clear qualifications, and requirements are specified, and we're working with a recruitment agency to help inform us on that process. Mr Fredericks: I just want to be clear: that is a usual process. The usual process, and it's transparent, is to ensure that there are guidelines for the appointment and then assessments are made about candidates against those guidelines. Senator, you know that is the usual process in these instances. Senator PRATT: Thank you. Could I ask for some reassurance about whether consideration is being given to extending Mr Seymour's term, if there is not an optimal candidate with the qualities and experience required. Mr Fredericks: We're not at that point. Senator PRATT: You're not at that point? Mr Fredericks: I just want to be clear: we've been very generous in the evidence we're giving. This is a process that is ongoing, and, as I say, I think we've been generous in what we have given, but, at the end of the day, this is a process that needs to be seen through. We do not have the capacity to answer a question such as that.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	68
69	BI-70	Louise Pratt	Anti-Dumping Commission evaluation	Senator PRATT: I do understand. Each year, the Anti-Dumping Commission is evaluated under the Regulator Performance Framework. Is there anything in this evaluation or any other evaluation that's been undertaken that would indicate that the commissioner's performance is unsatisfactory? Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice.	Anti-Dumping Commission	28/10/2020	68
70	BI-71	Louise Pratt	Anti-Dumping Commission funding	Senator PRATT: The commission resourced funding levels for the last two years. May I ask how it compares to previous years? Mr Fredericks: We may have to take that on notice. Ms McCulloch: I have some numbers, so let me see if I can assist. For 2019-20, the budget is \$12.3 million. Senator PRATT: For 2019-20? Ms McCulloch: That's right. Senator PRATT: For this financial year, do you know what it's likely to be? Ms McCulloch: I think the forecast for 2020-21 is \$11.6 million. Senator PRATT: Why the decline in funding? I note that, since the commission first started, cases have increased. What's the extent of the increase? And does the department have a view about whether the workload of the commission has increased? Ms McCulloch: I'd have to take that on notice.	Anti-Dumping Commission	28/10/2020	68-69
71	BI-72	Deborah O'Neill	CDIC staffing	Senator O'NEILL: In terms of that staff split, how many were Defence? And how many were from your department and how many were contractors? Mr McIntyre: As of 30 September, we had 54 staff altogether in the CDIC, consisting of eight defence industry facilitators, who are Defence secondees, so they're employees of the Department of Defence, we have 15 defence advisers, who are a mix of contractors and APS staff employed by our department; we have two staff specialising in exports and major projects, which are Defence positions; and we have 28 support staff who are made up of a mix of employees of our department and contractors. I thought I had the breakdown of contractors and staff, but I don't appear to have that to hand. I'll take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	70
72	BI-73	Deborah O'Neill	CDIC job losses	Senator O'NEILL: In terms of the separation, as this relationship comes to an end, how many are going back to Defence? Are all of the Defence staff going back to Defence? Are any of your departmental staff going back into Defence? Ms Kelly: I think any questions in relation to the future capability required for the CDIC should go to the Department of Defence. They are all questions that they are currently considering. I suspect that they are in the very midst of considering the capability required going forward. As you would've seen from the report, it is actually different functions—some similar, but also some new functions—that will be delivered by the CDIC. The Department of Defence is currently working through the process of deciding what it will need to deliver those new functions that are described in the report. Senator O'NEILL: So there will be no job losses? Is that what I'm hearing? Ms Kelly: Really, that's a matter for the Department of Defence. What the Department of Defence has told us is that the process is not about job losses. The process is about creating the new function that's described in the review that we feel will better support defence industries and getting the capability that's required to support that. They're currently going through the process of determining what that is. Senator O'NEILL: I hear what you're saying, but that's not giving me any comfort in terms of the roles that exist and the people who are in the roles. I have no clarity about who's going where as a consequence of this break-up. Ms Kelly: As I indicated, the Department of Defence is currently working through that process. It would be my expectation that there will be more people required in the new service as it's established by the Department of Defence because it certainly is taking on an expanded role, as you would have seen from the review. But all of that is that really something that the Department of Defence is working through as we speak. Senator O'NEILL: If you can provide me with any further detail on notice to give me some clarity around that, that would be much appreciated.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	70
73	BI-74	Deborah O'Neill	Review into the CDIC	Senator O'NEILL: I want to go to the review into the CDIC. It notes that while in many respects the CDIC integration into the department of industry has been successful, the CDIC fails to leverage the department of industry's data, insights and evaluation capabilities. I point to the part of the review that states: "...many intended positive benefits of embedding the CDIC in DISER... have not yet been fully realised, particularly leveraging DISER's data, insights and evaluation capabilities. Ms Kelly: I think that we understand and, in fact, we share the frustration that we don't have better data about industry, particular defence industries, in Australia. We are at the beginning of a journey to do that. We're very keen and very committed to working with the Department of Defence to continue to improve the nature of the data that we have about the Australian defence industry and we can do better in future on that. That's my understanding of— Senator O'NEILL: You've indicated the willingness to accept the recommendation and to do the work that's required. Perhaps, on notice, you could provide some indication of how you're going to use the data insights and evaluation capabilities to improve the function of the CDIC. Ms Kelly: Of course, Senator.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	72
74	BI-75	Deborah O'Neill	CDIC advisors and facilitators	Senator O'NEILL: In terms of the Northern Territory, have you employed a business advisor up there? Mr McIntyre: I'll have to take the details on notice, but I understand that we now have a business advisor that's based in Darwin, yes. Senator O'NEILL: Okay. Because FIFO, as we do when we come here, is one thing, but you don't embed yourself in the community, and it's hard to find out about businesses when you're physically not in the space. Mr McIntyre: I understand. We have someone there now. Senator O'NEILL: Has the CDIC employed an industry facilitator in Tasmania where they're so desperate for jobs and proper training and reform of their education system? There's a whole lot of stuff down there. Mr McIntyre: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't believe we do have a facilitator in Tasmania, but I need to confirm that. What I would say is that we do continue to provide services in Tasmania, both, as you say, by flying in expertise when necessary, and remotely at the moment, as you can imagine. Many of our services have had to be delivered remotely in the past six months. Indeed, we've found that in many cases that's allowed us to reach more businesses with the same resources, because often, as it was, it had been necessary to spend time in travel. Thirdly, we have both facilitation—business facilitators, defence facilitators—and also business advisers. There have been times when the business adviser has been able to provide some of the support that would have otherwise been provided by a defence facilitator. So when you take all of those methods combined, we've continued to be able to provide services around the country, including in Tasmania.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	73-74
75	BI-76	Janet Rice	Coal seam gas wells	Senator RICE: Thanks very much, Chair, and thank you for accommodating my timing. Good to see you again, even if it's virtually, Dr Marshall, Dr Mayfield and Ms Zielke. I want to start with the study that CSIRO did on methane leakage from coal seam gas wells that was completed mid last year. Can you just tell me, because I wasn't able to find the statistic—and I wonder whether you've got it to hand—how many coal seam gas wells there are in Australia at the moment? Dr Mayfield: Senator, I couldn't answer that question; I'd have to take it on notice.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	84
76	BI-77	Janet Rice	Research on leakage rates	Senator RICE: I have a question for the minister: will you commit to having the government fund more research on leakage rates? Senator Seselja: I'd have to take that question on notice. Senator RICE: Do you think it's important? Senator Seselja: I wouldn't offer a particular opinion, but I'd be happy for the minister to, on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	85
77	BI-78	Janet Rice	GenCost	Senator RICE: You've acknowledged, though, that the price has come down. Going back to that time line, your updated costs for the GenCost process are out for consultation. What is your time line as to when you expect to release them? Dr Mayfield: In terms of GenCost, I think early in the new year is when the next version comes out. I'll have to confirm that for you.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	86
78	BI-79	Janet Rice	Advice on hydrogen	Senator RICE: No, I'm not asking you about another product. Sorry, but I'm running out of time. What I want to know is whether CSIRO, since the Hydrogen Roadmap, has provided any advice to the Chief Scientist or the hydrogen strategy group—yes or no? Dr Mayfield: When we engage with the Chief Scientist, we provide him with the most updated figures we have got, whether they are published or not, so we would have provided our most recent figures to the Chief Scientist when last requested. I don't have a time line of when that would have occurred. Senator RICE: Can you take that on notice—and what advice you provided the Chief Scientist on hydrogen cost. Similarly, what advice, if any, have you provided to the minister about the need for updated energy costs to compare blue and green hydrogen? Dr Mayfield: In terms of providing information to the minister, we have made our road maps and our GenCost reports available. So our published information has been made available. Senator RICE: Yes, but anything else? The whole point of this is that things have changed since your road map—and you have acknowledged that in your letter to Mr Bandt, and that the cost of green hydrogen has come down. Have you provided advice to the minister about that reduction in costs since the road map? Dr Mayfield: I'm not aware of any specific advice around electrolyser costs that we have provided to the minister. Senator RICE: Have you provided any advice to the department? Dr Mayfield: Through the department, we provide advice around hydrogen through the LETS work that's been done. So we would have provided information on costs there as well. Senator RICE: Can you take on notice what advice was provided to the department and when. Dr Mayfield: Yes, we can.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	87
79	BI-80	Louise Pratt	Cost of renewable hydrogen	Senator PRATT: I have an additional question on notice. Can you provide advice to me and perhaps Senator Rice about the manner in which the cost of renewable hydrogen has come down and any data to support that. Thank you.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	87
80	BI-81	Janet Rice	Labour hire contracts	Senator RICE: Can you take on notice the number of people who are employed under labour hire contracts, and update that since February. Senator PRATT: I have an additional question on that: will they be converted to ASL positions—if any of them will be? Ms Zielke: We'll take that on notice.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	88
				Senator O'NEILL: Thank you very much. You will probably recall that last week, on Wednesday 21 October, the Prime Minister said a number of things about digital tech. Not everybody listens to everything that the Prime Minister says, but I'm sure you would have been listening to that matter of interest to you. It was about digital tech innovation and was at the E-Commerce Summit hosted by The Australian newspaper. He said: in the first few weeks of lockdown, over 40 per cent of small and medium businesses bought or installed the software for remote working. Another 22 per cent said they were headed in that direction. You're familiar with those comments and that statement by the Prime Minister? Dr Cameron: I am. I don't have the speech in front of me, but I am. Senator O'NEILL: I can assure you that they are his words; I didn't make them up myself. Has the department, or have other agencies, put in place any initiatives or measures to assist SMEs with finding the right software for their operations? Dr Cameron: I think that would probably be best directed to the department. Mr Williamson: Sorry, that's more a question for our digital division, which departed several hours ago when the department finished. I apologise. I'm very happy to take that on notice, but I don't think we still have the officers here who can help you with that. Senator O'NEILL: Okay. Let's see how we go. I'll push through. Perhaps the department, if anyone else could help. Are there any incentivisation schemes for the adoption of software packages either for remote working or other business operations?			

