

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-1	Carol Brown	Offshore renewables framework legislation	1. Have the policy settings for the offshore renewables framework been finalised by the Department? 2. Have the policy settings been put to the Minister? 3. Has the drafting process for the legislation begun? What level of priority has the legislation been given? 4. When does the government plan to introduce the legislation? 5. What are the functions of the 'Offshore electricity registrar' included in the 2021 budget? Will it be a stand alone department? 6. What WHS jurisdiction will apply to workers on offshore renewable projects? 7. Is the government still planning on requiring all offshore renewable energy projects to put up a bond for the full cost of decommissioning wind turbines before construction begins, even though this is not required for offshore oil and gas platforms and pipelines? 8. Will competitive bidding for offshore renewables licences be used? Will the criteria for decision making be based on a cash bidding process or on public interest criteria, such as local procurement and employment?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/06/2021	Written
BI-2	Bridget McKenzie	ANSTO-IAEA Coordinated Research Project on Small Modular Reactors	1. As I am sure you are aware, Small Modular Reactors are listed as a watching brief in its First Australian Technology Investment Strategy. I understand ANSTO has recently partnered with the International Atomic Energy Agency to evaluate the economics of Small Modular Reactors. Specifically, will this project look at SMR capital cost estimates? a. If so, will this information be shared with other government agencies and industry stakeholders like the CSIRO and their GenCost work? 2. On the topic of GenCost, has ANSTO been consulted for their expertise in nuclear technologies regarding the economics of current reactors and/or new reactors like SMRs? a. If yes, what information specifically has ANSTO provided the CSIRO for GenCost? b. If no, given that ANSTO's legislated mandate is to inform Australians on the facts and significant developments related to nuclear science and technology, is this something that ANSTO should be involved in?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	4/06/2021	Written
BI-3	Matthew Canavan	Government's policy on gain of function research and the Wuhan Institute of Virology	1. What is the Australian Government's policy on gain of function research? Is there a written prohibition on any work gain of function work being performed? If so, when was that written prohibition made and how has it been distributed to government agencies? 2. Has the Australian Government funded any gain of function research either here or overseas in the past 20 years? If yes, please list details and amounts of funding that have been provided for gain of function research over the past 20 years. 3. Has the Australian Government, including through the CSIRO, conducted any research with the Wuhan Institute of Virology, or its scientists, over the past two decades. If yes, please list details of the research and the Australian Government funding associated with the research conducted with the Wuhan Institute of Virology or its scientists? Please also list the names of any researchers from the Wuhan Institute of Virology that the CSIRO has conducted research with over the past two decades. 4. Does the Australian Government, including through the CSIRO, have any ongoing relationships with researchers at the Wuhan Institute of Virology? If so please detail the nature of these relationships.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	Written
BI-4	Peter Whish-Wilson	Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan	<p>1. Noting: • Woodside's Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan accepted by NOPSEMA on 5 February 2021 states that "the activities that form the scope of" the Plan include activities that will occur inside Production Licence Area WA-28-L; and • The Plan also states the impacts and risks associated with towing the Nganhurra riser turret mooring and its installation as an artificial reef (ie. activities outside WA-28-L) were considered; and • NOPSEMA's Key Matters Report on the Nganhurra Operations Cessation indicates the only activities authorised by the acceptance of the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan are those that will occur inside Production Licence Area WA-28-L; and • NOPSEMA's website states the proposed reef site is in a vacant petroleum title area, a is it correct that, while acceptance of the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan by NOPSEMA provides authorisation for decommissioning activities for the Nganhurra riser turret mooring within Production Licence Area WA-28-L, it does not authorise the proposed activities outside WA-28-L, including installation of the riser turret mooring as an artificial reef, as described in the Plan? b. If the answer to a. is no, what provisions of the OPGGS Act or its Regulations authorise the proposed activities outside WA-28-L, in particular installation of the riser turret mooring as an artificial reef? c. If the answer to a. is yes, is it also correct the proposed installation as an artificial reef is therefore not within the scope of the NOPSEMA Program under the OPGGS Act that is endorsed under Part 10 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999? If not correct, on what basis is the proposed installation within scope? 2. Did NOPSEMA obtain any independent review from any heritage expert of Woodside's 'World Heritage Property Values and Threats Assessment' in the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan? If not, why not? 3. What matters did NOPSEMA rely on in concluding (as stated in paragraph 3 of Key Matters Report: Nganhurra Operations Cessation) that the environmental impacts and risks associated with the riser turret mooring being deployed as an artificial reef "will be suitably managed under another credible regulatory regime (i.e. an artificial reef permit under the Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act (1981))"? 4. Is this the first occasion on which NOPSEMA has accepted an Environment Plan for offshore disposal of a riser turret mooring? If not, on how many prior occasions has NOPSEMA done so, and in relation to each occasion: a. Which company submitted the plan; b. At what location was the mooring disposed of; and c. What plastics (type and weight) were contained within the mooring? 5. If polyethylene and polypropylene are abandoned in and around the riser turret mooring, the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan indicates the degrading particles and fragments will float away from the proposed artificial reef location where they will undergo further breakdown into microplastics (p. 463). 6. Did NOPSEMA consider the possibility that these microplastics could be ingested by foraging marine turtles at locations other than in waters in the immediate vicinity of the artificial reef? a. If so: i. On what basis did NOPSEMA accept that the activity is not inconsistent with Action A3 in the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia? ii. Why did NOPSEMA not insist that Woodside alter the activity so it would not be inconsistent with Action A3 in the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia? b. If not, why not? 7. Marine debris prevention is everyone's responsibility. Why is Objective 1 in the Threat Abatement Plan for the impacts of marine debris on the vertebrate wildlife of Australia's coasts and oceans "not relevant" to the action described in the Environment Plan? 8. The fate of the second most abundant element in the riser turret mooring's steel, manganese, is not discussed in the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan. Did NOPSEMA consider the potential for the manganese in the riser turret mooring's steel to cause toxic contamination? a. If not, why not? b. If yes, please answer question 2.9. Noting: • an Australian Government paper found a potential for manganese to be toxic in freshwater; • a Chinese and Korean study found the leaching of manganese from steel is slow and constant, and occurs faster in marine than fresh water; • in hypoxic (deep water) conditions, manganese could dissolve faster • a Swedish study found even low concentrations of manganese in the natural environment can cause effects on bivalves' immune systems; • an Australian study found concentrations of dissolved manganese in seawater as low as 0.7 mg/L caused the flesh of one species of coral (Acropora spathulate) to disconnect and fall off the coral skeleton after 48 hours of exposure to 0.7 mg/L manganese in seawater; and • under Australian &amp; New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh &amp; Marine Water Quality processes, toxicant default guideline values for manganese in marine water and sediment have been approved for review, a first but necessary step toward their publication, did NOPSEMA ask Woodside what the concentration of manganese will be at the surface of the riser turret mooring, the point where the concentration will be the greatest as it dissolves out of the steel? a. If so, what was Woodside's response? b. If not, why did NOPSEMA not ask this key question? 10. What monitoring has been required that will ensure Woodside (or any other future owner or operator) will know if/when manganese starts to contaminate The Ningaloo Coast World Heritage Area? What is the parameter to be monitored, and what threshold has been set that will trigger management action to manifest manganese contamination? 