				I'll push through, perhaps the department, if anyone else could help, are there any interdepartmental committees for the adoption of software packages either for remote working or other business operations like taxation, bookkeeping, payroll or marketing? Mr Williamson: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator O'NEILL: Is the quantum shift that the PM referred to happening entirely irrespective of government policy and programs, or can the government actually take some credit for the shift in 2020 that we've seen? Mr Williamson: I'll take it on notice. There are a number of digital initiatives that are in this budget and previous announcements, but I'd want to come back to you with the detail. Senator O'NEILL: Have you done any analysis of how much people are moving because the context has shifted and they're going out and resourcing themselves and undertaking that change, as opposed to claims of the government leading or driving this digital adjustment? Mr Williamson: I'll take it on notice. Senator O'NEILL: The PM also said last week that the government's focus is on: ... investing in the skills of Australians so businesses can get the skills from Australia that they need for their businesses to succeed and Australians of any age can get the skills that will put them in jobs and keep them in jobs well into the future, helping our businesses make the leap to a post pandemic world. The digital economy is central to these tasks, to creating the jobs that Australians need. The speed of change in the digital economy means that our training system needs to be fast and responsive. I'm sure, like all Australians, we're happy to hear those words. The question is: what's really going on? What is the department doing to improve the digital and ICT skills base of the Australian labour force? Mr Williamson: I'll have to take that on notice. I don't have the details with me of the budget announcements. There were a number of budget announcements around digital skills. The secretary might be able to assist me. It's not in my remit.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	102
81	BI-82	Deborah O'Neill	Digital tech initiatives				
				Senator O'NEILL: If can hark back to the evidence we had yesterday evening from Ms Carnell about whether the department would give a tick to the digital tools that would enable businesses to pay legal wages. As I recall, there was some dispute about whether the department was sufficiently enlightened to be able to undertake that kind of work. Where is the line between the things you've just been saying, "We're going to be doing all of this stuff", and then when it really matters for people who are employed to get their fair wages and small businesses who might have some degree of confusion who want to use a digital solution to do the right thing and stay within the law—manage their business properly—the department doesn't seem to want to take responsibility for making sure that they get the right gear. Mr Fredericks: I don't think that's a fair proposition. At the end of the day, a department like mine needs to provide advice on what the priorities should be. Yes, last night the small-business ombudsman had a view about what she thinks should be a particular priority for government expenditure in order to support business—Senator O'NEILL: Small business. Mr Fredericks: Yes, exactly, Senator O'NEILL: She's the government's interface with small business. Mr Fredericks: That's not right. She's the ombudsman, and that's her job. She's entitled to that view, and it's very proper, let me say, but at the end of the day, governments have to make priorities decisions between a range of other initiatives, and in this budget and for this purpose, based on our advice, the government has made these investments, as I say, based on the advice of this department. I do wish that the team that were behind these measures were here, because they could give them full light—Senator O'NEILL: I'm happy to take more detail on notice. Mr Fredericks: I will do that—I appreciate that—but it's their expert advice that these measures, targeted as they are to these particular issues are ones that will enhance the digital capability of business, and that's something I think we're all striving for. But I will take on notice the detail of each of those five initiatives. Senator O'NEILL: Thank you. And what is the baseline data or equivalent to baseline data that you're starting with in terms of your assumptions about where we are. Mr Fredericks: Yes, I understand the question. I'll take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	103
82	BI-83	Deborah O'Neill	Digital tools to support small business				
				Senator O'NEILL: One of the concerns I have is the siloed nature of government and the practical lives of Australians, who don't care about the silos. They just want the job to get done, and they expect, actually, that people in the different departments are talking to one another, so it is relevant that we have a workforce that's IT enabled. I'll push on. If you can't answer them, you can't answer them, and you can send it to the appropriate place to get a response. How many IT graduates does the department project our economy will need over the next five years? Mr Fredericks: Yes, I will take that on notice. Senator O'NEILL: And the next 10 years. Mr Fredericks: Yes. Happy to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	104
83	BI-84	Deborah O'Neill	IT graduates				
				Senator O'NEILL: How many IT professionals has Australia brought into the country over the past five years or 10 years, via our skilled migration program? Mr Fredericks: I'll take that on notice, but I'll be seeking advice for that from the Department of Home Affairs. We'll be joined up when we give you the answer. Senator O'NEILL: I'm sure that you've been joined up in conversations with leaders in the digital field. I've had conversations with Mike Cannon-Brookes on many media and in person, myself. They constantly are telling us about the huge workforce hole that they have and the inability to skill up people quickly enough to fill these gaping holes that exist across the digital sector. You'd be aware of that. Do you have any input into that in terms of policy? Mr Fredericks: I'll take that question on notice, and I will consult with Home Affairs in providing that answer. Senator O'NEILL: Is the department aware of the analysis done by Deloitte which indicates that, over the next six years, Australia will need 123,000 workers with undergraduate or postgraduate degrees in IT-related fields? Looking at our current trajectory, on 2018 numbers we'll produce only a fraction of that, 38,000 graduates, in that time, which is a projected shortfall of 83,000 qualified applicants for high-skill, high-paid jobs. Mr Fredericks: I'll take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	104
84	BI-85	Deborah O'Neill	IT professionals				
				Senator KIM CARR: She said that Dr Paterson had resigned as CEO of ANSTO slightly ahead of his term. He has decided to take a period of leave before formally finishing. I want to take you to that statement in detail. Did Dr Paterson resign or was he asked to resign by the board? Mr Jenkinson: As per the statement, our board chair, Dr Paterson, resigned and he is filling a period before his official departure at the end of the year. Senator KIM CARR: You'll be able to advise me as to whether there was any correspondence between the ANSTO board and/or the minister concerning his performance prior to the announcement of his resignation? Mr Jenkinson: I'd have to take that on notice, because that would be correspondence between the board chair and the minister that I'm not aware of.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	5
85	BI-86	Kim Carr	Correspondence regarding Dr Paterson and Performance				
				Senator KIM CARR: If I could then ask the acting CEO: were there any legal expenses incurred by ANSTO in the settlement of the terms of Dr Paterson's resignation? Mr Jenkinson: There would have been some legal expenses incurred, yes. Senator KIM CARR: How much? Mr Jenkinson: That information I don't have, but I will be able to get for you.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	6
86	BI-87	Kim Carr	Legal Expenses relating to Dr Paterson's Resignation				
				Senator KIM CARR: But the organisation has had to pay out the remainder of his term. Will you be able to provide on notice how much that is? How much are the legal costs? And the correspondence between the board and Dr Paterson—could you table all of that, please? Mr Jenkinson: We can take that on notice.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	7
87	BI-88	Kim Carr	Payment Amount to Dr Paterson				
				Senator KIM CARR: Was the minister involved in the removal of the CEO? Mr Jenkinson: Again, I'll have to take that question on notice.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	7
88	BI-89	Kim Carr	Whether Minister had involvement in Dr Paterson's Resignation				
				Senator KIM CARR: What was the recommendation of the Tune review on the role of the CEO and the ANSTO executives? Have you got that material? Is that available to you? Mr Jenkinson: I can ask one of my colleagues if they've got the information on that. We can take that on notice. There was a number of recommendations in the Tune review. ... Senator KIM CARR: I want to know specifically: what did the recommendations say about the role of the CEO and the ANSTO executive? What can you tell me about that? Mr Jenkinson: Again, I'll take that question on notice, because we need to get to the details. There was a lot of recommendations in the Tune review and I'm not prepared for that question today. I will come back to you with that information. ... Senator KIM CARR: Can you table the recommendations of the Tune review? Mr Luchetti: We can obtain them for you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	7-8
89	BI-90	Kim Carr	Tune Review Recommendations				
				Senator KIM CARR: We'll come back to that. It's just been drawn to my attention that I may have misheard you. Did you say Dr Paterson's term ended in March 2022? Mr Jenkinson: I think that's correct. I will check that detail for you. Senator KIM CARR: Can you tell me that? Mr Luchetti: I believe that's the case. Senator KIM CARR: 2022? Mr Luchetti: That is correct. Senator KIM CARR: I see. "Slightly short of his term" is grossly inaccurate. Who drafted the statement for the CEO chair? Mr Jenkinson: I'd have to find that information out. Senator KIM CARR: You don't know that? Mr Jenkinson: No. Obviously my role as acting CEO came in after these events, but I certainly can find that information out. Senator KIM CARR: You've got deputies there. Can anyone else help? Mr Jenkinson: Not regarding that specific question at this point, but we can provide the information for you.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	7
90	BI-91	Kim Carr	Details of drafting of statement				
				Senator KIM CARR: Can you table the recommendations of the Tune review? Mr Luchetti: We can obtain them for you. Senator KIM CARR: I'd like them tabled. Is that possible today? Mr Luchetti: I just need to take that on notice. The recommendations I'm looking for specifically are on the role. I obviously want the full recommendations. These issues were canvassed. David Tune is no slouch when it comes to administrative reviews. What about a full copy of the review? Mr Fredericks: We're very happy to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	8
91	BI-92	Kim Carr	Tune Review Recommendations Report				
				Senator KIM CARR: "Broadly aware"—that usually means that you picked up the rumour. Did you approach the department about it? Or did the department approach you? Mr Edge: Did we approach the department about it? Senator KIM CARR: Yes. When you heard the rumour there was going to be a review into your operations, that's what "broadly aware" means in public service-speak, Yes Minister-speak. In my experience, "broadly aware" means you heard a rumour that it was going to be a line in the budget. You said that the terms of reference detail hadn't been shared with you. But I take it you rang the department and said, "What's all this about? Is that how it worked?" Mr Edge: It was a bit more formal than that. We meet regularly with our colleagues in Canberra and we talk about issues that we're working on and issues that are coming up and about to be announced. Senator KIM CARR: What date was that? Did you write a letter? What date did you raise that with the officers? Mr Edge: We would have to take specific dates on notice. But there would have been some conversations about general issues with our colleagues in the portfolio department and others. A regular business for us is talking about what's happening in government.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	9
92	BI-93	Kim Carr	Clarification of Dates of Communication				
				Senator KIM CARR: When did you advise the agency that there was going to be a review into their operations? Mr Luchetti: I can't provide you with the date. There would have been discussions. As Mr Edge mentioned, we regularly talk to each other. When we became aware, as part of the budget deliberations, we would have spoken with our colleagues at ANSTO. Senator KIM CARR: When did you become aware? Presumably you were told, too? Mr Luchetti: That's right. I don't have a specific date. I could take that on notice if that helps.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	9
93	BI-94	Kim Carr	Date advised of review				
				Senator KIM CARR: When will the review be concluded? Mr Williamson: I'll have to take that on notice. That is not settled yet. Senator KIM CARR: How much money is involved? Mr Luchetti: I don't think the budget paper specified a number.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	10
94	BI-95	Kim Carr	Date of Review				
				Senator KIM CARR: There are a number of issues. There is the price you pay to a consultant to undertake a review. Then there's the cost of the review overall. There is normally a budget set for a review, which is not the same thing as the amount of money you pay to a consultant. I want to know what the amount of money is that has been set aside for this review. Mr Fredericks: We will provide you that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	11
95	BI-96	Kim Carr	Budget for Review				
				Mr Jenkinson: ANSTO represents Australia on the Generation IV International Forum. We participate in that forum to provide input and expertise around future developments in nuclear engineering and nuclear technology. It is a treaty-level arrangement and we represent Australia in that forum. Senator ABETZ: Are we working with any other organisation in developing what I understand are called Generation IV nuclear reactors? Mr Jenkinson: We participate in that committee as part of the development and understanding of technologies for Generation IV. We don't work with particular organisations to build a specific reactor. Senator ABETZ: Do we partner with any other organisations in that task? Mr Jenkinson: Yes, we do. Senator ABETZ: Can you name them, please? Or where do they emanate from? Which countries? Mr Jenkinson: We can take that on notice. There is a Generation IV International Forum website which lists the member states, but we can take that on notice for you.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	11
96	BI-97	Kim Carr	Generation IV International Forum - Organisations and Countries				
				Senator ABETZ: Do we have any specific arrangements with any organisations in the People's Republic of China? Mr McIntosh: We have some fairly inactive memoranda of understanding—Senator ABETZ: Sorry? Can you speak up, please? Mr McIntosh: We have fairly inactive memoranda of understanding with institutes in the People's Republic of China, but I'm not aware of any current work going on under those arrangements. Senator ABETZ: If you could give us a list on notice of those, that would be very helpful, and advise as to when those arrangements went into, for want of a better term, inactive mode? Mr McIntosh: I will take that on notice. Senator ABETZ: Thank you. Were we in any arrangements with any Chinese researchers or organisations as we sought to develop the Synroc technology? Mr McIntosh: Not that I'm aware of. Senator ABETZ: If you can take that on notice, that would be very helpful.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	11
97	BI-98	Eric Abetz	Generation IV International Forum – PRC				
				Senator ABETZ: Did you get such advice in relation to ANSTO's strategic partnership with the Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics? Mr McIntosh: That partnership was entered into in around 2012. I can check that on notice. It was entered into around 2012 or 2011, somewhere around then. I can take the precise date on notice. It was certainly entered into with the full knowledge of the Australian government. Senator ABETZ: So there was no collaboration after 2012? Mr McIntosh: That collaboration proceeded for a period. But, as far as I'm aware, it's no longer active. I will take on notice when exactly that was. I have taken on notice what—Senator ABETZ: If you can take on notice when it started and when it ended and the full details of that collaboration, that would be very helpful. Were SINAP members introduced to the innovation precinct that was under development at ANSTO? Mr McIntosh: No. Senator ABETZ: You might like to take that on notice. I have a document in front of me purportedly from ANSTO suggesting that CEO Adrian Paterson—I know that was some time ago; the predecessor—welcomed the agreement as it was consistent with ANSTO and Australia's interest in and support of generation IV reactor systems, in particular the MSR and TSMR systems; and that Dr Paterson introduced SINAP members to the innovation precinct, which is under development at ANSTO. You might like to take that on notice and provide us with a full explanation of that. That might then lead to other questions at another time. Thank you.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	12
98	BI-99	Eric Abetz	Partnership with Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics				
				Senator SHELDON: You had 12,000 normal doses that would go out. You said you imported some doses to cover that. What was the shortfall from 12,000 in comparison with the imports? Mr Jenkinson: I would have to give you a very specific number on notice. I can't give you that information. But it would not be anywhere the level of 12,000 because of the way that the prioritisation is done. Senator SHELDON: That means there would be quite a few people that were delayed in receiving their cancer treatment as a result of the incident? Mr Jenkinson: There would have been a number of people certainly delayed receiving diagnostic scans, and then potentially the associated treatment they then needed as a result of that diagnosis. That could have happened. Senator SHELDON: I appreciate to get a full figure would require some investigation. Do you have a rough estimate? Mr Jenkinson: I don't have a rough estimate. I think it would be probably wrong for me to give you a rough estimate. It is not going to be the correct number. I would prefer to work with the community and my colleagues. In terms of figures, it would be 50 per cent. I think we would have to work that up into what is an absolute number.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	13
99	BI-100	Anthony Sheldon	Lucas Heights Nuclear Facility - Dose Production Numbers				
				Senator SHELDON: Do you have an expectation for when this report will come back? Mr Jenkinson: I don't have a date on that at this stage. My colleagues—Mr Edge: It is being considered by government. That will take however long the government takes to consider it, I guess. We are ready to support our colleagues in the industry department and others in government with any questions or statements about that, but that's a matter for government. Senator SHELDON: Thanks very much. To the minister very quickly, do you have an expectation of when the report might be dealt with and come back? Obviously it's an extremely urgent matter. It's a significant report. Senator Hume: I can't answer that, but I can take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	15
100	BI-101	Anthony Sheldon	Date of Future Supply of Nuclear Medicine Report				

101	BI-102	Gerard Rennick	Chirped Pulse Amplification Technique	Senator RENNICK: Have you looked at the application, the technique, chirped pulse amplification, which uses laser pulses to transmute radioactive waste in order to reduce its half life? Mr Jenkinson: We'll take on notice that specific technique. I have a number of colleagues at ANSTO, waste management professionals and scientists, looking into waste management. I'm sure that we will be able to come back with a quality response.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	15
102	BI-103	Kim Carr	Risk Mitigation	Senator KIM CARR: Sure, but that's your advice. You'll say to me that that is advice to the minister. Senator Hume, what is the government's position in regard to the risk factor of changing the leadership of the ADC, given the international circumstances that we're facing with a global recession and a major disruption in terms of a trade war between the United States and the People's Republic of China? Senator Hume: I can't give you the details of the minister's thinking, but I can assure you that it would have crossed her mind and she would have considered this as part of the process. Senator KIM CARR: Can you take that on notice and get a detailed response as to what the minister was thinking? Senator KIM CARR: No, the response to that proposition. What risk mitigation is now going to be taken into account at the prospect of changing the leadership of the ADC at this time? Senator Hume: I could, but I am not entirely sure what evidence you are looking for. Senator KIM CARR: How the government is going to mitigate the risk? Senator Hume: I think the existence of the commission itself is evidence that it is mitigating the risk. Senator KIM CARR: No, it's about the leadership of the commission. That's the question here. Senator Hume: I think the appointment process will consider the importance of that position. Senator KIM CARR: If I could ask the deputy secretary—the Anti-Dumping Commission is evaluated under the Regulatory Performance Framework, is it not? Ms McCulloch: The answer is, yes, but I'd have to take on notice the detail. I'm not familiar. Senator KIM CARR: You will be able to tell me whether anything in that evaluation, or any other evaluation for that matter, that's undertaken by the department, the Department of Finance, the Department of Trade, or any other aspect of the government, that indicated the commissioner's performance had been unsatisfactory? Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	19
103	BI-104	Kim Carr	Regulation of Anti-Dumping Commission	Senator KIM CARR: How the government is going to mitigate the risk? Senator Hume: I think the existence of the commission itself is evidence that it is mitigating the risk. Senator KIM CARR: No, it's about the leadership of the commission. That's the question here. Senator Hume: I think the appointment process will consider the importance of that position. Senator KIM CARR: If I could ask the deputy secretary—the Anti-Dumping Commission is evaluated under the Regulatory Performance Framework, is it not? Ms McCulloch: The answer is, yes, but I'd have to take on notice the detail. I'm not familiar. Senator KIM CARR: You will be able to tell me whether anything in that evaluation, or any other evaluation for that matter, that's undertaken by the department, the Department of Finance, the Department of Trade, or any other aspect of the government, that indicated the commissioner's performance had been unsatisfactory? Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	19
104	BI-105	Anthony Sheldon	Increase in Dumping Numbers	Senator SHELDON: Thank you, Mr Seymour. I appreciate you just gave evidence to one question regarding there being a 177 per cent increase in cases. I understand that, from 2013-14 in comparison with 2018/19, there was a 35 per cent higher number of cases that were completed as well from the commission. Also, you've given evidence that over 50 per cent of the cases have been successful to date. I'm wondering if you'd be able to compare the number of cases that were conducted prior to the establishment of the ADC. Do you have these figures? Mr Seymour: Actually, we had a conversation about this very issue earlier today. Most of that information—in fact, I think all of that information—is contained in the annual reports of the former Customs and Border Protection Service. So, if I can take that on notice, we will do some research at this end and see how far back we can go. We may have some access to some information because routinely the function of anti-dumping has a reporting obligation to the World Trade Organization and I think we might find some data there. But it's a good question. I will take it on notice, if I can, and come back to you.	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	24
105	BI-106	Larissa Waters	Cloud Brightening Technology	Senator WATERS: Perhaps I need to understand a bit more about the nature of the expanded area and the technology. Can you outline for me some of the ecological risks associated with the cloud brightening trial and what you're proposing to do to manage those? Dr Hardisty: That's a pretty detailed program that's still under development. That part of the program—we're still working that out. Would you mind if I took that on notice and asked the actual researchers who are leading this at Southern Cross University to provide you a brief? Senator WATERS: Thank you very much. If you could take that, as you say, on notice, then the whole committee can get the benefit of that response. I'll ask a few other detailed questions, but if you need to refer to the folk that are actually conducting that trial, so be it. The RRAP webpage regarding the cloud brightening project says: Significant feasibility, engineering and experimental work is required, and regulatory and social licence issues must be addressed, before cloud brightening could be implemented. This is expected to take around 10 years. Putting aside the feasibility and the engineering work, which you might like to address in that question you took on notice, can you outline for me the regulatory and social licence issues that you anticipate will need to be addressed?	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	28
106	BI-107	Larissa Waters	APPEA Membership Fees	Senator WATERS: How much do you pay in membership fees? Dr Hardisty: I will have to take that on notice because my CFO is saying he doesn't have it off the top of his head.	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	30
107	BI-108	Larissa Waters	Base Funding for Scott Reef Project	Senator WATERS: Is the research on Scott Reef subject to any oversight by Woodside? Dr Hardisty: Oversight in what way? Senator WATERS: In terms of whether it can be released publicly or in terms of whether they get a sneak peek and might request any tweaks? Dr Hardisty: No. We don't engage in that. Our whole ethos is that we're objective. That's why they want to work with us: because they know that what we provide is completely objective and unfiltered by any view one way or the other. Senator WATERS: Could you please take on notice the level of funding over the last 10 years—your base funding? I heard what you said about CPI-ing but I'm interested in the indexation of your base funding.	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	31
108	BI-109	Peter Whish-Wilson	Scott Reef Project Partners and Environmental Groups	Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take on notice who the partners are? I understand there are fishing industry partners, APPEA, Woodside—I'm not sure who the other partners are but perhaps you could take it on notice. Are any environmental groups—Dr Hardisty: Sorry, Senator, Chair, I didn't hear that very clearly. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take on notice who those partners are, Dr Hardisty? I've got a rough idea who some of them are but I'd be keen to know who they all are. Dr Hardisty: We'll send you a complete list. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Were any environmental groups involved at the experimental stage in terms of the survey design, or were they partners in any of the research project? Dr Hardisty: Dr Hardisty: We'll send you the full list, Senator. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you confirm, though, whether any environmental groups were involved in the survey experiment stage—Dr Hardisty: I don't have that information to hand right now.	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	31
109	BI-110	Larissa Waters	InSAR subsidence detection for cultivated crops	Senator WATERS: Thanks very much, Geoscience, for being with us here today. I've just got a few questions about the—I hope I'm going to say this correctly—Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar, which is thankfully shortened to InSAR, so I'll just call it InSAR. I understand that is the methodology that you're using to measure subsidence for coal seam gas projects. A lot of land affected by CSG is farmland, ergonomic cultivated fields. Am I correct in saying that InSAR currently cannot provide baseline data for cultivated fields? Senator Birmingham: Your question wasn't all perfectly clear, but hopefully the officials—Dr Johnson: I'll paraphrase the question just to make sure that I've got the understanding. You're asking whether, specifically in cultivated land, InSAR can detect subsidence? Senator WATERS: Correct. Dr Johnson: I'll go to my colleague Alison Rose. Ms Rose: We actually use satellite positioning and radar data to be able to get a vertical land movement measurement capability that's able to detect changes in land height within centimetre accuracy, so it enables government and businesses to make informed decisions. In terms of your particular question, are you asking about subsidence and uplift of landmass, or are you talking particularly about cultivated crops? Senator WATERS: I'm talking about cultivated crops, because obviously my concern is the impact on productivity from coal seam gas and water impacts. I'm interested in how we detect baseline levels in order to then measure subsidence and whether your InSAR methodology can actually be used to establish a baseline on cultivated farmland. Ms Rose: I'd need to defer to some of my subject-matter experts, particularly on cultivated lands. But I can confirm that, in terms of the use of interferometric SAR, we have a long and rich history of radar data and positioning data so that we can actually create baselines and determine change over time. Obviously, we can't see into the future, but we can determine, through the use of InSAR technologies, a difference in uplift or subsidence within the landscape. Senator WATERS: On cultivated land? Ms Rose: I'd need to confirm that. I need to take that question on notice.	Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	35
110	BI-111	Larissa Waters	Advice from department regarding InSAR accuracy	Senator WATERS: Has Geoscience provided any advice to the environment department or the Independent Expert Scientific Committee on coal seam gas and large coal mine development, regarding any qualifications around the accuracy of InSAR for cultivated land? Ms Rose: I'd need to take that question on notice. Senator WATERS: Thank you. Would the approval conditions or the provisions of the water monitoring and management plans used for InSAR data as the trigger be appropriate for cultivated fields? Ms Rose: I'm sorry; I missed the last part of that question. Senator WATERS: If there are any approval conditions or water management and monitoring programs that use InSAR as a trigger, would that be appropriate for cultivated fields? Dr Johnson: Again, I think we'll have to take that on notice, because it's predicated on the answer to your first question. Senator WATERS: Indeed; thank you. That's really the chief area that I'm interested in at this stage, so I will await your responses on notice. Thanks very much.	Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	34-35
111	BI-112	Matthew Canavan	Expenditure for North West Shelf Study	Senator CANAVAN: Are we doing any other work outside of Exploring for the Future to do research on our oil and gas resources in Commonwealth waters? Dr Johnson: Yes, we are. Dr Heap: Yes, we are. We've just completed a big study on the North West Shelf to look at the deep sections, which haven't traditionally been targeted by the industry, to open up a new frontier there; that's Triassic players, to use the geological term. That's based on the Dorado discovery that happened a few years ago. We've tried to map that out across the whole of the North West Shelf, or a large portion of it anyway. Senator CANAVAN: How much are you spending there? Dr Heap: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't know the exact answer to that.	Geoscience Australia	29/10/2020	38-39
112	BI-113	Anthony Sheldon	Ranking regarding National Resource Investment	Senator SHELDON: Can you take us through where we're ranking against other countries for resource investment? Mr Quinn: I may have to take that on notice. I don't have the most recent Fraser Institute results in front of me.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	40
113	BI-114	Anthony Sheldon	Global Offshore Resources Strategy—New Export Markets	Senator SHELDON: The global offshore resources strategy promises to unlock new export markets. What new export markets for resources has the government facilitated opening since the adoption of the resources statement in 2019? Mr Trotman: To answer your question, the government has actively been promoting existing contacts with our north Asian trading partners—Japan, China and Korea. We're looking to develop opportunities in India. Former minister for resources undertook a number of visits to India previously. There are also great opportunities in South-East Asia. These are the sorts of markets that we will be targeting as part of the strategy. Senator PRATT: Can you confirm any new markets from the work so far? You said existing and potential. Mr Trotman: I'd probably have to take that on notice. I can talk about countries. Senator PRATT: Can you tell us about any of the wins that you've had where a new market has opened up since this—Mr Trotman: New markets open up all the time for various companies. What we're talking about is a broader, macro scale. As I said, we'll be working very closely with our partners in Australia and also the department of foreign affairs to identify where those market opportunities might be. Senator PRATT: Have you had any breakthroughs since 2019? Mr Trotman: I'll take that on notice. What I can possibly do is come back to you with a number of names of companies that have entered into new markets. Especially, I think, you could argue that the resources sector has been holding up very well over the past six to nine months during COVID and has been holding markets. It's probably developed new markets as well. I'll take that on notice and come back to you, if that's okay. Senator SHELDON: What is the current and projected value of exports to these markets to the Australian economy? I gather that you're going to take that on notice, too? Mr Trotman: I'll take that on notice. I'm not exactly sure which countries you are talking about. Senator PRATT: The ones that you have identified as targeted for new export markets. Mr Trotman: Again, I'll take that on notice because I don't have that information in front of me in terms of the existing trade values with those countries and the prospective trade values. Senator SHELDON: Mr Trotman, it would help us to understand. An announcement is made that there's a strategy; there are new export markets and a statement is made in 2019. During the short time that I've been here, the first thing, rightly, that a department would want to do—and I'd expect it of a minister as well—is proclaim all the successes that they're having. Can you tell us of any success that you've had on the basis of the questions that we've asked so far, or are you taking them all on notice? Mr Trotman: Certainly, I won't take them all on notice. Senator SHELDON: Please don't tell me that it's the vibe. Senator PRATT: Tell us the story of a win that you've had somewhere. Mr Trotman: If we point to critical minerals, with the establishment of the Critical Minerals Facilitation Office, we've had a number of developments with companies that are trying to break into new markets, be they in the United States, Germany, France or Korea. Again, I'll probably have to take it on notice in terms of naming those companies and providing extra information. Definitely, in the critical minerals space, we see the greatest potential moving forward from traditional markets, which have been in iron ore, coal and LNG. As I said in my previous answer, the sector has been holding up remarkably well; it will continue to hold up remarkably well and it will provide the impetus for the kick-start to the economy as we progress through the current COVID crisis. Senator PATRICK: In terms of naming companies, those companies would be under disclosure obligations, so what would be the harm in naming those companies? Is it just because it's got a commercial name or feel about it? Mr Trotman: There's stuff that's in the public domain in terms of prospective opportunities for companies like Lynas in the United States. Again, with respect to listing all of the companies, I don't have that information in front of me. We could perhaps talk about it in further detail, if there are further questions around the operations of the Critical Minerals Facilitation Office. My colleague Ms Jessica Robinson could talk about some of those opportunities that we're working on. Mr Fredericks: Senator, to assist you and the other senators, in fairness to you, we'll come back to you on notice with as much information as we possibly can, on a company by company basis, on the expanded markets that have occurred since 2019. The evidence from the officers is that that has been the emphasis of the work that the department and government have been doing—assisting companies to develop those markets. In fairness, we should come back with that information. On top of that, obviously, inferentially, that will mean we'll also come back with any information we have on broader markets that have been targeted more generally. We'll take that on notice, but we understand the inquiry and we'll come back with as much detail as we can.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	41-42