11. The Key Matters Report: Nganhurra Operations Cessation states that the control measures being implemented to reduce impacts from plastics and foam contaminants include (inter alia) the "Development of a Marine Debris Monitoring and Management Program consistent with the objectives of the Marine Debris Threat Abatement Plan" (Program). Which of the following elements of the Program did NOPSEMA consider mitigate the impacts from plastics and foam contaminants? Was it the: a. Plastics offsets program? b. Funding of research? c. Funding of an education program(s)? d. Publication of information relevant to other regulatory processes? 12. Before NOPSEMA accepted the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan on 5 February 2021, had NOPSEMA seen any document confirming that the State of Western Australia has agreed to accept the ownership of and liability for the integrated artificial reef? a. If so: i. Did the document make explicit that Western Australia (WA) has accepted it will own the artificial reef and hold the responsibility to manage its impacts? ii. Which agency and level of authority in WA signed off on the confirmation? iii. Does the document make clear that the WA Treasury and/or the WA Cabinet are aware of and accept liability for the integrated artificial reef? b. If not: i. Why not? ii. Did you seek written confirmation from WA that WA will manage ongoing impacts? iii. Did the response give NOPSEMA assurance that WA understands and accepts these responsibilities? 13. Has NOPSEMA seen evidence that demonstrates Recfishwest has adequate financial resources available for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of the integrated artificial reef? a. If so, what evidence has NOPSEMA seen? b. If not, why did NOPSEMA not insist on seeing such evidence? 14. Has NOPSEMA seen any written agreement(s) between Woodside, Recfishwest and/or the WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the transfer of ownership of the integrated artificial reef discussed in the Nganhurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan? a. If so, what document(s) has NOPSEMA seen? 15. Noting Recfishwest is the applicant for the Sea Dumping Act permit, what, if any, consideration did NOPSEMA give to the capacity of Recfishwest to comply with permit conditions in deciding the permit would provide suitable management of environmental risks associated with the riser turret mooring?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	4/06/2021	Written
BI-5	Anthony Chisholm	Grants programs or funds administered by the department	1. For all grants programs or funds administered by the department, please provide: a. Name of the program or fund b. Total budgeted funding c. Total funding paid out to grant recipients d. Final decision-maker 2. Were there any new grants programs or funds to be administered by the department introduced in the 2021-22 Budget? a. If so, please provide: i. Name of the program or fund ii. Total budgeted funding iii. Final decision-maker (or intended final decision-maker) 3. Were there any grants programs or funds to be administered by the department provided with additional funding in the 2021-22 Budget? a. If so, please provide: i. Name of the program or fund ii. Funding profile for the additional funding over the forward estimates	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	7/06/2021	Written

Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-6	Janet Rice	CSIRO ASL 2021-22	<p>•What is CSIRO's current ASL as of May 2021 and what CSIRO's current ASL cap? •How much does CSIRO predict Average Staffing Levels to increase in FY 2021-2022? •How does CSIRO reconcile the difference between projected ASL increases contained in the budget papers last October (ASL 5,141 projected to increase to 5,351) and those quoted in May (5,018 projected to increase to 5,414)? •Is CSIRO experiencing difficulties in recruiting additional staff to meet projected ASL increases? •How have current international travel restrictions affected CSIRO's recruitment strategies? •What new measures has CSIRO taken to boost local employment given international travel restrictions? •How does CSIRO manage ASL internally; is this done centrally or devolved to CSIRO Business Units? •Is ASL now primarily managed at the portfolio level? What processes does CSIRO engage in with the Department of Industry, Science and Energy and Resources (DISER) to manage staffing at the portfolio level? •What is CSIRO's understanding of the arrangements in place to manage CSIRO's ASL with relation to the Department (DISER), Department of Finance and the Expenditure Review Committee?</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	7/06/2021	Written
BI-7	Gerard Rennick	CO2 Peak Emissions	<p>1.In the last set of answers from the CSIRO, it was acknowledged that CO2's peak emissivity at 14.8 microns emits energy equivalent to at -80 degrees Celsius. Can the CSIRO explain how energy emitted at -80 degrees Celsius is going to heat the atmosphere which has an average temperature of 15 degrees Celsius? 2.Where on Earth or in the atmosphere does the temperature get to -80 degrees? 3.Noting also that CO2 is only 0.04% of the atmosphere, if I have a 2.5 litre jug of water with an average temperature of 15 degree and I add 1 millilitre of water/ice at -80 degrees then the jug of water isn't going to get hotter is it? 4.CO2 is 0.04% of the atmosphere. Why does Larry Marshall continue to refer to CO2 as a blanket which has 100% contiguous cover for a given surface area unlike CO2 which is not contiguous in the atmosphere. The key difference being that convection can move much freely through non-contiguous substances than contiguous substances. If I put a postage stamp on my body the small amount of heat it blocks from radiating away from my body is not going off the heat being lost from the remaining surface area is it? 5.If Nitrogen and Oxygen are transparent to Infrared energy what is the process by which they are heated and is it fair to say the CO2 is largely heated in the same way? 6.In the estimates hearing Larry Marshall described the temperature data from the Bureau of Meteorology as being irrefutable. Can Larry Marshall please explain the 350 million to 500 million calculations used to homogenise the maximum temperature at Marble Bar and the 200 million calculations used to homogenise the minimum temperature at Marble Bar over the last 100 years. Has the CSIRO been able to reproduce these calculations? I look forward to an explanation as the Bureau has been unable to provide any coherent explanation as to why such a process is either irrefutable or coherent. 7.Why does Larry Marshall continually say the market is moving to renewables? It is not the market that is moving towards renewables but rather government mandate. For example, Australia has mandated that the national energy grid must be powered by 33TW of renewables? Is Larry Marshall saying that that RET be abolished? 8.If the market is driving the move towards renewables how will the market compensate for the fact that it costs three times more to recycle batteries than use raw materials? 9.Could the CSIRO please provide workings on how they calculated the downwelling radiation of 333 w/m2 attributable to greenhouse gases? 10.Could the CSIRO please confirm if they believe there are enough dams in Australia to provide backup storage for the energy market. This is in response to the comments made by CSIRO staff that hydro power will be used if battery storage is required longer for eight hours. 11.CO2 has four vibrational frequencies. One of these at 2.8 microns, is in the near infrared spectrum which is a component of incoming solar radiation. How much incoming energy do the CSIRO estimate that is absorbed/emitted by CO2 at this frequency? 12.Using Planks law isn't energy with a wavelength of 2.8 microns over 5 times more energetic than energy with a wavelength at 14.8 microns? 13.If so, then why isn't the fact that CO2 absorbs/emits incoming infrared radiation discussed alongside the fact it absorbs/emits outgoing longwave radiation? i.e. why is radiation impacted by CO2 only counted in the outgoing direction but not the incoming direction? 14.Given the atmosphere is circa 2-3 billion years old and CO2/H2O has been in the atmosphere for that time clearly convection has been able to carry heat the top of the atmosphere despite the presence of CO2 and H2O?</p> <p>Is it not fair to say that as heat increases more energy is driven from the earths surface to the emission level via deep convection in the tropics thereby cooling the lower atmosphere? 15.Why can't convection/evaporative cooling allow for an uplift in CO2 of 100-200ppm given that Water Vapor at 25 degrees and 75% humidity is around 15,000ppm which has a much greater and fluctuating role in absorbing and emitting energy than CO2? 16.It has been suggested that without convection the Earth's surface temperature would be between 60-70 degrees Celsius thereby suggesting that convection cools the Earth's surface by circa 45-55 degrees. Doesn't this suggest that convection has the ability to counter any increases in the surface temperature of the earth as a result of the marginal increase in downward welling radiation from increasing CO2 that is forecast to increase temperature by 1-2 degrees? 17.Given the there is no clear boundary between the atmosphere and outer space won't any increase in heat also increase the rate of heat loss to outer space? 18.Re the CSIRO cost gen report what accounting or valuation standard says that assets should be discounted over the life of their loan and not their useful life?</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	7/06/2021	Written