114	BI-115	Anthony Sheldon	Resource Data Strategy	Senator SHELDON: I understand that. In the resource data strategy, as I've mentioned, at page 37, it states 'improve information transparency to build community trust'. Can you explain to me what the problem was before with data transparency and community trust? I'm still not clear about what the problem was and I'm still not clear—my apologies—for what the rectification is or what we're trying to rectify. Mr Trotman: I haven't been involved directly in the work of that working group; so I think I would have to take that on notice. But in terms of, I guess, where the question—Senator SHELDON: So you don't know what we're trying to improve. Mr Trotman: No, I wouldn't say that. All I'm saying is that in terms of the precise detail of the data that the group is looking at—and it doesn't have, I guess, community buy-in—I can't distinctly point to what particular data.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	43
115	BI-116	Anthony Sheldon	Achievements of Resource Data Strategy	Senator SHELDON: How might you describe the sorts of achievements that the resource data strategy has delivered to date? It's one of those measures and goals things. Mr Fredericks: Perhaps I can just say that it's clear that what the officials have said is that that data strategy is a work in progress and, importantly, it is a work in progress under the auspices of the COAG Energy Council. That includes, obviously, state energy ministers as well across the country. There's a clear time line for the next piece of work, which is a presentation of that basic data to and decisions for senior officials. So I think, in fairness, it is a work in progress. It hasn't been developed yet. It is being done under the auspices of resources ministers across Australia and there's a time line for how that goes forward. Senator SHELDON: Would you be able to share with us, now or on notice, the time line and what's been met along the time line so far? There's a time line of events: here's what's been met and here's what's been pushed out. Some of it may have been done quicker—and I'm not suggesting one way or the other. Mr Fredericks: We're very happy to take that on notice. Mr Sullivan: We're happy to take that on notice. Just in terms of the problem, to re-emphasise the issue and the difficulty of the issue, this has been a work in progress across multiple governments for over two decades. This goes back to original first ministers' discussions in the early 1990s trying to get this right in terms of metadata standards, transfer, ownership, what should be in the public domain and how transparent it is. There have been a number of attempts to do this and to do it comprehensively. In terms of progress against this, this is difficult work. The metadata standards across trying to bring cultural and heritage data together with biodiversity data and geophysical data in a spatial context that is in this century, where the metadata is understood and transferable and where there is transfer of data between jurisdictions that can be seamless and that can be used for spatial interrogation across multiple sectors for multiple purposes, is not only a Holy Grail for Australia but also a problem that it's affecting a lot of countries. There are steps that are being taken now to make sure that we're still heading in the right direction. The end point of this, in terms of a resources data strategy to bring together those fields, will take time. I think Geoscience Australia is the best place for that to happen but we're happy to come back on notice with respect to what progress has been made. I just want to reinforce that this has been an issue that has been facing governments and the private sector as well as community groups for over two decades.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	44

				<p>Senator PATRICK: I don't like the word 'underspend' in these circumstances, because it is all a very big cost to the taxpayer. For anyone listening, the Australian government is in charge of an FPSO off the coast of the Northern Territory. We are paying something like \$5 million a month just to have a vessel sitting there doing nothing. We'll get to the circumstances of how we arrived there. Is the monthly cost around \$5 million a month? Ms Gillies: We don't have a static monthly cost. Senator PATRICK: Just roughly. Ms Gillies: I would have to take on notice average amount. Some of our expenditure has been a one-off payment—for example, our oil spill memberships and our insurances—whilst others are milestone-based, and then we have some static monthly costs. The \$75.344 million covers this current financial year and February to June of the last financial year. I won't do some quick maths for you, but it is roughly about \$75.344 million divided by 16 or 17 months.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	46
116	Bi-117	Rex Patrick	Monthly cost of floating production storage and offloading (FPSO) Unit				
			Monthly Maintenance Cost of floating production storage and offloading (FPSO) Unit	<p>Senator PATRICK: So how much has been spent on maintenance? Ms Gillies: I would have to take that on notice. The \$60.32 million is inclusive of maintenance. Senator PATRICK: I understand, but I'm trying to separate those out. Ms Gillies: I can certainly take that on notice and get you a breakdown of the maintenance works.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	46-47
117	Bi-118	Rex Patrick					
			Value of \$4.5 Million Spend	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. Can you also provide to the committee how you establish that the \$4.5 million, or thereabouts, represented value for money for the taxpayer— Ms Gillies: I can take that on notice. Our job has been, in the interests of the Australian government and the people, when we acquired legal title to this under the operation of the law, to do everything we could do to discharge our proper obligations. Part of that was to engage with Woodside. We understood all the history to that and the irony, as you said. But at the end of the day our obligations were to discharge the responsibilities that we now have as the legal titleholder and contract in a way with Woodside which was in proper compliance with the procurement guidelines of the Commonwealth. We are satisfied that we have done that. Senator PATRICK: Part of my frustration here is the lack of foresight from the department; I'll come to that later and perhaps from NOPSEMA.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	47
118	Bi-119	Rex Patrick					
			Material state of Northern Endeavour Vessel and Report	<p>Senator PATRICK: What's the material state of the Northern Endeavour? It has been shut down for some time. Ms Gillies: Could you be more specific? Senator PATRICK: My understanding is that there are perhaps some proposals for an exit pathway out of this. You have just mentioned that one of them is to have the whole thing decommissioned. I understand that others are looking. In the KPMG report there was an indication of a potential buyer or someone who would take over the vessel. When you leave things just sitting there, particularly at sea, and then try to start them up again, there can be a significant cost and ordeal to that. That's the context in which I ask: what is the state of the vessel? Ms Gillies: When we took possession of the facility earlier this year, there was that critical backlog of maintenance issues. We are working through that. Improvements have been made to primary and secondary structures. There are utilities, lifting equipment, power generation and electrical systems. If you would like further information, I can take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: NOPSEMA did a report into the state of the vessel; I remember seeing a survey report, perhaps not necessarily through the committee. I presume that you would have a state of the vessel and a schedule of work. Can you provide that to the committee, please? Ms Gillies: I can take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	47-48
119	Bi-120	Rex Patrick					
			Indicative cost of Northern Endeavour Decommissioning	<p>Senator PATRICK: What is the order of magnitude of the cost for decommissioning the well? Ms Gillies: That work remains ongoing. Senator PATRICK: Numbers have been thrown around in the media of up to \$200 million. Mr Fredericks: Senator, you will appreciate that we can't give that evidence now. I know the question you raise but, at the end of the day, we will have potentially a commercial negotiation on our hands in relation to what you're talking about— Senator PATRICK: With all defence contracts, you lay out a band of what cost of the project is, and that doesn't undermine commercial operations. Mr Fredericks: Understood. Senator PATRICK: I presume that you're not going to just sole source this back to Woodside—I would hope not—and reward them again. Mr Fredericks: Understood. As the witness said, we are working on exactly that piece of work and in due course, we'll make a decision about our capacity to make that more generally available. Senator PATRICK: Is that an unrealistic number—a couple of hundred million dollars? Mr Fredericks: I don't think we can answer that question. If you like, we'll take it on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	48
120	Bi-121	Rex Patrick					
			Historical Value of Australia's fossil fuel exports	<p>Senator McKIM: I'm not interested in gold. I'm just interested in metallurgical coal, thermal coal and LNG. Mr Campbell: Okay; I can talk to those. Metallurgical coal exports fell to 35 billion in 2019-20 as prices fell. Metallurgical coal exports are forecast to fall a little further in 2020-21 to 23 billion but are forecast to partially recover to 28 billion in the next financial year as prices and volumes lift. Thermal coal exports dropped to 20 billion in 2019-20 but are expecting a partial recovery to 17 billion in 2020-21-22. That's driven, again, by some slow gains in prices and a strong recovery in volumes as the global economy recovers. LNG exports are expected to fall to 31 billion in 2020-21 from 48 billion last financial year. That's largely due to the weaker prices which are linked to lower oil prices generally speaking. Senator McKIM: Thank you. Could I just ask you to take on notice, please, how that relates to two years ago in those categories? Mr Campbell: Yes, I'm happy to do that. I don't have those historical tables in front me.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	49-50
121	Bi-122	Nick McKim					
			Country Coal Export Forecasts	<p>Senator McKIM: In terms of quality, are you suggesting that quality is why you're projecting Australian coal exports to be pretty much the only ones in the world that will grow and that exports from countries like Indonesia, Russia and South Africa will stay flat? Is that a quality issue. In your view? Mr Campbell: Certainly, quality is a relevant factor for some of the purchasers. A good example would be if we talk about limitations that some countries are putting in place. When you have a higher calorific content in your coal source, you're more likely to be attractive, when you fit within a physical volume quota. In those terms, again, Australia performs relatively strongly compared to other coal-producing nations. Senator McKIM: In the real world, where Japan's coal imports, for example, have declined by seven per cent this year, that has hit Australian imports hard, while Russian and Indonesian exports into Japan have stayed firm. How does the quality argument play out when you look at what's actually happening in the real world? Mr Campbell: All of our forecasts are based on our existing sales lines to these countries and the IMF forecasts that we underpin with those. As I say, we're not going to quality as a driver; it's a relevant factor for some of the purchasing nations, but, fundamentally, it's the principles of our existing trade relationships, the growth in Japan and their appetite for particular types of coal. It's going to be different for different markets. As I say, unfortunately, I don't have the country by country breakdown in front of me, I can certainly take it on notice and see whether there's anything more I can unpack for you on that.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	51
122	Bi-123	Nick McKim					
			International Resource Announcements in Upcoming Report	<p>Senator McKIM: Okay; thanks. Things are moving very quickly in this space. I'm sure we can agree on that. Since your September quarter report, our two biggest customers of thermal coal—that is, KEPCO in South Korea and JERA in Japan—have committed to exiting coal. Will you be incorporating those announcements into your next quarterly report? Mr Campbell: Our next report will probably be due around mid-December. We'll be taking into account a range of factors, including major announcements. Senator McKIM: Would that include the South Korean Green New Deal that will see 14 gigawatts of solar and wind installed over the next two years? Mr Campbell: It may. I'm not close enough to the underlying figures to comment on it blow by blow. I'm sure my colleagues that are looking at these issues in some detail will be taking account of these factors; absolutely. Senator McKIM: Could you take those questions on notice and provide any response to the committee?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	52
123	Bi-124	Nick McKim					
			Proportion of Gas Exporters	<p>Senator PRATT: What proportion of Australian gas exporters in the eastern states that are connected to the gas grid over here does that represent? Mr Trotman: I might have to take that one on notice. I don't have that information with me.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	57
124	Bi-126	Louise Pratt					
			Company Control	<p>Senator PATRICK: Mr Waters, can you just perhaps take on notice, to assist—you said the problem was identified in 2015? Mr Waters: Yes. Senator PATRICK: What representations were made to government in respect of this potential problem over time from 2015 onwards? Mr Waters: I should note that when we first raised the concern about change of company control it would not have been about the two titles that you've been talking about. Senator PATRICK: No, I understand. It was general. Mr Waters: It was another transaction. It was more general about the concern over being unable to provide a level of scrutiny where there was a change of company name. Senator PATRICK: That's exactly what I'm after. I'm not specifically after this. There was a problem identified. I'd like to know what representations were made—when and to whom and the substantive position that was put—if you could go through your records and provide that on notice, please. Mr Waters: Certainly, I am happy to do that.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	62-63
125	Bi-127	Rex Patrick					
			China Coal Export Data sets	<p>Senator CANAVAN: How recent is the data that you have in terms of coal exports to China? What's the last month that you know of with reliable data? Mr Campbell: I'll have to take on notice the latest data set that we have.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	53
126	Bi-125	Matthew Canavan					
			Job estimates for 2020-21	<p>Senator McALLISTER: What are the job estimates for the 2020-21 financial year? Mr Trotman: I'd have to take that on notice. There are a lot of numbers and decisions that would have to take place in the course of the next 12 months. It would be difficult for me to predict.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	64
127	Bi-128	Jenny McAllister					
			Job Numbers Stemming from 13 Government Measures	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Mr Fredericks, may I ask one final question. I appreciate your attempt to assist. It's an easier one than asking for specific jobs numbers. Of the 13 measures referred to by Mr Sullivan, which of them will deliver actual jobs to Australians in 2020-21 or 2021-22? Mr Sullivan: Perhaps we should go through all 13 measures then. Senator McALLISTER: We probably don't have time. If you just— Mr Sullivan: So in terms of— Senator McALLISTER: Just name them. Just name them. Just name the ones that will deliver. I don't want a description of the measure. I just want you to name those ones that you expect will deliver jobs in the near term, by which I mean the next two financial years. Senator Birmingham: I'd advise that Mr Sullivan go through the measures. Mr Sullivan: All the measures contribute to putting downward pressure on price as well as supply, and they will support jobs. So I just want to make that point rather than just the individual measures. With respect to heads of agreement across likely supply, delivering strategic basin plans, continued work through CSIRO, accelerating consultation and certainty around potential gas reservation, as well as state and territory government energy emissions-reduction state deals, the state deals will deliver jobs in the short term. The strategic basins—as I have given evidence—will deliver jobs. Whether they deliver inside the two years that you put on that, I'd have to take that on notice to see whether that projection fits that time frame. My indication is I think it will. In terms of the second component around the different streams of activity under the gas plan, which is efficient transportation and gas generation, as I have already given evidence now to two committees, the national gas infrastructure plan interim report is designed to be given to government in the end of the first quarter next year and will identify projects that have jobs associated with it in the two financial years. Whether that's delivered by a private investment or whether that's facilitated through Commonwealth investment, whether that is underwriting or direct support, is a matter for government. But in terms of those job numbers, that is part of that national gas infrastructure plan. In terms of the acceleration work on pipeline regulatory reforms, that underpins keeping downward pressure on prices. As I gave evidence before, there has been a 54 per cent reduction 12 months second quarter to 12 months second quarter. Keeping pressure on that will deliver jobs because gas is an incredibly important part of the cost structure for a number of Australian businesses, particularly SMEs. Senator McALLISTER: Mr Sullivan, I might— Mr Sullivan: In terms of the secondary pipeline— Senator McALLISTER: Mr Sullivan, I'm going to pull you up there. I did say—I Mr Sullivan: Sorry, the number of times where I have tried to get through the whole package of measures across two committees now has been pretty limited—and Senator McALLISTER: You directed me not to ask questions about this package the last time we spoke. Mr Sullivan: No, I directed— Senator McALLISTER: And it's on that basis that I came back this afternoon. Mr Sullivan: I requested that you— Senator McALLISTER: My colleague, Senator Watt, has questions about northern Australia. And as it happens, the information that you're providing now is of not a great deal of value, to be very honest—if you were able to provide that information on notice. I do feel obliged, given the time constraints, to go to my colleague. Senator Watt: I did provide an opportunity to nominate which of these dot points— Senator Birmingham: In the interests of time, Mr Sullivan can provide further information on notice. I think Mr Sullivan was being directly relevant in answering your question, which asked about which projects would see jobs delivered over the next couple of years. He was identifying it project by project, working through. He didn't have time to go through the whole 13, so he will address the rest on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	65-66
128	Bi-129	Jenny McAllister					
			Australian Energy Update 2020 – Figure 2.3 Interpretation	<p>Senator McKIM: I've got a couple of questions for the department in regard to the Australian energy update 2020 and, specifically, a really great graph—figure 2.3 on Australian natural gas flows. I want to test if my interpretation of this graph is correct. Is it the case that this graph shows that the biggest domestic consumer of gas in Australia is actually the LNG industry itself, with about 7.5 per cent consumption of total gas supply, and that the LNG industry actually uses significantly more gas in Australia than the entirety of the manufacturing sector in Australia, which used just 6.6 per cent of the gas that Australia produced in 2018? Mr Sullivan: I don't have that report in front of me, and I don't have necessarily the specialist staff because they— Mr Fredericks: Strictly this question falls into outcome 2 in our portfolio, which is the energy outcome, rather than outcome 1.3, which is the resource outcome. I know that's not an easy distinction, but we can very happily take it on notice. Senator McKIM: I would like you to take it on notice, please, and I appreciate that.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	71
129	Bi-130	Nick McKim					
			Basin Selection Process	<p>Senator McKIM: Can you ask that you provide the committee on notice with a précis of the process that you will go through to choose the other three basins? Mr Trotman: I'm very happy to do that. Senator McKIM: Can you also provide on notice the total projected reserves contained in all of the basins that are being considered for inclusion in those remaining three basins? Mr Trotman: I'll do my best to get that to you, Senator. Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice. Mr Trotman: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	71
130	Bi-131	Nick McKim					
			Seismic Inquiry – Cause and Effect Pathway	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: You did say there were no requirements for this chemical-warfare-agent dump site to be addressed. In the current plan it says there is no established cause and effect pathway between [inaudible] and CWA dump sites. Is there no established cause and effect pathway because there have been no studies on this? Or is that just what the Department of Defence told you? Mr Grebe: There's probably quite a long answer to this, which we might get to discuss in the seismic inquiry, if we're called. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes, I'm happy to do that, or you can take that on notice if you'd prefer to do it that way. Mr Grebe: The simplest answer for here and now, and given that you asked, is that there's no potential for physical interaction. A seismic survey releases air bubbles, bubbles of air, from a compressed air gun, so it doesn't actually involve explosions or any physical interaction anywhere near the seabed. These munition sites are in extremely deep water, and seismic surveys operate right near the surface, probably the distance of a kilometre through the water column, so there's just no physical reaction potential.</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	74
131	Bi-132	Peter Whish-Wilson					

132	BI-133	Kim Carr	Departmental processes regarding Anti-Dumping	1. Did the Department submit proposals to the Minister for reform or restructuring of the Anti-Dumping Commission in 2019? 2. If so, a) On what date were they submitted? b) What was proposed? c) Are these proposals still under consideration? d) Has the Minister indicated whether she would consider further proposals? 3. Did the Department distribute an Anti-Dumping Survey on 26 August 2020? 4. If so, a) To whom was it sent? b) How many responses were received? c) Will these responses be published? And if so, when? 5. Is the Department's evaluation of the International Trade Remedies Forum still underway? If so, when will it be completed? b) Will the evaluation be published?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
133	BI-134	Kim Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission Operations	1. Since the ADC was established, in what percentage of cases have duties been imposed? 2. How does this compare with cases conducted prior to the establishment of the ADC? 3. Does the Commission expect there will be overproduction of certain products and/or intermittent dumping when markets come in and out of lockdown? 4. Is there a risk of increased dumping and circumvention activity in next 12-18 months? 5. Does the Commission have sufficient staff and other resources to cope with an increase? 6. Onsite exporter verification activities of the Anti-Dumping Commission were suspended on 20 March 2020. Does this suspension continue due to travel restrictions, etc? 7. Is there a plan for adjustment as limitations are reduced in future?	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
134	BI-135	Don Farrell	Manufacturing Announcement in Budget	1. Do all of the grants programs have grant guidelines that are readily available to the public? 2. Who is the decision-maker for these grants or funds? How is the decision-maker assisted in making their decisions – departmental advice, an advisory group, some other independent body? 3. Were there any new grants programs or funds established in the 2020 Budget or the July update that your department is responsible for? 4. If so, what are they, and how much funding was provided? 5. For the new grants programs, have grant guidelines been developed? Where are they up to at the moment? Will you be consulting with the Department of Finance on these guidelines? 6. For the new grants programs, who will be the decision-maker for the grants? How will the decision-maker be assisted in making their decisions, will it be departmental advice? An advisory group? Some other independent body? 7. For the new funds, how will funding be distributed? 8. For the new funds, who will be the decision-maker for the funding? How will the decision-maker be assisted in making their decisions, will it be departmental advice? An advisory group? Some other independent body? 9. How will the decision making process ensure grants go to projects based on merit, and not whether they are in a marginal or target Liberal seat? 10. Will the Department be having regard to the sports rorts scandal to ensure that is not repeated? 11. What assurance can you give that this will not be another sports rorts scandal – and that projects will be funded based on their merit and not where they fall on the Prime Minister's colour coded spreadsheet? 12. Where there any grants programs or funds that you administer that were provided with additional funding in the 2020 Budget or the July update? 13. If so, what were they, and how much funding was provided?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
135	BI-136	Don Farrell	Management Advisory Services and Tenders	1. When the Department puts out a tender, what does "management advisory services" encompass? 2. We have seen contracts awarded for large sums, tens of millions of dollars – why do management advisory services cost this much? 3. On the 7th of April this year, a contract was published - CN3671300. It awarded \$33 million to the Australian Industry Group. What was this tender for and why was it awarded to the Australian Industry Group?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
136	BI-137	Don Farrell	Rio Tinto Loan	1. Could you please explain what the loan of \$137 million to Rio Tinto Aluminium as referenced on page 127 of the Department's most recent annual report was for? 2. Was the loan offered by the Department or was it sought by Rio Tinto? 3. Is it common for the taxpayer to provide interest free loans for multinational firms? If so can you provide a list of other companies that have received interest free loans? 4. Are you aware that Rio Tinto are currently in discussions with the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment to cease their contribution (approx. \$2m pa) to the operation of the supervising scientist that monitors the environmental impacts of the Ranger uranium mine? 5. Do you think it would assist these negotiations by letting the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment know that you have provided Rio Tinto with this interest free loan?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
137	BI-138	Don Farrell	Australia's TEA Ranking	The Portfolio Budget Statements refer to Australia's ranking in the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor indicator of total early-stage entrepreneurship activity (TEA) falling to 12th out of 25 OECD countries (Budget Related Paper No. 1.9, p. 44). 1. Why is this slide happening? 2. What are the economic consequences of this slide? 3. What initiatives are being undertaken to improve Australia's TEA ranking and the underlying issue of a decline in the proportion of new businesses founded by a member of the adult Australian population? 4. What reviews have been undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of existing measures designed to address this issue?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
138	BI-139	Don Farrell	Australia's Global Innovation Index (GII) Ranking	The Portfolio Budget Statements refer to Australia's ranking in the Global Innovation Index (GII) worsening in 2020, with Australia now ranked 23rd on the GI (Budget Related Paper No. 1.9, p. 45). 1. Why is this slide happening? 2. What are the economic consequences of this slide? 3. What initiatives are being undertaken to improve Australia's GI ranking and address the areas of weakness highlighted by the GI 2020 report? 4. What reviews have been undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of existing measures designed to address this issue?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
139	BI-140	Don Farrell	Administered and/or Discretionary Grant Program/s	1. Please provide, for all administered and discretionary grant programs administered by each Department and Agency within the portfolio for FY 2019-20 to date: a) Name of the administered or discretionary grant program. b) The recipient of the grant. c) The ABN or ACN of the grant recipient. d) The charitable status of the grant recipient. e) Who authorised the grant payment? f) For each year of the budget and forward estimates: i) What is the total funding budgeted for the program? ii) How much funding has been contracted and allocated? iii) How much funding has been contracted but not allocated? iv) How much funding has been committed but not contracted? v) How much funding is uncommitted, uncontracted and unallocated?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
140	BI-141	Don Farrell	Advanced Manufacturing Facility	1. The Budget contains a measure to provide \$5 million this year to establish an Advanced Manufacturing Facility in South Australia to "facilitate the manufacturing and assembly of electric vehicles". Has this money been allocated to anyone yet? Will it go to tender? 2. What will the Facility do to facilitate electric vehicle assembly and manufacturing? Can you provide details? 3. Has the Government appointed people to run the Facility? If so, who? If not, what assurances can Australians have that you will conduct a transparent appointment process?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
141	BI-142	Don Farrell	Role of the Anti-Dumping Commission	The Minutes of the International Trade Remedies Forum (9 July 2019) <a href="https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-01/international-trade-remedies-forum-meeting-outcomes-and-action-items-9-july-2019.pdf">https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-01/international-trade-remedies-forum-meeting-outcomes-and-action-items-9-july-2019.pdf</a> saw the Anti-Dumping Commissioner respond to a question about whether the Anti-Dumping Commission was sufficiently funded: "The ADC had achieved significant operational efficiencies through reforms to its investigation model. While this had enabled the Commission to handle an increased case load, there may be limited capacity to absorb a further increase in demand, or further reduce case timeframe" 1. Did the Government consider boosting the funding available for the Anti-Dumping Commission following this advice from the Commissioner? The Productivity Commission has previously noted a cyclical upswing in actions against dumping typically occurs during softer economic conditions (for example, previous peaks in activity were observed during 1991-92 (economic contraction and the Iraq war), 1997-98 (Asian Financial Crisis), 2001-02 (bursting of the dotcom bubble and September 11) and following the Global Financial Crisis and in the soft economic conditions that have been prevalent since). 2. Does the Government recognise that the COVID-19 pandemic has created risks of a global oversupply of products and the potential for intermittent dumping to displace Australia industry? 3. If yes, does the Minister/Department believe the anti-dumping commission has a role to help protect domestic industry against these challenges? 4. Would it not have been prudent to provide extra funding for the anti-dumping commission to deal with a potential spike in applications for anti-dumping duties?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
142	BI-143	Don Farrell	Anti-Dumping Reforms	I understand from previous estimate hearings that the initial round of consultations occurred between 24 August 2017 and 14 September 2017. The second call for submissions ran between 13 and 27 October 2017. And on 31 May 2018, Minister (Cash) confirmed she had been presented a package from the Department, which was being considered by the Government. On 9 July 2019 Minister Andres explained to the International Trade Remedies Forum that her Office had not been able to progress the policy reforms given the timing of the Federal election. The Minister mentioned that there was now a need to re-consult on the reforms to ensure they remained current. The Minister noted that this consultation would be conducted in a timely manner and that it was important for stakeholders to take the opportunity to inform the Minister of the key concerns experienced by their sector. Subsequently ITRF members were contacted on Tuesday, 20 August 2019 and asked to comment on the reforms, welcoming feedback by 9am on Monday, 2 September 2019 with the email noting that "The Minister is not considering adding new elements to this package of reforms as this could unreasonably delay consideration of these important proposals." Then on 26 of August 2020, an Anti-Dumping System Survey was provided by the Department under the guide of The Australian Government being conscious of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Australian businesses and consumers. And the need to better understand these impacts where they relate to Australia's anti-dumping system. The survey in addition to asking about the proposed 2017 reform package asks about several other aspects including which "broader public interest considerations could be incorporated into the anti-dumping system" The survey labels the 2017 reforms as "Previous reform ideas" and asks, "Are these reforms still relevant?" 1. Was a reform package provided to the Minister after the 2019 consultations of them? 2. Is the Department aware that it is still the position of the Minister to not add new elements to this package of reforms as outlined in 2019? 3. Who was the 2020 survey sent to and who responded to the survey? 4. Where is the reform process up to now?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
143	BI-144	Don Farrell	International Trade Remedies Forum (ITRF) Evaluation	The department is conducting an evaluation of the International Trade Remedies Forum (ITRF). 1. Where is this process up to?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
144	BI-145	Don Farrell	Digital Readiness Assessment Tool	The 2020/21 budget papers refer to \$3.0 million allocated to "develop a Digital Readiness Assessment tool to help businesses self-assess their digital maturity and provide them with, and to support leaders of Australian organisations to improve their digital literacy and decision making" (BP 2, p. 66, Cross Portfolio). 1. How do you determine digital readiness? How do you benchmark or test digital literacy in the business community? 2. What sort of programs and policies will this funding actually go towards and what is the expected return on investment for the Australian taxpayer? 3. How was this amount of funding determined as appropriate to adequately address this issue? 4. Who was consulted about this funding level and who will design the assessment tool? 5. Can you take us through some of the existing measurements and findings on overall digital literacy in Australia? 6. How many businesses are estimated to benefit from this assessment tool? 7. What is the expected or conventionally used criteria to assess digital maturity?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
145	BI-146	Rachel Stewart	PPE production	1. What is the current Australian manufacturing output of N95 respirator masks and other essential PPE? 2. Given that we're seeing devastating COVID-19 numbers in many parts of the world which produce Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), what are the Government's plans to scale up this production to ensure that Australia is continually able to access our needs without being impacted by the rest of the world? 3. How does the Government plan to build in surge capacity for the production of PPE, should it be necessary?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
146	BI-147	Don Farrell	Women in STEM	The budget papers list \$25.1 million allocated to "establish a Women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Industry Cadetship program to support 500 women working in STEM industries to complete an Advanced Diploma through a combination of study and work integrated learning experiences" (BP 2, p. 67, Cross Portfolio). 1. What initiatives are already in place to try and encourage more young women into STEM? The budget papers also list \$14.5 million allocated to "extend or expand existing initiatives that support girls and women to gain STEM skills and capabilities, including the Women in STEM Ambassador, the Women in STEM Entrepreneurship Grants Program and the Girls in STEM Toolkit" (BP 2, p. 67, Cross Portfolio). 2. What are these existing initiatives? Are we measuring whether they are working? 3. How many ambassadors and entrepreneur recipients have we had so far? 4. How was it determined that this was an appropriate amount of funding given the ongoing, chronic issue of women being underrepresented in STEM industries and professions in Australia? 5. What reviews have been undertaken to evaluate the performance of these existing initiatives that support girls and women in STEM, and what were the findings of those reviews?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