BI-8	Murray Watt	Departmental name changes	<p>Senator WATT: ... Are you able to advise us how many name changes have there been for the department of industry since? It feels like there has been quite a few. Mr Fredericks: I will need to take that on notice, if I can. Senator WATT: From my information, it seems that we had the Department of Industry and then we had the Department of Industry and Science. Then we had the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science. Now, of course, it is the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources. I'm not sure if there have been any others. Does that sound about right to you? Mr Fredericks: I will take it on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	5
BI-9	Murray Watt	Industry Ministers since 2013	<p>Senator WATT: Minister, do you know how many industry ministers there have been since 2013? Senator Seselja: Since 2013, no, I don't. I'm sure I could take that on notice for you.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	5
BI-10	Murray Watt	List of Industry Initiatives in Budget	<p>Senator WATT: Ms Urquhart, it looks like you're reading from a document. Perhaps, in the interests of time, you could table the remainder of that so that we can put some more questions to the minister. I appreciate the update. Mrs Urquhart: I think we could certainly provide you with a list of initiatives out of the budget.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	11
BI-11	Murray Watt	Incurred costs of MOG	<p>Senator WATT: ...Mr Fredericks, does the department have an estimate of the cost incurred to date to change the department's name four times, recruit new department secretaries and deputies and move staff between the revolving doors of this department over the last eight years? Mr Fredericks: I will take that on notice. Senator WATT: Thank you. It does seem to me that the industry that has benefited most from this portfolio is the industry that builds signs and prints business cards. There has clearly been a lot of money spent with all of these machinery of government changes, name changes and ministerial changes. Mr Fredericks: I will be honest with you. When you see the information we give you on notice on that question, you will be surprised how little that costs. Senator WATT: I certainly hope you are right. Mr Fredericks: We will see. I am quietly confident. I could be wrong. There are two elements to that. In terms of signage and cards, we have kind of pushed past that world a bit. I'm not sure that really costs a hell of a lot. There are costs to a MOG; that is fair. Senator WATT: Website updates? Mr Fredericks: I'm not sure the world of IT is going to cost us a hell of a lot. Senator WATT: There would be internal staff dedicated towards it. Mr Fredericks: A website is a live issue. We have existing resources dedicated to it. I shouldn't guess. I am saying to you, Senator, that I would quietly confident that they are relatively small in that world. There are costs to doing a MOG; that's fair. Senator WATT: And a ministerial change. Mr Fredericks: We'll look at that. I'm not sure there would be a huge cost to the department of that at all. But we'll have a look at that for you. As I say, in terms of the costs of the MOG, there are benefits as well. These things tend to balance out a bit. That said, Senator, in fairness to you, we will put it notice for you and get the exact numbers.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	11-12

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-12	Murray Watt	SES Movements from 29 March 2021	Senator WATT: I will wrap up this section. How many senior public servant changes have been made since Minister Porter was appointed on 29 March this year? Mr Fredericks: I will take that on notice. If I was surmising, I think we have appointed one division head since that time. I just can't remember. We have appointed a recent division head, but I don't recall whether it was before or after the appointment of Minister Porter. Anyway, it's minimal. Senator WATT: Who is the new division head? Mr Fredericks: Sarah Goldsworthy, who has been appointed to the technology division. Senator WATT: Was that a vacancy that already existed or a new position? Mr Fredericks: It was a vacancy caused by an internal movement of staff to another position. Senator WATT: Have any senior public servants left the department since Minister Porter was appointed? Mr Fredericks: I don't believe so. I will check that. I think the answer is no. If I am wrong on that, I will put it on notice for you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	12
BI-13	Murray Watt	Ministerial meetings on company premises	Senator WATT: On notice, could you please advise us of every meeting the minister has had with representatives of individual businesses as opposed to peak bodies since his appointment? Did any of those examples you have given us, Minister, occur on site, or were they in his office? Senator Seselja: I don't have that detail so I can take it on notice. Senator WATT: Ms Urquhart or anyone else from the department, are you able to tell us of any meetings the minister has had with a business person or a company representative on site since his appointment? Mrs Urquhart: Do you mean on a company's premises, Senator? Senator WATT: Yes. Be it a work site or a head office. Mrs Urquhart: I have no doubt that it has occurred, but I don't have that information with me. I would have to take it on notice. Senator WATT: You have no doubt it has occurred, but do you know of any that have occurred? Mrs Urquhart: No, I don't. I will need to take account of that. Senator WATT: So you are not aware? Mrs Urquhart: I will need to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	15
BI-14	Murray Watt	Ministers diary	Senator WATT: Minister, could you please table Minister Porter's diary since his appointment? Senator Seselja: I don't know if it is a practice to table diaries. We will take it on notice and see what information can be provided. Senator PATRICK: Certainly diaries are publishable under FOI. CHAIR: The minister has taken it on notice. I have been chairing committees for four years and it has never happened. I am happy for the minister to take it on notice, but it is certainly not usual practice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	15
BI-15	Murray Watt	Ministerial press conferences	Senator WATT: Is anyone from the department able to enlighten me on whether I missed a press conference in the middle of the night or some time from Minister Porter? Ms Cook: I can confirm, yes, that the minister has released 23 media releases. I understand that the minister has done around three press conferences. Senator WATT: Three press conferences. Could you give me the dates of those press conferences? Ms Cook: I am certainly aware of the one previously referenced, which was, I think, in Perth on 21 March, where he talked about the mRNA vaccine. Senator WATT: March the 21st, or May? Ms Cook: Sorry, May. I beg your pardon. That was 21 May. Senator WATT: Yes. I am aware of that one. I wasn't aware of the other two. Ms Cook: I understand there was also a press conference in Sydney in relation to the defamation case. They are the two I am aware of. Senator WATT: One about portfolio matters and one about his private defamation case? Ms Cook: We'll take the rest on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	16-17
BI-16	Murray Watt	Ministerial interviews	Senator WATT: How many media interviews, Minister, has Minister Porter done since he took on this role over two months ago? Senator Seselja: I don't have that information. As I say, I don't monitor the minister's media. Senator WATT: I am aware of one interview he did with Sky News since his appointment. Has he done others, Ms Cook, that you are aware of? Ms Cook: I will take that on notice so I can check that for you, Senator. Senator WATT: Are you aware of any other interviews? Ms Cook: I am not, no. But I will take that on notice. There could be.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	17
BI-17	Murray Watt	PMO directions regarding media	Senator WATT: Has the Prime Minister or his office asked or directed Minister Porter to not undertake media, Minister? Senator Seselja: Not to my knowledge, no. Senator WATT: Can you take that on notice? Senator Seselja: Sure. Senator WATT: Has the Prime Minister or his office requested or directed Minister Porter to decline requests for media interviews and conferences? Senator Seselja: Not to my knowledge, no. Senator WATT: How many media requests for interviews has Minister Porter declined since he was appointed to this role? Senator Seselja: I don't know the answer to that question. Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice for us, please? Senator Seselja: Sure	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	18
BI-18	Rex Patrick	Number of cloud services and locations of data storage	Senator PATRICK: Regardless of whether they've been approved, how many cloud services were accessed or used within the department's IT system over the last 12 months? Ms R Lee: We had 200 systems accessed. However, there are services provided external to the department that are sometimes accessed through a software service arrangement. We don't have numbers for them. I can take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: I would appreciate it if you would. You would say the difference between the 200 and perhaps a new number is simply due to catch-up reasons? Ms R Lee: No. It would be more to do with services that the department doesn't necessarily provide that we might consume. Senator PATRICK: For how many of those 200 cloud services you have do you have a contractual arrangement to ensure that the data is stored within Australia? Ms R Lee: I would have to take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Do you have any sort of feel for it? Ms R Lee: Yes. Largely, our services are contained in Australia, where possible. We are doing a current review at the moment. I would expect that the majority of those services are onshore. Senator PATRICK: For those that are not, can you please advise what countries the cloud hardware resides in, please? Ms R Lee: Yes. Absolutely. I will take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: I am not singling out your department. I have asked this across a number of portfolios. I am trying to get a feel for things. Based on Top Talkers report and traffic analysis, which countries did the department's IT network systems interact with the most over the last 12 months? Ms R Lee: I will take that on notice. It is monitored through our gateway provider and provided to us. I can definitely take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	19-20