147	BI-148	Don Farrell	Digital Skills Finder	The budget papers refer to \$2.5 million to "support an industry led Digital Skills Finder Platform to enable Australian workers and small to medium enterprises to easily find digital skills training courses for reskilling and upskilling in digital literacy" (BP 2, p. 66, Cross Portfolio). 1. How do you think Australia is travelling on digital skills – generally speaking? 2. Can you define for us what are "digital skills" – beyond coding and related computer language expertise – what do actually need here? 3. Where does Australia currently sit compared to say OECD economies? 4. Adequately self-sufficient or too much reliance on importing these skills? 5. What consultations were undertaken in developing this new digital skills initiative? 6. What process was undertaken to scope the size and nature of the issue being addressed by this initiative? 7. How was it determined that this was an appropriate amount of funding and/or an appropriate initiative to address the skills gap within the technology sector in Australia? 8. What are the targets set for evaluating the success of this initiative? 9. What has been the quantum of importing digital skills into Australia via the skilled migrant program, say over the last 5 years? 10. How many digital skills courses are available in Australian tertiary education already? 11. What do they tend to cost per course? 12. How many graduates of Australian based tertiary digital skills qualifications have we had over the past 5 years? 13. Is there capacity for our existing uni and TAFE digital skills training courses to take on more applicants immediately?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
148	BI-149	Don Farrell	Whyalla Steel	1. The Budget contains a measure to provide \$15 million this year to support an upgrade of steel processing and galvanising capability in Whyalla. Has this money been allocated to anyone yet? Will it go to tender? 2. Will the recipient be required to abide by the Government Procurement-linked Payment Times policy - i.e. to receive government funds they need to pay their small suppliers within 20 days?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
149	BI-150	Don Farrell	Blockchain	1. What sort of programs and policies will this funding actually go towards and what is the expected return on investment for the Australian taxpayer? 2. How was this amount of funding determined as appropriate to adequately address this issue? 3. Who was consulted about this funding level and the design of the pilots? 4. Why does the Government want to see the take up of blockchain by Australian businesses? What exactly are the benefits? 5. Will the pilots be subject to benchmarking or quality control?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
150	BI-151	Don Farrell	COVID-19	1. When did the CSIRO first become aware of the potential impacts of Covid-19? 2. Did you brief the Prime Minister or any government ministers about the potential impact? If so who and when? What was the nature of this advice?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written

				1.The ASL cap has recently been lifted for the CSIRO. By how much? Was this as a result of a request by CSIRO? 2.(If yes) Is this more, less or the same as requested? -and- What prompted the request? 3.How does CSIRO intend to utilise the additional ASL? 4.Will more staff be employed? If yes, how many? In what scientific areas? Please provide a breakdown. On notice if not answered 5.What type of positions will increase the most? Scientists? Engineers? Laboratory technicians? Support staff? Please provide a breakdown. 6.Will there be more growth in early-career positions, mid-career positions or more senior positions? Please provide a breakdown. 7.Will some workers currently engaged through labour hire or contractors, instead be directly employed by CSIRO? If yes, how many? In what areas? Please provide a breakdown. 8.How will CSIRO determine work of an ongoing nature and convert these workers to more secure, employed positions? 9.In an answer to a question on notice (AL-67 Senator Kitching) you have said there was an overall reduction in headcount of 131 between 1st July 2019 and 1st of March 2020. How has the headcount changed from March until now? 10.It was reported recently that there were 200 job losses from the CSIRO. Can you give further details eg- any forced redundancies, what area/s were affected? 11. At the last Estimates you stated that there were 263 people on labour hire. How many are currently on labour hire? 12.In the latest annual report it states on page 120 that "The apparent reduction in headcount and full-time equivalent staff from 2018-19 to 2019-20 can largely be attributed to a change in our preferred mechanism for engaging short-term staff (from casual and term contract, to labour-hire), as well as term contracts coming to an end in line with the completion of projects." Why is labour hire now the preferred mechanism for engaging short-term staff? 13.According to the latest annual report, headcount is down by 596 over the last twelve months. How many of those are due to labour hire and how many due to project completion? 14.Research scientists/engineers and project staff headcount has dropped over 6.5% since 2015/16 yet management position headcount has increased by over 31% over that same period. Why is there an increase in management while a decrease in your core business?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
152	BI-152	Don Farrell	CSIRO External Funding	1.CSIRO's own-source income – the majority of which is external revenue from industry partners – is reduced by \$154 million, or 25% (in percentage terms), in 2020-21 compared to 2019-20. What is the major contributor to the loss of external revenue this year? 2.Which sectors and industries are you expecting the biggest decline in investment from? Please provide a breakdown. 3.In the following three years (2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24), external revenue is only forecast to gradually recover and not get close to the external revenue received by CSIRO last year. Why is that? 4.Does this slow recovery of R&D investment into CSIRO reflect forecasts for declining business R&D investment in the Australian economy overall? If yes, are you concerned about this? Are there other things we should be doing in our economy to boost R&D investment from business?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
153	BI-154	Don Farrell	ASL and Headcount	Please provide a table outlining ASL and headcount by financial year from 2016-17 onwards. Please provide this for the: a)Total organisation; b)by functional area; and c)by site.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
154	BI-155	Don Farrell	Scoping Study	1.The Budget notes a "scoping study with ANSTO on its governance and commercial arrangements. The expenditure for this element is not for publication (nfp) due to commercial sensitivities". What type of matters will this scoping study consider? 2.Why is this commercially sensitive? 3.Will the scoping study include options for privatising, outsourcing, or putting certain functions out for tender? 4.The Budget also provides \$81.6m for decommissioning activities. Is this in preparation for the removal of waste to a new national facility? 5.Can you give us an up to date snapshot of current waste storage capacity? 6.Will the storage facilities need to be expanded even if the Minister, under his existing powers, nominated a site today? 7. Are there any immediate safety concerns regarding the ongoing storage of radioactive waste at Lucas Heights until a site is established?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
155	BI-156	Don Farrell	Recent Incidences	1.It was reported in the media last week that there was a fault at Lucas Heights recently that interrupted the supply of molybdenum-99. What happened? 2.How did this affect cancer screenings and other procedures that use this isotope? 3.Has supply returned to pre-incident levels? 4.How does this incident differ from the one in September that saw 2 workers exposed to radiation doses above the statutory levels? 5.What is that status of those workers now? Have they returned to work? 6.It was reported that rural and regional areas were expected to "bear the brunt of the shortage." Why? 7.Are you providing ongoing reports to the government about the disruptions that have occurred over the last couple of years? What work is being done to ensure nuclear medicine services aren't continually disrupted? 8. In your submission to the COVID-19 inquiry you referred to the challenges related to getting supplies from overseas and transporting supplies across the country due to limited commercial flights. Has there been any work done by ANSTO and/or the Government to assess the long-term financial impacts of Australia not having a reliable nuclear medicine supply; the costs associated with having to transport supplies from overseas; and the loss to the economy by not being able to produce materials for both the Australian and overseas markets?9 The Government funded a business case to look at long-term nuclear medicine supply in Australia. Has the Government been presented with the business case; when will a decision be made on progressing the business case; and would the Government agree progressing the business case has been made more urgent by the impacts caused by ongoing disruptions due to incidents at Australian facilities?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
156	BI-157	Don Farrell	Commissioners Record	1.In a newspaper article in 2018 you're quoted as saying that for investigations into anti-dumping and countervailing since the ADC was established duties have been imposed on about 55 per cent of cases (including after appeals etc), is this still the situation approximately 55% success rate after the commencement of a formal investigation into applicants claims since the ADC was established? 2.How does this compare to cases which were conducted prior to the establishment of the ADC, do you have those figures?	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
157	BI-158	Don Farrell	Commissioners Role and Staff Retention	1.You are the inaugural commissioner can you outline your role and the expertise that you have developed over the journey including your work in international forums? 2.Is it fair to say that, stakeholders whether they be Australian manufacturers, importers, foreign exporters, potential circumventors of Anti-Dumping duties, foreign governments etc know what approach they are going to get when dealing with you and your team which is a vigorous, independent application of the legislation without fear or favour? 3.Regarding your team, have you had a stable group of investigators over time regarding retention and particularly in more recent years? 4.Are you proud of your team, the work they do and what they have been able to achieve over the last 7 years or some since the Commission was established? 5.Has retention been impacted at all by the decision of the Government to advertise for the Commissioner position and are there any risks from your point of view? 6.Have you applied for that position? 7.Would you be open to continuing in the role as Commissioner if at the conclusion of that process it's determined by the Government, for whatever reason that it is not the optimum time for a change in leadership of the Commission	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
158	BI-159	Don Farrell	International	1.Does the Commission's expertise get called on when it comes to DFAT or others defending Anti-Dumping investigations conducted by other jurisdictions against Australian exports, i.e. Barley and Wine	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
159	BI-160	Don Farrell	Capacity	According to various Regulator Performance Framework Self-Assessment Report Submitted by The Anti-Dumping Commission... Compared to 2013-14 in 2018-19 completed cases by the Commission averaged 35% higher than 2018-19 compared to 2013-14 for cases? (Also, any differences between complex cases and less complex cases) 1.Minutes of the International Trade Remedies Forum, June 9 record you are saying: "The ADC had achieved significant operational efficiencies through reforms to its investigation model. While this had enabled the Commission to handle an increased case load, there may be limited capacity to absorb a further increase in demand, or further reduce case timeframe"- can you expand on this?	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
160	BI-161	Don Farrell	Forecasts for demand of Anti-Dumping services	The Productivity Commission has previously noted a cyclical upswing in actions against dumping typically occurs during softer economic conditions (for example, previous peaks in activity were observed during 1991-92 (economic contraction and the Iraq war), 1997-98 (Asian Financial Crisis), 2001-02 (bursting of the dotcom bubble and September 11) and following the Global Financial Crisis and in the soft economic conditions that have been prevalent since. 1.Are there any distinct risks that the Commission is aware of, for example overproduction of certain products and/or intermittent dumping when markets come in and out of lockdown determining economic activity is uncertain? 2.Do you think there is a risk in an upswing of dumping and circumvention activity in next 12-18 months and, in your view- how well is the Commission equipped to respond to any increase from a personnel perspective (given you may not be there) and from a resource perspective? 3.For example, what happens if there is an increase in demand for Anti-Dumping services amongst Australian industry? From a personnel perspective (there's a chance that when there is an upswing in cases that you won't be there) and also from a funding perspective (noting your previous concerns about the limited capacity the Commission has to absorb a further increase in demand) what are the risks?	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
161	BI-162	Don Farrell	Operational – COVID-19 restrictions on international travel	1.I understand onsite exporter verification activities of the Anti-Dumping Commission (the Commission) were suspended for all cases until further notice, effective today (20 March 2020), I take it this suspension continues due to travel restrictions etc? 2.Onsite verification has been an important feature of the Commission's work, particularly in recent times - What challenges have the change of policy brought, what solutions have been implemented and what is the plan for the future as limitations are reduced in the future?	Anti-Dumping Commission	29/10/2020	Written
162	BI-163	Kim Carr	CSIRO Operations	1.During the pandemic since February, can you list the divestments that have been made from the CSIRO. 2.Do the increases in Government funding for 2020-21 fully offset the expected declines in revenue over the forward estimates? 3.When considering expenses not requiring appropriation in the budget year are excluded, does the increase in Government funding still fully offset the expected declines in revenue? 4.Does the funding provided to the CSIRO over the forward estimates fully cover the estimated 5.7% decline over the forward estimates? 5.How much of the revenue decline do you anticipate is from a loss of revenue from industry, State Governments, and Commonwealth sources? Can you please provide a breakdown? 6.In the context of the global pandemic and the estimated revenue shortfall: a)What specific areas of science does the CSIRO believe they need to build capacity in? b.Are these areas they can build capacity in, under current funding arrangements? 7.Noting that the staffing cap hasn't actually been "lifted" (budget paper 4), it increases this year and next year, then there is a steep decrease to pre-pandemic levels; what is the future of the average staffing levels (ASL) in the forwards and beyond?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
163	BI-164	Kim Carr	Resignation of Dr Paterson	1.On what date was Dr Paterson's resignation received? 2.On what date did the ANSTO Board discuss Dr Paterson's resignation? 3.On what date was the Minister briefed on Dr Paterson's resignation? 4.Were there any legal expenses incurred by ANSTO in the settlement of terms of Dr Paterson's resignation? 5.How much and over what period? 6.On what date was legal advice first sought? 7.Is the matter concluded and no further legal expenses expected to be incurred? 8.Was it necessary to increase the offer of the pay out to Dr Paterson's Contract? 9.What was the payout in terms of months? 10.Can you provide a full copy of the Tune review into ANSTO? 11.What process will ANSTO follow for appointing a new CEO? 12.Has this process commenced?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	Written
164	BI-165	Larissa Waters	Beetaloo Strategic Basin Development Plan	Prior to the 2020-21 Budget, the government had already allocated \$8.4M to a Beetaloo Strategic Basin Development Plan 1.How much of the previous allocation has been spent to date? 2.What has it spent on? In particular, has any money been spent on: a) a feasibility study for a pipeline to the basin? b) any other economic or technical assessment for infrastructure relating to the basin? 3.Has the balance of previous funding been included in the Strategic Basins funding announced in the Budget? Regulatory conditions set by the NT government require all emissions from the Beetaloo project to be offset. Some estimates suggest compliance with those conditions could cost billions of dollars annually. FOI documents indicate that officials warned the Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction that "Emissions from development of onshore shale gas in the Northern Territory may be difficult to offset and could impact on Australia's progress in meeting Paris Agreement commitments". 4.In the last estimates, your Department advised that the NT government and the Commonwealth were still working on the offset policy detail. Is that still the case? 5.Will any of the funding for the strategic basin go towards developing a clear offset policy? How will it address concerns that offsets will be difficult to secure? 6.Has the Commonwealth government agreed to fund the offsets? 7.Has any analysis been undertaken of the impact of requiring companies to pay to satisfy strong offset requirements on the attractiveness / economic feasibility of the projects? 8.Why is the government funding strategic plans prior to finalisation of an offsets policy? 9.Is all onshore gas now exempt from paying Petroleum Resource Rent Tax? If so, will Origin or other producers within the Beetaloo basin pay PRRT to the Commonwealth in respect of oil deposits?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
165	BI-166	Malcolm Roberts	Global CO2 measurements	Senator ROBERTS: Could you, please, send me the inflexion points? I want to see the data, please, because from what I have seen from global atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, they have continued to rise relentlessly, despite no inflexion whatsoever. I would like to see how much and when? Is that clear, Dr Mayfield? Dr Mayfield: What we'll provide you is with the Cape Grim record, which is the continuous record of the CO2 content in the atmosphere. Senator ROBERTS: That's CO2 at Cape Grim. Can you give me the global? Dr Mayfield: As I said, CO2 is a gas that mixes well across the globe. There are minor variations but, overall, it is a very good indicator of the time series of CO2 measurement. Senator ROBERTS: Could you show me the global levels? I want to know how much it's changed and when? Dr Mayfield: As I said before, that work is done periodically through the Global Carbon Project; they report annually. We will provide you some of that work as well as the Cape Grim measurements.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	79-80
166	BI-167	Larissa Waters	NAIF Board	1.Under new governance arrangements for the NAIF, is it proposed to have a government representative on the board? 2.If so, who will this be and what measures will be implemented to ensure the independence of decision-making is maintained?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	29/10/2020	Written
167	BI-168	Alex Gallacher	National Resources Statement 2019	1.Page 40 of the National Resources Statement 2019 commits the Government to a Roundtable with industry to boost tertiary and VET outcomes for the sector. But in the Resources Statement Update 2020 – Page 4 – the 'Next Steps' is to convene a Roundtable on a resources workforce strategy. a)Has the Roundtable ever met? b)Why has this Roundtable been delayed? c)Is there a determined membership of the Roundtable yet, and if so, who is on it? 2.Action 1 of the National Resources Statement (Page 27) was to "deliver the most globally attractive and competitive investment destination for resources projects." a)Where does Australia rank against other countries, for resources investment? 3.The 'National Resources Statement' commits to a Global Offshore Resources Strategy that will unlock New Export Markets. a)What new export markets for resources has the Government facilitated opening since the adoption of the Resources Statement in 2019 and for what resources? b)What is the current and projected value of these exports to these markets to the Australian economy?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written

168	BI-169	Alex Gallacher	ADGSM and Gas Reservation Issues Paper	<p>1.The Budget Papers 2020-21 – page 116. The section is called ‘JobMaker Plan – gas-fired recovery.’ It promises around \$52 million to unlock the gas supply and empower gas customers. But there’s no mention of a Gas Reservation policy. a)Why is Domestic Gas Reservation not included in the 2020-21Budget? b)Why is the ADGSM not included in the Budget? It was just recently reviewed by the Department – were there no improvements that could be funded in the Budget? 2.On Page 5 of the Gas Reservation Issues Paper, the Department quotes the Productivity Commission from its March 2020 report - it says “domestic gas reservation schemes can reduce returns to investors and discourage investment in gas exploration and extraction, leading to higher prices in the longer run and imposing net costs on the community.” a)WA has a domestic gas reservation policy – doesn’t that state, on average, have lower gas prices than the east coast? b)Please disclose evidence that the WA domestic gas reservation policy has discouraged investment in gas exploration and extraction. 3.The Australian newspaper ran a story on the Gas Reservation Issue Paper, in its October 28 edition. The story includes a comment from a respected oil and gas analyst from Credit Suisse, Saul Kavonic: “A prospective reservation policy is unlikely to impact pricing materially for at least the next five to 10 years, in our view.” a)Assuming there’s a gas reservation policy ready to replace the ADGSM in 2023, it could be between 2028 and 2033 before industry gets certainty of gas supply and price if Credit Suisse is correct. Is that a valid interpretation? b)Has the Department modelled what effect on jobs and investment a 10-year delay in domestic gas reservation would cause to manufacturing? 4.The Australian Domestic Gas Security Mechanism was introduced in 2017 to “to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of gas to meet the needs of Australian consumers” . But it ends in 2023. a)What’s the plan for the gap between expiry of the ADGSM and a gas reservation policy? b)Has the Department considered fixing the ADGSM so it works? Doesn’t a new gas regime create more uncertainty for gas users? 5.In its 2020 Interim Report of the Gas Inquiry, the ACCC says, on page 6: “LNG producers collectively sold 18 LNG spot cargoes into international markets at prices substantially below domestic gas price offers” at the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020. a)Why would domestic gas prices be higher than export prices? b)If this situation is due to interstate demand, does that mean there is insufficient supply to the domestic market? Does that reflect a lack of liquidity/elasticity in domestic demand? 6.The ACCC’s Interim Report of the Gas Inquiry (p.6) also says the difference between low export and high domestic prices raises questions about competition in the east coast gas market. But the supply of gas on the east coast is guaranteed by a Heads of Agreement signed by just THREE large gas exporters. a)To what extent does the reliance on THREE gas producers perpetuate competition problems? b)The current Heads of Agreement terminates at the end of this year – in what ways will the subsequent Heads of Agreement be different to the one it replaces? 7.The 2020-21 Budget Papers – on Page 116 – lists a ‘JobMaker Plan – gas-fired recovery’ and includes \$10.9 million in this financial year, “to reset the East Coast gas market, including developing a National Gas Infrastructure Plan, work to establish Wallumbilla as the Australian Gas Hub, improving pipeline regulation and empowering gas customers.” a)Does this initiative address competition problems in east coast gas? If so, can you explain how this \$10.9 million will be spent to “empower gas customers”? b)The National Gas Infrastructure Plan is due to be released at the end of the first quarter 2021 – will it include modelling of jobs created from the gas-fired recovery? 8.The Department reviewed the efficacy of the ADGSM in 2019 and the findings were published in January 2020. Page 5 of the Review, Recommendation Number 3: “the review recommends amending the ADGSM’s guidelines to include referencing the ACCC’s LNG netback price series in estimating a potential shortfall.” This references the fact there is no mention of gas PRICE in the ADGSM. a)When will the ADGSM be updated to include the price of gas? 9.The Australian Energy Market Operator’s Gas Opportunity Statement of 2020 predicts “projected shortfall of gas supply on peak winter days in the southern states from 2024, unless more southern supply sources are developed, or pipeline capacity limitations are addressed.” a)The shortfall is forecast in the year after the ADGSM finishes – what succession plan does the Department have for the end of the ADGSM? b)What is being done about the southern gas supply and pipeline limitations? 10.Core Energy prepared a paper for AEMO in 2019 which forecast Delivered Wholesale Gas Prices for Residential and Commercial users between 2020 and 2050. The report says on Page 9 that WA gas prices will be lower than the east coast over the next 30 years because of WA’s domestic gas reservation policy. a)Has the Department modelled a domestic gas reservation scheme based on the WA policy?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
169	BI-170	Alex Gallacher	NOPSEMA Announcements and Policy	<p>1.Your website announces that NOPSEMA has new draft guidelines for Offshore Project Proposals (OPP) and recently-revised guidelines for Environment Plans (EP). You’re asking for submissions on OPPs and EPs. a)What is wrong with the current Offshore Project Procedures? b)What is not working with the Environment Plans? c)What changes to OPPs and EPs would NOPSEMA like to make? d)How many submissions does NOPSEMA receive when it asks for public input on a proposed project? 2.NOPSEMA issued a Policy note on 7 September, 2020 – it covered regulatory compliance monitoring, enforcement and intervention for offshore oil pollution incidents. Page 4 spells out that under section 576B of the relevant Act, NOPSEMA – if there’s an offshore incident - can direct a petroleum company to do certain things, but also, NOPSEMA can take action itself and then charge the company for the costs. a)What deficiencies or problems does this policy resolve? b)What criticism has industry made of this power? c)The policy note also clarifies search and seizure powers for NOPSEMA officers. Why was this required? 3.In its latest issue of its corporate magazine “The Regulator”, NOPSEMA says it has responded to the Department’s review of the Northern Oil and Gas Australia administration by “taking steps to ensure that inspection processes and practices are reviewed and appropriately modified.” a)Could you outline what NOPSEMA will change in its approach to end of life and decommissioning issues such as presented with the Northern Endeavour? b)Are there any legislative changes that would allow NOPSEMA to better respond to situations such as the Northern Endeavour administration?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
170	BI-171	Rex Patrick	Titles and Northern Endeavour	<p>1.What’s the current status of the titles that were held by Timor Sea Oil and Gas Australia / Northern Oil and Gas Australia? 2.What options are available to the Commonwealth in regards to those titles going forward? 3.Has NOPTA had any involvement with the Northern Endeavour Task Force [the Task Force]? a)What’s the nature of that involvement been? b)Has NOPTA provided any recommendations or advice to the Task Force? i. If so, what has that been? 4.What input has NOPTA provided to the plan for resolving the Northern Endeavour issue?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
171	BI-172	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Task Force - General Operations	<p>1.What has been expended on maintenance and repairs since the Commonwealth assumed responsibility? a)What repairs have been effected during this time? 2.How can the Task Force be sure that the Commonwealth will not be accountable or responsible for having degraded the value of the Northern Endeavour? 3.Please provide the breakdown of the costs to date (This should include the monthly costs paid to UPS)?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
172	BI-173	Rex Patrick	Plan Moving Forward	<p>1.At the hearing Ms Shanah Gillies advised that the total Government allocation was \$75.344 million, of which \$60.32 million would be spent by 30 Nov 2020. For how long is the \$15.02 million remaining going to fund the continued operations of the vessel? 2.Has the Task Force submitted any plans to the Government that would finally resolve the “Northern Endeavour” and the tenement remediation issues? a)Yes, what was the feedback/response? 3.By what date is the Task Force required or planning to submit a plan to the Government that would finally resolve the “Northern Endeavour” and the tenement remediation issues? 4.The Task Force engaged Woodside to assist? a)What was the specific scope of that engagement? b)How much has been paid to Woodside? 5.Has Woodside been asked to provide an offer to disconnect Northern Endeavour and/or remediate the tenements? a)Has this been provided? 6.Have any other entities been approached to disconnect and/or remediate the tenements?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
173	BI-174	Rex Patrick	Conditions and Laying Up of Northern Endeavour	<p>In response to a question about Northern Endeavour’s status, Ms Gillies stated that Northern Endeavour was ‘laid up’. 1.In what form of ‘lay up’ is Northern Endeavour? 2.Who prepared the laying up plan? a)Who was involved in approving the laying up plan? 3.Who approved the current position as a lay up site? 4.What is the plan for bringing the vessel out of lay up? 5.What’s the vessels current classification status? a)How is Lloyd’s continuance as the classification society reconciled with the issues identified by NOPSEMA? 6.What is the current state of the FPSO? 7.Noting the FPSO has not undertaken production for over a year what’s the material state of the production plant and machinery?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
174	BI-175	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Temporary Operations Insurance	<p>1.What are the reasons for each of the cost increases associated with the insurance (Contract Notice CN3671307)? 2.The last amendment shows the insurance ends on 15 October 2020, is the operation currently insured? a)What was the cost associated with the last amendment? b)What is the end date of the insurance?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
175	BI-176	Rex Patrick	Action Relating to NOGA	<p>1.Did the Minister provide any direction or guidance to NOPSEMA regarding the course of action, or the desired outcome? a)If so, what was that guidance or direction? 2.Did the Minister endorse the approach being taken? 3.Did NOPSEMA management ever raise or discuss the issue of the Northern Endeavour and/or NOGA with any members of the Advisory Board? a)If so, what advice or feedback was received from the Advisory Board?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
176	BI-177	Rex Patrick	Advisory Board	<p>1.How are Advisory Board members selected? 2.How often does the Advisory Board usually meet? 3.How many meetings occurred in: a.FY 2018-19? b.FY 2019-20? 4.Please provide copies of the minutes from the meetings conducted in the years in 3a and 3b? 5.What was the cost of the Advisory Board in: a.FY 2018-19? b.FY 2019-20?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
177	BI-178	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour	<p>1.Is NOPSEMA aware of the current status of the Northern Endeavour FPSO? a)In its current state, lighthouse mode, what, if any, involvement does NOPSEMA have? 2.Were any personnel injured after NOGA/TSOGA acquired the operation from Woodside? 3.What issues with the material state of Northern Endeavour existed when Woodside operated the FPSO? 4.Did NOPSEMA put in writing what repairs it wanted undertaken in July when it issued the prohibition notice? a)Were these repairs done? 5.Did NOPSEMA direct NOGA to undertake additional repairs in September, which were beyond those listed in July? a)Did NOGA (and its financiers) request NOPSEMA provide a written list of the repairs required to enable production could re-commence? b)Did NOPSEMA provide this written list? If so, can a copy be provided? ii.What on this list has been addressed since it was issued? iii.What has been addressed under the Commonwealth’s possession? iv.What has the cost been? 6.Had NOGA increased production and decreased down time since taking ownership of the vessel? a)How does that accord with good operator practices?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
178	BI-179	Rex Patrick	Lloyds Inspection	<p>Under a warrant issued in May 2019 NOPSEMA inspected Lloyds. 1. In relation to the inspection: a)What were the findings of the inspection? b)What were the conclusions? c)What were the recommendations? 2.If vessels were inspected at the time, please advise if they were: a)Northern Endeavour b)Montara Venture, c)Pyreneis Venture, d)Nganhurra. i. If not which vessels were inspected? 3.Was a report prepared, covering the inspections on these other vessels? a)What were the findings, conclusions, and recommendations? 4.Was a copy of the inspection report covering Lloyds and/or the vessels (including, findings, conclusions and recommendations) provided to the Walker Review team.</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
179	BI-180	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Environmental and Spill Response	<p>1.Were there any environmental incidents or oil spills whilst the FPSO was operating under NOGA/TSOGA’s ownership? 2.Did NOPSEMA investigate NOGA in relation to its oil spill response during its ownership? a)If so when and when was the closing report finalised? b)What were the findings in the closing report? c)Was NOGA provided a copy of the closing report? d)Was this discussed with/explained to Mr Steve Walker?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
180	BI-181	Rex Patrick	NOPSEMA interaction with Department	<p>In an email of 24 May 2019 a member of NOPSEMA provides a dot point agenda, in reference to a discussion that’s to occur that day, which includes the agenda item “Tools available to achieve the desired outcome”. 1.What was the ‘desired outcome’ that they were referring to? 2.What were the ‘tools available’ that were mentioned and discussed? 3.Who attended that meeting? 4.Please provide a copy of the minutes of that meeting? 5.Why was Ms Lisa Schofield, a Maritime Boundary Co-ordinator, interacting with NOPSEMA in regards to the Northern Endeavour? a)How many emails were exchanged between NOPSEMA and Ms Schofield regarding the Northern Endeavour whilst she was negotiating the new maritime boundary?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
181	BI-182	Peter Wish-Wilson	White Shark Populations	<p>1.A CSIRO report from February 2018 on white sharks, estimated for the first time, adult white sharks across the Australasian region to be around 2,210. That report was funded under the National Environmental Science Program. Has CSIRO sought additional funding for a similar study into white shark populations? 2.Is CSIRO currently studying white shark populations or tagging white sharks? If so, can you provide updated figures for white shark populations?</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	28/10/2020	Written
182	BI-183	Peter Wish-Wilson	North West Shoals to Shore Research Program	<p>1.When will the North West Shoals to Shore Research Program study be publicly available and where will it be made available? 2.Have any interim results or reports been provided to: a)any government organisations; b)any oil and gas entities, including the sponsors of the study; c)APPEA; d)fishing industry stakeholders; or e)any environmental groups 3.If so, which ones? 4.Which environmental groups were invited to attend and/or did attend the January 2018 workshop? 5.Will any results of the experiment be made publicly available and if so, where will they be made available? 6.Have any results of the experiment been provided to: a)any government organisations; b)any oil and gas entities, including the sponsors of the study; c)APPEA; d)fishing industry stakeholders; or e)any environmental groups.; 7.If so, which ones?</p>	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	Written
183	BI-184	Peter Wish-Wilson	Decommissioning Offshore Assets	<p>1.How many late-life offshore assets are due for decommissioning in the next ten years that NOPSEMA are aware of? 2.Are any of these currently on the market? 3.How many compliance actions did NOPSEMA issue in the past two years that relate to decommissioning issues? Can you provide a list of them? 4.How many were related to failures to properly maintain equipment and/or infrastructure? 5.How many were related to such failures on equipment/infrastructure anticipated to require decommissioning with the next five years and ten years? 6.What criminal and civil penalties can NOPSEMA impose on operators for s572 decommissioning breaches of the OPGGS Act? What are the maximum financial penalties? 7.What are the potential cost savings that operators may obtain by failing to maintain or fully remove equipment at decommissioning? 8.Has NOPSEMA received any submissions from any organisation advocating for increased penalties within any part of the OPGGS Act or Regulations? 9.What if any action is being taken to review or amend any penalty provisions in the Act or Regulations? 10.How many times has NOPSEMA brought action against an operator, either criminal or civil, under the s572 provisions? If there are instances, can you provide a list and relevant dates? 11.What was NOPSEMA’s role in the Government’s review of the decommissioning framework in late 2018? Has it been completed? If so, what were the recommendations and how have they been implemented?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written