BI-19	Rex Patrick	Social media, TOR and VPN	Senator PATRICK: Thank you. In terms of network log analysis, in the last 12 months, what percentage of traffic has been used for streaming and social media services? Ms R Lee: I don't have the exact numbers. Departmental logs do monitor that traffic. Staff are expected to follow the department's ICT conditions of use. Social media websites are approved for access, but not on an ongoing basis. People submit a business case to get that. I can get numbers. It is a large number. Senator PATRICK: A lot of these are largely a follow-up from the ANAO report into some of these services. What about torrent traffic? Ms R Lee: That is all blocked. Senator PATRICK: That is all blocked. So you can say that none is used? What about Tor traffic? Ms R Lee: I would have to take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: That is access to the dark web. Ms R Lee: My understanding is that that would be all blocked too, but I can double-check that. Senator PATRICK: I understand that it might be authorised. In some sense, I am asking whether that activity is taking place in an unauthorised way. Ms R Lee: I doubt it. We have strict controls around our cyber security and access on our protected network. Senator PATRICK: What about using VPNs through your gateways? Ms R Lee: To try to hide it? Senator PATRICK: Yes, to anonymise and/or mask what is being accessed. Ms R Lee: I would expect that to be blocked as well. I can double-check that for you and take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Could you give some statistics on where it has been attempted or, in fact, used? I have asked about torrent traffic and Tor traffic and if there is use and it is authorised. You could imagine law enforcement might have access to some of these services for legitimate law enforcement purposes. If it is authorised, can you provide some background as to why it might have been authorised? Ms R Lee: Absolutely.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	20
BI-20	Rex Patrick	Residual data contracts	Senator PATRICK: But it can also be a bit more nuanced. You can even have a service operated out of Australia, but, because of the 24-hour service, it might be accessed by India, Europe and then the United States. That is even when it is located here. I presume that that is all being looked at and sorted out as part of these new policies? Ms R Lee: Yes. It is considered before you enter into a contractual arrangement—what the data is and where it is being supported. Some support staff are contained overseas. You look at what it looks like before you make a decision to enter that contractual arrangement. Senator PATRICK: So there are residual contracts where that may not have been done, but you're moving towards— Ms R Lee: Possibly. I don't think for any of our large contracts, and particularly not with any sensitive data, it is contained overseas. Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice to make sure. Ms R Lee: We'll definitely take it on notice and check.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	20-21

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-21	Murray Watt	Ministerial engagement with Whyalla steelworks	Senator WATT: One of the particularly serious incidents involving an Australian business that has occurred since Minister Porter's appointment is the situation around Whyalla. We'll have some questions about that in more detail later. What direct engagement has the minister had with steel workers at Whyalla whose jobs have been under pretty serious threat over the last couple of months? ... Mr Williamson: I will have to take on notice your question about the minister's engagement with steel workers. Senator WATT: Is anyone aware of any engagement the minister has had? Mr Williamson: I am not directly. I am certainly aware he has been briefed and engaged on the issues around Whyalla steelworks extensively. Senator WATT: Has the minister visited the Whyalla steelworks over the last couple of months? Mr Williamson: I don't know the answer to that. Senator WATT: Is anyone aware that he has? Mr Fredericks: I don't have the answer, but we'll take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	21
BI-22	Murray Watt	Stakeholder engagement with Porter	Senator WATT: Mr Fredericks or anyone at the table, has there been any communication from any stakeholders or individual companies since Minister Porter's appointment indicating that they are not particularly keen to engage with him? Mr Fredericks: I certainly have not personally. I am not aware of any within the department. I will take it on notice given it is a question about the department generally. I will take it on notice. Personally, I am not aware of any.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	21
BI-23	Murray Watt	Ministerial contact with Microsoft	Senator WATT: Minister, did Minister Porter or his office have any contact with Microsoft after this article was published and before that statement was made? Senator Seselja: Not to my knowledge. Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice, please? Senator Seselja: Sure. Senator WATT: Did any other minister or their office have any contact with Microsoft in response to this article and that statement? Senator Seselja: I am here representing Minister Porter. To the extent that— Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice, please? Senator Seselja: To the extent that in this portfolio I can take that on notice, I will take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	22
BI-24	Murray Watt	MO Engagement with women in STEM	Senator WATT: The article continues: Ms Rich has previously participated in two of Minister Andrews' tech sector roundtables, but said she was now concerned that Mr Porter's appointment would detract from the Women in STEM programs his predecessor had championed. Mr Fredericks or anyone else at the table, have you received any indication from stakeholders that there is some concern that the Women in STEM program will be detracted following Mr Porter appointment? Mr Fredericks: I personally haven't received such. I will check with the others. Mrs Urquhart: Notwithstanding, as I said before, the visibility of the minister's diary, you are referencing a media article. I did reach out to colleagues in the technology and national security division to assess the extent of interactions with the technology sector. In fact, they advised me that our engagement with the technology industry has increased following the lifting of restrictions as we put our focus forward on economic recovery and the delivery of budget measures. Specifically in relation to Women in STEM, we are continuing to work across the portfolio to deliver programs that support women in technology. You will recall that in the budget, in the women's economic security package, there was \$42.4 million announced. Specifically we are working on Boosting Female Founders, the Women in STEM strategy action plan and the higher level STEM qualifications program. Senator WATT: That is all departmental engagement with the sector, isn't it, rather than ministerial? Mrs Urquhart: I can certainly reiterate that, from the department's perspective, we've not seen a decline in interactions with the tech sector. We are flagging the work that we are doing in innovation on Women in STEM. Senator WATT: Sure. There is nothing in here that makes me think that the department's engagement with the sector would be impaired. It's about the minister's engagement with the sector. Mrs Urquhart: As I said, we would need to take on notice the minister's personal engagement because we don't have visibility of his diary. Certainly we have seen nothing to suggest that there has been any ebb in the work we are doing in either the technology sector or the Women in STEM initiatives in particular.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	22-23
BI-25	Jess Walsh	Advisory board members	Senator WALSH: This is probably already published. You mentioned your advisory board to your taskforce. Who is on that? Mr Luchetti: I might take that on notice at the moment. We have a concern that, because they will be undertaking the assessment and providing advice to government, making public who those individuals are may potentially result in situations where they are approached with regard to particular applications. Mr Fredericks: We need to take a bit of advice on that because they are part of the procurement process. We would need to get some advice from our lawyers and procurement experts. Senator WALSH: This is a situation where you might have companies on your advisory group who might bid for the— Mr Williamson: No. It's more about companies potentially approaching members of the advisory group bilaterally, if you like. Mr Fredericks: Bilaterally, yes. But we will take it on notice and see what we can come back with. ... Senator PATRICK: Can I ask a supplementary question? Senator WALSH: I don't mind, as long as I get more time at the end, being interrupted by you gentlemen. Senator PATRICK: Well, it's directly related. Did you say there is not a public listing of who is on the advisory board? Mr Fredericks: That's correct. But we did say that we would take it on notice. Senator PATRICK: The NIH in the US, when they look at grants and so forth, always publish the names of the people involved. They actually make it a disqualifying feature of a tender if someone who is tendering approaches someone who is on the board. From a transparency perspective, there should be no reason why you should not make that expert panel public. Mr Fredericks: I understand that point. Of course, we are taking advice from our lawyers and our probity advisers all the way through this process to make sure that we do the right thing. So we will take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: There would have to be a compelling reason not to do that. Secrecy around the awarding of contracts becomes an incubator for corruption. The threshold must be extremely high. Again, I note that the United States would not tolerate that. Mr Fredericks: We understand that point. Obviously, we are subject to the rules of the Commonwealth. We'll take it on notice for you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	26-27
BI-26	Anthony Chisholm	Details of meeting with Treasury, PM&S and Regional Development	Senator CHISHOLM: At our last hearing, Mr Williamson, I think you provided testimony that the industry department is working across government with colleagues in portfolios such as Treasury, Prime Minister, regional development and so on to ensure that we're keeping ministers very well advised on developments and the issues at play. I want to get some clarification. Since the beginning of 2021, how many times has the department of industry met with Treasury, PM&C and Regional Development to discuss Greensill Capital, GFG and the Whyalla steelworks? I hope that you can provide dates, including which ministers were present on which dates. Mr Williamson: Sure. I will have to take the substance of that on notice. In general, the department has had ongoing conversations with the agencies you mentioned. Would you say it was weekly, Mr Weaver? Mr Weaver: At one point it was daily. Mr Williamson: So, very frequently. We will come back to you with a number. They are discussions between departments and officials. They haven't involved ministers. But it is fair to say that the taskforce we have formed in the department has extensive and ongoing connections to those other agencies.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	32
BI-27	Anthony Chisholm	Meetings between Julie Bishop, Matthias Cormann and Lex Greensill	Senator CHISHOLM: Was the department informed of the meeting organised by Ms Julie Bishop between the former finance minister Matthias Cormann and Mr Lex Greensill and Mr David Cameron at Davos in 2019? Mr Williamson: Not that I am aware. Senator CHISHOLM: Could you take that on notice, particularly if the department conducted any research into Greensill Capital or its supply chain financing or prepared communications for the minister's office before that meeting? Mr Williamson: I will certainly do that. Senator CHISHOLM: Have any officials from the department of industry ever had verbal or written communications with Greensill Capital or Mr Lex Greensill? Mr Williamson: Not that I am aware. Senator CHISHOLM: Would you be able to take that on notice and provide a copy of those communications if they are available? Mr Williamson: Certainly.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	34-35

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-28	Rex Patrick	Discussions between Energy and Industry - SA & NSW Interconnector	Senator PATRICK: The timing of this was in the feasibility study, which was delivered to industry. Indeed, what concerns me is that in some sense—this is not a criticism of government; it is not a bad thing—that brought forward the interconnector. They've done that by way of funding. There's potential for a mismatch here. Perhaps on notice you could provide some details of the discussions that have taken place between energy and industry—dates and general outlines of the discussions that have taken place. I am also concerned—I get that this is not within the scope of your particular role, but it is absolutely directly related—about the two companies involved in that interconnector project for South Australia, which is, I think, Transgrid and ElectraNet. ElectraNet is a Chinese majority owned company that has in the past, as they are commercially entitled to, gone to China to source their transmission lines. Actually, in some sense, there is free scope for them to do that. The feasibility study identified that it needed to be price competitive. All of this can come rapidly unstuck if the government doesn't put the right emphasis on those two commercial entities to use Australian steel. Otherwise we'll end up putting in a capability in Whyalla that is no longer financially viable. I want to get a feeling as to whether or not that is being looked at. It is a serious issue. I am raising it as I don't want to have to come back here a year later and find that this has been mucked up. Mr Fredericks: I will take that on notice. The questions around the nature of that interconnector project fall in the energy portfolio.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	36
BI-29	Rex Patrick	Nu-Rock Grant Details	Senator PATRICK: My concern is that they are interconnected. It would be easy to muck up the timing of them. I have a second question in relation to Whyalla. A couple of years ago, a \$3 million grant for Nu-Rock was announced. I don't know if anyone knows about that. It is about basically supporting a company that can take the steel slag from Whyalla and turn it into building products, which may also solve the timber shortage problem that we've got here in Australia. That seems to have languished. Does anyone know about that project? Mr Williamson: I don't think we do. Our industry colleagues don't, so we'll take that on notice. It's not one that— Senator PATRICK: Is it possible to place a call so that when I come back after lunch or whenever, someone could at least— Mr Williamson: We'll try and find out what program that was under and what we can tell you about the grant ... Senator PATRICK: Did we end up getting someone who might be able to answer questions about Nu-Rock? Mr Williamson: Our AusIndustry network have had some contact with Nu-Rock, but we haven't been able to find any details of a grant. It may be something that is administered in another portfolio. We are still chasing. They are aware of the company, but they haven't done negotiations on a grant. Senator PATRICK: I know there are negotiations afoot, so maybe I haven't quite identified them. Mr Williamson: We are still on it. Mr Fredericks: We'll formally take it on notice. If we get any more information, we'll let you know.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	36-50
BI-30	Matthew Canavan	Steel consumption and Import figures	Senator CANAVAN: Do you have figures on how much we consume in finished steel? Mr Wilson: From memory, it is about 6.4 million tonnes. Mr Williamson: I have a stat here. Our domestic production is 73 per cent of national needs. Senator CANAVAN: So it is about that six to seven million tonnes a year? Mr Williamson: We'll come back to you with the exact details. Senator CANAVAN: That's alright. You can take it on notice and give me the exact figure. So we're a net importer of steel? We're the largest exporter of coking coal and iron ore in the world? Mr Wilson: We're not a net importer of steel. We produce about 5.3 million tonnes and we import about a million and something. Senator CANAVAN: I am saying a net importer in the sense that our consumption minus the poured steel— Mr Wilson: We do import steel, yes. Senator CANAVAN: Obviously we possibly import more than just the gap. Mr Wilson: I'm sorry, Senator, yes. Senator CANAVAN: We import more than just the gap, presumably, because some of our steel would be exported et cetera. But in net terms, on the exports and imports of it— Mr Wilson: Yes. Sorry, Senator. You're right. Senator CANAVAN: we are now a net importer of steel. When did we become a net importer of steel? When did our production of steel fall below domestic consumption? Mr Wilson: I would have to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	36-37
BI-31	Matthew Canavan	Tariffs on imported steel	Senator CANAVAN: Do you have the figures for what tariffs we're applying to steel imported from other countries at the moment, including any anti-dumping or countervailing duties? Mr Williamson: Not to hand, but we can get them for you. Senator CANAVAN: Take that on notice. Thank you. Mr Williamson: The Anti-Dumping Commission does report on that. Senator CANAVAN: They'll probably have those figures to hand? Mr Williamson: We'll pull them together for you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	38-39
BI-32	Anthony Chisholm	Patent box consulting with Treasury	Senator CHISHOLM: Were any consultants engaged in putting this proposal together? Mr Campbell: That would be a matter for Treasury. I would need to consult with them. Senator CHISHOLM: Did the government factor in expert advice from domestic or international sources about the efficacy of patent boxes? Mr Campbell: Again, I would need to consult with Treasury. They have lead carriage of the design of this. I am happy to take that on notice and check.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	43
BI-33	Anthony Chisholm	Patent box design of proposal	Senator CHISHOLM: Was industry involvement in the design of the proposal done through the department? Mr Campbell: When you say 'industry', do you mean external industry, not the industry department? Senator CHISHOLM: Yes, sorry. External. Mr Campbell: Honestly, I would have to take that on notice with the Treasury. I don't know what consultations they held directly with industry. Mr Fredericks: I think it is worth noting that it is a Treasury measure. I will call it out because it is here. The government has made it clear that they will consult with industry before settling the final detailed design of the patent box measure. Treasury has been open that they do see a need and a necessity to consult with industry in settling the final design. Mr Williamson: There is a discussion paper coming from Treasury on that shortly	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	44