184	BI-185	Peter Whish-Wilson	Northern Endeavour	1.What, if any, representations did NOPSEMA make to either the Minister or NOPTA prior to Woodside's sale of the Northern Endeavour? 2. Who is currently regulating the Northern Endeavour in relation to safety and environmental management? 3. Does any relevant expertise exist within NOPSEMA to professionally advise on decommissioning of a vessel such as the Northern Endeavour? If yes, what advice has been provided and to whom? 4. Has Woodside been a recipient of any Environmental Improvement Notices from NOPSEMA in the past three years? If so, when and in relation to what? 5. Has NOPSEMA been given a full unredacted copy of the Walker Review?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
185	BI-186	Peter Whish-Wilson	Nganhurra Operation Cessation Environment Plan	1. Was this equipment previously subject to an Environmental Improvement Notice? If so, when? 2. How many inspections has NOPSEMA undertaken on the Nganhurra RTM or FSP? 3. How many of those inspections occurred after the Environmental Improvement Notice was issued? 4. Is the Nganhurra RTM in breach of s572 of the OPGGS Act? If so, has NOPSEMA considered taking action against Woodside under the s572 provisions? If not, why not? 5. Does Woodside's latest Environmental Plan propose to dump the Nganhurra RTM near Ningaloo, instead of removing it and disposing of it onshore? If so, is this consistent with NOPSEMA's best practice? 6. Why has the Nganhurra not yet been decommissioned and disposed of onshore? 7. Does the Nganhurra require complex repairs in order to remove it? 8. Is NOPSEMA aware of any instances in which Woodside has successfully undertaken similar repairs? 8. As part of the Nganhurra Cessation Program, Woodside is proposing to 'donate' the ill maintained RTM to RecFish West. In that case, does NOPSEMA consider that component of the project to be within the scope of NOPSEMA's EPBC strategic assessment? Is it potentially also regulated by the EPBC Act (in addition to the Sea Dumping Act)?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
186	BI-187	Peter Whish-Wilson	Community Consultation	1. Over the past three years, what activities and projects has NOPSEMA undertaken to educate and build community understanding of its role and process and increase community trust and engagement in it as a regulator? 2. Can NOPSEMA provide cost estimates (including project spends, travel, personnel time) for NOPSEMA's engagement in these activities? Were any of these costs recoverable?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
187	BI-188	Peter Whish-Wilson	Equinor and the Great Australian Bight	1. Over the past two years, how many external meetings did NOPSEMA staff attend in relation to Equinor's proposal to drill in the Bight and who were those meetings with? 2. At how many of these meetings were Equinor staff present? 3. What were the costs of attending these meetings (travel costs, staff time)?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
188	BI-189	Peter Whish-Wilson	Australian Antarctic Division	1. Does NOPSEMA obtain advice from the Australian Antarctic Division? If so, on what basis is this advice obtained? Is it paid for by NOPSEMA? 2. How many times did NOPSEMA obtain advice from AAD in the last two years, when was it sought and received, at what cost (if yes to above), what was the specific advice requested, for what, and in relation to what projects (assessments) and/or policies?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	29/10/2020	Written
189	BI-190	Nick McKim	Gas-fired Recovery	1. Is any of the public money being spent on the Government's gas-fired recovery initiative being allocated for research to reduce the carbon end-products created to make gas? a. If so, how much? 1. Have the last four incumbents of the Australian Industry Participation Authority (AIP Authority) position been appointed to undertake the role as a full time or part time role (for clarity were the incumbents 'dual hatted' performing both roles at the same time)? a. If the person was "dual hatted" was the other role a part time position? b. How does the Minister ensure that the role of the AIP Authority is properly undertaken and not compromised by being dual hatted? 2. Why is there such a high turn over rate in the people appointed to the AIP Authority? 3. In what form did the Minister provide the appointees with approval to undertake the roles additional to those of the AIP Authority?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
190	BI-191	Rex Patrick	Australian Industry Participation Authority	The Jobs Act establishes that concerns or complaints raised by an affected party about the compliance of proponents and operators will be investigated by the Australian Industry Participation (AIP) Authority. 1. Have there been any complaints to the AIP Authority since it was established? a. If so, how were the complaints dealt with? b. Were there any complaints in FY 2019-20? c. How were they dealt with? 2. How many investigations were undertaken in FY 2019-20? a. What were the findings? b. How many have been undertaken since establishment of the AIP Authority? c. How are the findings of investigations promulgated?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
191	BI-192	Rex Patrick	AIP Authority - Complaints and Investigations	1. How is the compliance monitoring program being implemented? a. Is it the program fully reliant on the AIP plan compliance reports? 2. Have any proponents (or operators) been found to be non-compliant with the approved AIP Plan? a. If so, what actions have been taken by the AIP Authority against proponents or operators found to be in Breach? b. Have any proponents or operators been found non-compliant on more than one occasion? If so, which ones? i. What action was taken in these cases?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
192	BI-193	Rex Patrick	Australian Industry Participation Compliance Monitoring	1. When will the 2019-20 self-assessment report be published? 2. Noting the aim of the Jobs Act is to ensure Australian entities obtain full, fair and reasonable opportunity to supply into Australian projects, does the assessment also canvass feedback from the broader industry participants/entities?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
193	BI-194	Rex Patrick	AIP Authority Self-assessment	1. What is the funding allocation for FY 2020-21? 2. Where is the AIP Authority funding outlined in the in the PBS? 3. What was the funding allocation for FY 2019-20? 4. What's the AIP Authority resourcing for FY 2020-21?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
194	BI-195	Rex Patrick	AIP Authority Funding	The Jobs Act underwent its mandatory five year review in 2018. 1. Four of the recommendations from the review have been implemented, what's the timeline for implementing the others? 2. Can the AIP Authority explain how the implementation of the 'four' that have been implemented align with the recommendations in the report?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
195	BI-196	Rex Patrick	Recommendations from the IOBS Act Review	In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020: 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
196	BI-197	Kimberley Kitching	Executive Management	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the following be provided: a. List of functions. 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
197	BI-198	Kimberley Kitching	Ministerial functions	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the following be provided: a. List of functions. 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
198	BI-199	Kimberley Kitching	Departmental functions	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
199	BI-200	Kimberley Kitching	Executive office upgrades	For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the Department/agency advise the quantum spent on customised and special-order furniture and office supplies (excluding items such as ergonomic desks and chairs and items required for work, health and safety purposes). Please provide a full breakdown, descriptions and cost.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
200	BI-201	Kimberley Kitching	Customised and special-order furniture and office supplies	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment. 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
201	BI-202	Kimberley Kitching	Facilities upgrades	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
202	BI-203	Kimberley Kitching	Staff travel	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
203	BI-204	Kimberley Kitching	Legal costs	Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 be provided including: a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel. b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. 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. 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. e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
204	BI-205	Kimberley Kitching	Secretarial travel	Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
205	BI-206	Kimberley Kitching	Departmental staff allowances	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: a. Subject matter b. Company c. Costs for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 d. Contract date period 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
206	BI-207	Kimberley Kitching	Market research	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide: a. When approval was first sought. b. The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process. c. The timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline. 3. Can an itemised list of all Auslander Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
207	BI-208	Kimberley Kitching	Advertising and information campaigns	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. Can an itemised list of all Auslander Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided. 3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
208	BI-209	Kimberley Kitching	Promotional merchandise				

				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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 please be provided including: 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. 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. 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. 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. e.Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
209	BI-210	Kimberley Kitching	Ministerial overseas travel				
210	BI-211	Kimberley Kitching	Social media influencers	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2.What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote. 3.Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided. 4.Can an itemised list of all Auslander Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
211	BI-212	Kimberley Kitching	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
212	BI-213	Kimberley Kitching	Board Appointments	1.Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members. 2.What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio 3.Please detail any board appointments made from 30 June 2020 to date. 4.What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid. 5.What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors. 6.What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
213	BI-214	Kimberley Kitching	Stationery	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
214	BI-215	Kimberley Kitching	Media monitoring	1.What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the each Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Auslander Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided c.What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the FY 2020-21. 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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Auslander Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided c.What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
215	BI-216	Kimberley Kitching	Departmental staff in Minister's office	1.Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including: a.Duration of secondment. b.APS level. 2.Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
216	BI-217	Kimberley Kitching	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020? 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.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
217	BI-218	Kimberley Kitching	Recruitment	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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2.Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
218	BI-219	Kimberley Kitching	Staffing	1.How many full-time equivalent staff were engaged at each of 30 June 2019, 30 June 2020 and at 10 November 2020. 2.How many of these positions are (a) ongoing 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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 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 periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
219	BI-220	Kimberley Kitching	Comcare	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status. 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 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
220	BI-221	Kimberley Kitching	Fair Work Commission	For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
221	BI-222	Kimberley Kitching	Fair Work Ombudsman	For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
222	BI-223	Kimberley Kitching	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
223	BI-224	Kimberley Kitching	Public Interest Disclosures	For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many public interest disclosures have been received.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written
224	BI-225	Anthony Sheldon	Business case for long-term nuclear medicine supply	Senator SHELDON: The government funded a business case to look at long-term nuclear medicine supply in Australia, which we just talked about. The government has been presented with that business case. Regarding progressing the business case, has it looked at the urgent impacts caused by ongoing disruptions in particular? Separate from that, as to what the cost is to the economy for these disruptions that we've had—do you have any figures on that that you can make available to the committee? Mr Jenkinson: I don't have any figures to hand and would have to check to see if we have anything that is robust that we could provide. In terms of the process and the urgency of a facility or any future supply of nuclear medicine, I am sure you all understand that building facilities in nuclear medicine is a process that takes time. It needs to be fully understood. From our point of view, the money that's been provided in the budget is for us to invest in making sure that our current facility is as robust as possible while the government undergoes a decision-making process for the best way forward for nuclear medicine. It's such a critical component of Australian healthcare to ensure that we have good diagnosis, which leads to good healthcare. You mentioned having personal connections with people. Most people would have a personal connection with somebody who suffers from either cancer or heart disease, which are the two key areas in which diagnostic medicine plays a role. It is a very important part of Australian healthcare, and that decision-making process needs to be a robust one.	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/10/2020	15
225	BI-226	Gerard Rennick	Reef Snapshot	Senator RENNICK: Okay. I guess this comes back to another problem that I have or an issue that I raised in the Great Barrier Reef inquiry, and that is standardised benchmarking of performance measures on the reef, because you've just said this study isn't a like-for-like study of what you've got on your website. As someone who's responsible for taxpayers' funds and protecting the livelihoods of farmers and all Australians, including the tourist industry, we need a standardised benchmark of coral cover, coral growth rates, seagrass and whatever. I'm following this stuff now. I see this came out a few weeks ago on the news. I go to the AIMS website. I see a different figure. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars on research and it is very difficult to work out what is really happening if we're not going to do like-for-like comparisons year by year and have a standardised database of data that shows year-by-year growth in coral, coral rates, coral covers, et cetera. Dr Hardisty: Could I respond to that. It's a great point. The reef community is moving towards trying to take a very complex system and create the best possible picture of what's going on. There are a lot of different things going on and there are a lot of different players. But this is why, for instance, last year, for the very first time, AIMS, CSIRO and GBRMPA, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, issued our first ever joint statement on the reef. We call it the Reef Snapshot. It will now be issued every year jointly by the three Commonwealth agencies who are responsible for the reef in different ways—the science component, the management component and so on, working together to provide that one consolidated view. It has never happened before, but we've started that now. Senator RENNICK: Is that also going to provide consolidated datasets as well? Dr Hardisty: Yes. It's short and brief. It's made for the layperson and for, you know, decision makers. It's not a long scientific document—it's made for the general public and for decision makers. But what it does do is provide links and information to datasets that we all agree tell the story of what's going on. I can give you a copy of that brief snapshot. It will henceforth be produced every April, right after the summer season, which is the critical time, so if there are disturbances we can capture them, et cetera. And the importance of that is to try to start to provide exactly what you're asking for.	Australian Institute of Marine Science	29/10/2020	26
226	BI-227	Murray Watt	Northern Australia advisory group	In reference to the Northern Australia advisory group appointed in March 2020, can the Office of Northern Australia please provide details on: 1.The appointment selection process 2.Any salary or remuneration provided to members of the advisory group 3.Any travel undertaken by the advisory group, broken down by i.Type of travel (flight, car, etc.) ii.Location iii.Cost iv.Members attending 4.Any other costs accumulated by or allocated to the operation of the advisory group 5.The ongoing review of the Northern Australia agenda	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	29/10/2020	Written
227	BI-228	Katy Gallagher	Contractor expenditure	1.Please provide the following figures: a.Expenditure on all contractors for 2019-20 b.Expenditure on all contracts with labour hire firms for 2019-20 c.Headcount of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as at 30 June 2020 i.In total ii.As a percentage of total staff headcount d.As a percentage mark-up on the cost of the contractor, the maximum and minimum fees paid to labour hire firms in 2019-20 2.Has the agency performed any analysis on whether it costs more to engage staff as contractors compared with hiring staff as employees? If yes, please provide this analysis. 3.Has the agency engaged any Senior Executive Service or equivalent positions on a contract/labour hire basis? If yes, please provide details. 4.In relation to contracts for market research: a.How much has been spent to date since 1 January 2020? b.How much has been spent since 24 August 2018? c.Please provide a table with all contracts entered into since 1 January 2020 along with the following information: i.Total contract value ii.Supplier iii.If it was approved by the Service Delivery and Coordination Committee	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	28/10/2020	Written