BI-34	Rex Patrick	JAS-ANZ Testing	Senator PATRICK: I am not saying that you have in any way misled me. All I am saying is that no-one can have any confidence. This is where we started this conversation. We have a database that makes a claim that a product is safe. It doesn't contain the relevant information to be able to perhaps self-audit that claim because there is no test information available. There is no historical information available. Indeed, even the body that is doing the certifying has come to a conclusion erroneously that this very dangerous product is not being used in Australia when in fact it is, or that this product has relied on a certificate that is, in the words of the barrister for the victims of the Grenfell fire, not representative of the product subsequently sold on to the market. Mr Savery: I will have to take this information away with me and come back to you, because you are making an assertion. I don't know if it is correct or not until it has been looked at. Senator PATRICK: I am just following your audit trail. I have presented the documents mentioned in your audit trail in the information provided back to the committee. I am not saying you misled; I am simply saying you have this wrong in all the evidence I have laid out. It is an example. I will come back to the consequence of this. It is a clear demonstration that the system we have to assure people that building products are safe is, in fact, not doing its job. The taxpayer is not getting value for money, and it can give rise to significant safety concerns. One would ask whether or not we should can the whole lot. Mr Savery: Well, if you are asking that question, my answer is that the ABCB is in the process of reviewing product certification on behalf of building ministers as part of a national product assurance framework. There is work underway to determine a future for product certification for building products. Senator PATRICK: This erroneous finding means that there is on buildings in Australia a type of cladding that has an effect, as described by Mr Dalrymple, a senior member of the Victorian fire service during the Docklands fire, like wrapping buildings in petrol. Let me tell you some buildings around Australia that are using this product. Chisholm TAFE in Frankston is using this product. Parliament House in Tasmania is using this product. The admin, arts and technology building at Maribyrnong Secondary College is using this product. There is Chisholm Casey Technical School and Carey Grammar Middle School. I am being careful not to name private addresses because I don't want to devalue people's houses. There is Maribyrnong Secondary College. This is a dangerous product that is being used in this country. I am not suggesting that necessarily all of these are multistorey buildings. I will point out that the advice in the manual here says that you can go above 18 storeys. This is a complete failure, and it's putting Australian lives in danger. What do you say in relation to me naming those buildings that are using this product and to the owners and, in fact, users of those buildings? Mr Savery: I will have to go back and review the information provided to the ABCB when it requested reassurance as to whether or not this product had been tested to BS 8414	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	51-52

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-35	Andrew McLachlan	JAS-ANZ Audits	Senator McLACHLAN: Yes. I have a couple of questions. We had a conversation last time. I want to pick up where we ended off around the auditing. JAS-ANZ, for you, I understand, does the audits of the conformity bodies. Do you know how many conformity bodies there are, or is that a shifting number? Mr Savery: Well, it can shift. Senator, as I understand it at the moment, there are four accredited certification bodies under CodeMark. Senator McLACHLAN: They are accredited by JAS-ANZ? Mr Savery: By JAS-ANZ. Senator McLACHLAN: As I understand it, as a consequence of certifying them as being appropriate, they audit them. Are those audits scheduled each year, or are they random? How does that audit program work? Mr Savery: That is probably is a question ultimately that needs to be directed to JAS-ANZ. Obviously, I can take it on notice and do that. My understanding is that it is random. JAS-ANZ obviously accredits certification bodies for any number of different product certification schemes. They undertake scheduled and random audits of those bodies. Senator McLACHLAN: Do they publish them? I had a little difficulty finding them, but it could be my fault rather than theirs. Mr Savery: I would have to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	52-53
BI-36	Andrew McLachlan	JAS-ANZ Audit Report	Senator McLACHLAN: If you have any public information that is available, could you provide that to me? Mr Savery: Yes. Senator PATRICK: Could we have that audit report provided to the committee? Mr Savery: I would have to talk to JAS-ANZ as to whether or not the audit report is a public document. But there is public information available. Senator PATRICK: Even though it is not public, that doesn't stop the Senate asking for it. Senator McLACHLAN: I will formally call for it, and you can take advice on whether it's available or not. We can go through that process. That gives you something to go away with back to the board.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	53
BI-37	Andrew McLachlan	JAS-ANZ Legal Status	Senator McLACHLAN: It is on structure. You say it is not for profit. Under what act is it incorporated—a state act, or is it a federal incorporation? Mrs Urquhart: In answer to that question, I don't have the precise information at my fingertips. But I did mention that it is under a treaty. My assumption is that the terms of the arrangements are set down in the treaty. Mr Williamson: We'll take it on notice. The specific question is an interesting question, so we'll take it on notice. Senator McLACHLAN: It is. I am asking more as a lawyer out of a peculiar interest in its legal status. I am interested in whether it has a membership or a nominal membership and whether that membership is held by the states and New Zealand. The next question you can take on notice is whether we can ultimately sack them. Mrs Urquhart: We'll provide you with a comprehensive— Senator McLACHLAN: I'm not suggesting we do. I am interested in the legal situation. Mrs Urquhart: No. We'll certainly provide you with more comprehensive information on notice. Mr Fredericks: We will. We will get you comprehensive information on that. It is an interesting element, wearing your lawyer's hat, that an Australian government minister is responsible for making the appointments to the board, which is an unusual not-for-profit company. We'll have to see how that looks.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	55
BI-38	Murray Watt	Ministerial response to Departmental complaint	Senator WATT: And it wasn't shared with any other department within the government. So it was raised at the minister's office. Do you know whether the minister's office raised it with any other ministerial office, such as the Prime Minister's office? Ms Bryant: I don't know. I would have to take that on notice. I would go back to the nature of the complaint didn't warrant that level of communication, certainly by the department with Prime Minister and Cabinet or the APSC. Senator WATT: Minister, do you know whether the matter was raised with any other minister's office such as the Prime Minister's office? Senator Seselja: No. I don't. Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice, please? Senator Seselja: Sure. Senator WATT: If it was, when, how, with whom and what action was taken? Senator Seselja: Sure. Senator WATT: Do you know whether the Prime Minister or any other minister has ever spoken with Minister Porter about this complaint? Senator Seselja: No, I don't. Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice, please? Senator Seselja: Sure	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	57-58
BI-39	Murray Watt	Complaints regarding Minister Andrews	Senator WATT: Did you ever have a complaint made by a departmental officer about Minister Andrews while you were in the portfolio? Mr Fredericks: I don't believe I ever did. I think we would have to take that on notice. Senator WATT: Do you know, Ms Bryant? Ms Bryant: I'm not aware, Senator. I would have to check with my team.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	58
BI-40	Rex Patrick	Reasoning in delay of launch permits	Senator PATRICK: I am going to a concern that they may have withdrawn because the opportunity passed with the delay in the launch permits. Are you aware of that as a reason? Mr Palermo: I am not aware of that as a requirement for them withdrawing. I can certainly look into that further. Senator PATRICK: If you wouldn't mind, take it on notice. This is a theme that I have been running with—that you guys haven't been keeping up on these things. You were enthusiastic last time, I think, or optimistic, might be the word, with a bit of caution. Why haven't we got to the point where we've issued one yet? Mr Palermo: As I say, I am still optimistic. I think this is an incredible part. It is why access to space is a key priority area for the agency. As you would expect, circumstances can change. I have had an expectation that we would issue a permit by now. But, at this point in time, I would say that no applicant has met the requirements under the rules of the act to issue a permit. We are getting closer every day. We work almost weekly and on a daily basis with one applicant in particular. There are two things required to get a permit. One is the launch facility licence. We have issued only one of them, which is the Koonibba one.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	59
BI-41	Rex Patrick	Comparing jurisdictions	Senator PATRICK: As part of the review that you just talked about, are we benchmarking or at least establishing what other jurisdictions charge so that we understand where we are competing as a government against, perhaps, the US government or other jurisdictions? Mr Palermo: Yes. We understand what other jurisdictions do in this respect. Senator PATRICK: Is there any chance of providing that information to the committee? ... Senator PATRICK: Can I have a response to that? In some sense, you were looking at it from an agency lens as opposed to a customer lens. Someone who wants to conduct a launch looks around and says: 'I don't care about the history. I see that New Zealand does this price. The US does this price. Australia does this price.' That clearly would be factored into where they want to set up and establish. That is the lens upon which I would like to look at how competitive you are compared with other jurisdictions. Mr Palermo: Understood. We can provide that information on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	61-62
BI-42	Rex Patrick	Economic snapshot figures	Senator PATRICK: This is the economic snapshot of the Australian space sector for 2016-17. I will give you the relevant page. I will seek to table it if we need to. See the highlighted numbers there? Mr Muffett: I think we have provided this previously on notice. We'll take it on notice. We can give you the breakdown of where that figure has come from.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	63
BI-43	Murray Watt	MMS Budget figures	Senator WATT: So administered funds budgeted in 2020-21 was about \$72 million? Ms Luchetti: Correct. Senator WATT: And you are confident that you will have all of that spent by 30 June? Ms Luchetti: We're on track. Senator WATT: What is the most recent figure you have? Ms Luchetti: I would have to take that on notice. What I can tell you is that the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund round 2 grant opportunity has opened and closed, and announcements are due to be made shortly. It has \$50 million in grants in projects allocated to the national manufacturing priority areas. With regard to the Supply Chain Resilience Initiative, we've conducted ongoing analysis and identified a number of sectors there. It has \$100 million worth of grants that will open on 1 July. We've spent that money around the Supply Chain Resilience Initiative.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	68

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-44	Bridget McKenzie	MMS consultation and studies	Senator McKENZIE: Can the department outline what consultation was undertaken that led to the identification of the six national manufacturing priorities that form the Modern Manufacturing Strategy? How did we pick the six? Ms Luchetti: Broad consultation was undertaken regarding the six national manufacturing priorities. Some analysis was done by our Chief Economist around comparative advantage. I might need to get the Chief Economist to talk about the analysis done around comparative advantage. Mr Campbell: The identification of sectors of comparative advantage and strategic interest were part of the detailed ERC cabinet process. So all of the relevant departments, including agriculture and water, were definitely consulted as part of the development of all the priority sectors. Senator McKENZIE: So the departments were consulted? Mr Campbell: Correct. As part of the ERC process. It is normal practice. It was based on our own internal analysis and a range of other analyses pointing to areas where Australia has comparative advantage. Senator McKENZIE: So internal analysis, I understand. What other analysis? Mr Campbell: We drew on a lot of external analyses as well. There has been quite a number of previous studies about areas of comparative advantage in Australia that have generally pointed to areas such as food and beverage, the agriculture sector and the tourism sector and so forth. There's quite a long history to the use of these revealed comparative analysis tools and techniques. Senator McKENZIE: On notice, could you provide me with those external studies that you have done? I would appreciate that. Mr Campbell: I can do so.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	71
BI-45	Bridget McKenzie	Fibre consultation	Senator McKENZIE: You said you consulted external papers et cetera. You have consulted departments. Did you talk to industry bodies, RDCs et cetera, about what manufacturing capability in fibre products exist in this country? Mr Campbell: Certainly, as part of the exercise, we drew on the advice of some of the industry growth centres as well. They have connections into a lot of the sectors. I have colleagues that would be closer to that. We can try to take it on notice and come back to you if there is anything further we can provide. Senator McKENZIE: Yes. On notice, I think there is some conjecture about the depth of consultation and, therefore, knowledge around what is actually out there. Can I take it that there were no internal discussions or assessment by government to add fibre manufacturing to the food, beverage and fibre section of the manufacturing strategy? Ms Luchetti: Fibre, wool and timber all benefit from the Modern Manufacturing Strategy, particularly pillars 1 and 2. One is getting the economic conditions right. Two is about science and technology. It is important to say that if, for instance, there is interest from a fibre manufacturer and it wanted to work with one of the national manufacturing priority sectors, and the work aligns, they would be eligible under the Modern Manufacturing Strategy.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	72
BI-46	Bridget McKenzie	Regional manufacturing consultation numbers	Senator McKENZIE: The other aspect I want to pursue is regional manufacturing and the level of consultation you had with regional manufacturers in developing the strategy. Ms Luchetti: I can't break down the numbers around regional consultation. All up— Senator McKENZIE: Why can't you break that down? Ms Luchetti: I would have to take that on notice. Senator McKENZIE: Okay. Ms Luchetti: I will take that on notice for you. The department received 340 submissions through the consultation process in a three-week period. I will look at those from regional manufacturers.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	72
BI-47	Bridget McKenzie	Regional manufacturing data	Senator McKENZIE: On notice, could you provide a little more detail on the opportunities and challenges for regional manufacturing that were identified through your consultation? Mr Purtell: Happy to, Senator. Senator McKENZIE: How many jobs in regional areas will the strategy deliver? Mr Purtell: As Mr Campbell was saying, we don't do projections on the jobs through the strategy. Given the number of jobs created, as discussed earlier, following the bounce-back from COVID and the significant role that manufacturing jobs play in regions, I think there is already an upward trajectory. We would expect that to continue. We don't have precise projections. Senator McKENZIE: Is that something you actually choose to accept, or do you just look at a global number? Mr Purtell: We certainly examine it. If you look at the road maps, you see that all of them talk about measures of success. Again, they come from industry, largely or predominantly. Jobs is one of the elements that industry has said obviously indicates that we are progressing towards the goals set out in the road maps. It is not the only one. I think in all six national manufacturing priorities, there is increased value added and increased investment. I should say it is very heartening to see that the investment numbers in manufacturing have also been tracking up over recent months. Some credit is to be given to the strategy for encouraging that investment. There are exports and new patents and other forms of IP. Depending on the road map, there are four, five or six things that we are tracking in terms of measuring success. Senator McKENZIE: If I could get the regional numbers on that, that would be great.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	74
BI-48	Murray Watt	Manufacturing grants	Senator WATT: What was it last time? Was it about 19 or something like that? Mr Campbell: Seventeen, it might have been. I might have to check that. The jobs attached, though—again, these are small programs—is 122. Senator WATT: When were the grants paid out for round 1? Mr Campbell: I will get that information for you. Senator WATT: I am after the date or approximate date that the round 1 grants were paid out. Ms Greenwood: I can't give you the precise dates rolling through. We start the funding process. The project commences. All of those projects have different completion dates. They also have milestone payments that happen across those dates. We will take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	76
BI-49	Rex Patrick	AI Program Schedules	Senator PATRICK: Is it possible for you to lay out those particular objectives, with perhaps a schedule that says when the centres are likely to be commenced, where they are to be commenced and how long until you think they're going to be up and running, and the same for the other program? I just want a bit of a time line as to what your plans are. Ms Goldsworthy: I can give you an update on where they are at and the current stage, if that is helpful. Senator PATRICK: Yes. I'm happy to do that, but just— Mr Fredericks: I think we might do that very briefly and take it on notice, because I think I know what you're after, Senator. Senator PATRICK: Yes. Mr Fredericks: You just want a bit of an understanding about the time frame for the rollout of each of the four measures. Senator PATRICK: Yes. What the time frames are. Mr Fredericks: So we'll just take that on notice	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	80
BI-50	Rex Patrick	CRC Details	Senator PATRICK: In terms of the outcomes of the CRCs that were part of this program, is it possible, perhaps on notice, to provide feedback on what was done under those CRCs and what was achieved under them? Mr Bradley: Sure. I'll just make a point of clarification. The \$25 million was for what we call CRC-P, cooperative research centre projects, which had a specific focus on AI. I have some examples, but we can take that on notice if you prefer. Senator PATRICK: Can you give me the examples? I am quite curious. Mr Bradley: Some of the projects that were funded, included: automating data collection and analytics in underground mines using drones and AI, transforming joint surgery rehabilitation with AI in telehealth, image recognition to detect brain aneurysms, and enabling real-time medical diagnostics using a digital stethoscope. Senator PATRICK: If you wouldn't mind, on notice, describing each of the CRCs—to that level is fine—and also where they are going; whether or not those particular projects have reached finality and are not being progressed or whether there's some next stage that has been taken up commercially. I would just like to be able to see some outcome from the program that isn't necessarily funded by the taxpayer but someone's taken that and done something with it, if that's possible. Mr Bradley: Sure. I think we can follow up on that. We can provide some detail.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	81

Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-51	Murray Watt	Budget allocations from MMF	Senator WATT: Mr Fredericks looks like he does. I was looking at page 38 of the PBS. There's the allocations for the MMF. But maybe some of that \$37 million is round 1 funding? Mr Fredericks: Yes. I think you could be right, Senator. Just on that table you are looking at on page 38, I would be more confident if I had our chief financial officer to unpack that for you. So, if it's okay, we'll take that on notice. Senator WATT: Sure. Okay. So, to be clear, close to \$37 million has been allocated for the MMF in the coming financial year, but only \$25 million of that is for round 2? Mr Williamson: I think that is right. We'll confirm that for you on notice. Ms Greenwood: Yes. That is my understanding. But we'll take it on notice to confirm it.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	82
BI-52	Murray Watt	Remainder of funds	Senator WATT: How much of that \$72 million that is administered funds is not likely to have been received by successful grant applicants by the end of this financial year? I understand what you're saying: all \$72 million will be committed or allocated—or however we want to phrase it—but how much of that money will still be in the hands of the Commonwealth, as opposed to in the hands of X, Y, Z corporation? Mr Fredericks: I'll answer that in two ways. Our aim is to have zero in the hands of the Commonwealth at the end of this financial year—that is, all of it in the hands of grantees. But, secondly, as you will appreciate, Senator, that will depend on the capacity of grantees to receive that money in that time. Senator WATT: It's on 3 June. The announcements haven't been made yet. Is it likely that any of the successful applicants will actually receive money this year, or is it more likely that they'll receive it next year when they achieve their milestones? Mr Fredericks: I'm just going to keep repeating myself. Our aim is to achieve full allocation out of the Commonwealth. It will depend on the capacity of grantees to manage that. Senator WATT: Can I pre-emptively put in a question on notice then. You've normally got 30 days to respond, which will take us over 30 June. Can you come back to me in 30 days on notice to say how much has left the Commonwealth? Mr Fredericks: We'll come back to you, in accordance with the usual rules with time lines for coming back on QONs, but we understand that you will want the answer to speak as of 30 June. Senator WATT: Correct. Mr Fredericks: Roger that. Senator WATT: So even if we don't get the answer until 3 July or 5 July or whatever, I'm talking about 30 June. Mr Fredericks: We understand. Senator WATT: Thanks. Maybe you could break it into the programs: the strategy overall, MMI and MMF. Mr Williamson: The grants programs.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	83-84
BI-53	Murray Watt	Industry growth centres details	Senator WATT: How long have those six growth centres existed? Mr Williamson: Since 2015. I think possibly a couple started in early 2016, but I'll come back to you if that's incorrect. Senator WATT: I would like to know the amount of funding that the growth centres were allocated for the last four financial years. Mr Williamson: Sure. We might have to— Ms Looney: Yes, I don't think I have that in front of me at the moment, Senator, so we can take that on notice and get back to you. Senator WATT: From the rough calculations we've done, we think it's around \$270 million over the last four years. Does that sound right? Ms Looney: That sounds in the ballpark, yes. Senator WATT: Do some get more than others, or is there an even distribution? Ms Looney: Yes, some do get more than others, but it's a relatively even distribution. We can provide that information. Senator WATT: So the total Commonwealth funding to all six of them over the last four years was around about \$270 million? I won't hold you to the exact figure, but it's around that. Mr Williamson: Yes, it's in our ballpark. That's right. Ms Looney: It's in that ballpark, and we can confirm that.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	85
BI-54	Murray Watt	IGC review report	Senator WATT: Has the department undertaken any review, or engaged external consultants to undertake a review, into the operation of the industry growth centres? Mr Williamson: Yes. As part of our departmental evaluation strategy, there was what I think is called an initial impact evaluation conducted throughout last year. Senator WATT: Who conducted that? Mr Williamson: That was conducted by ACLI Allen. Senator WATT: What did you call that review? Mr Williamson: I think it was called an initial impact evaluation. Senator WATT: Of the IGCs? Mr Williamson: Of the IGCs, yes. Senator WATT: Has that been made public? Mr Williamson: No, it hasn't. Senator WATT: Is there a reason that it hasn't been made public? Mr Williamson: The department's still considering the evaluation and has yet to formally brief ministers on it. It will potentially go to questions of the future of the growth centre initiative. So at the moment it hasn't been released publicly, but that's not to say it won't be. Senator WATT: Could you table a copy of that review, please. Mr Williamson: I will have to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	87
BI-55	Murray Watt	IGC Review - Ministerial briefing	Senator WATT: As I understand it—and I think there have been a few media reports about this—the report was completed in the final quarter of 2020. Mr Williamson: Yes. I think we received it in December. Senator WATT: So the final report hasn't been sent to the minister's office. Were any draft reports sent to the minister's office? That could cover either Minister Porter or Minister Andrews. Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of, but we can take that on notice. Senator WATT: Was Minister Andrews ever briefed on this report, given she held the role until March? Mr Williamson: I don't believe so, no. Senator WATT: So the report was received by the department around about December. Mr Williamson: Yes. Senator WATT: But neither Minister Porter nor Minister Andrews was ever briefed on it? Mr Williamson: That's correct—to date. Senator WATT: What about Minister Andrews's office? Were they ever provided with a copy, or was it ever discussed with them? Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of, but I'll take that on notice. Again, they were aware that the evaluation was happening. I should just step back. The department's evaluation strategy, I think, is on the website. It's public. All of the evaluations that are being or will be conducted are flagged. Minister Andrews and her office would have been aware of that. I'll just take on notice the extent to which any further briefing was provided. Senator WATT: Ms Looney or Mr Campbell, as the people overseeing this review, did either of you brief the minister's office—either the previous minister or the current minister? Mr Campbell: No. Ms Looney: No. Senator WATT: Consequently, no feedback would have ever been provided to the department from either minister or from either minister's office about the review? Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of, but we will come back you. Senator WATT: You did said they were aware the review was happening. Mr Williamson: Yes. Senator WATT: Was any guidance given by either minister or either minister's office about the outcome they were looking for or some recommendations they thought would be worthwhile? Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of, no. Senator WATT: Ms Looney or Mr Campbell? Ms Looney: I'd need to take that on notice. Senator WATT: But you're not aware of anything? Ms Looney: No.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	88
BI-56	Murray Watt	IGC Review report - date of receipt	Senator WATT: Could you confirm for me the exact date you received the final copy of the report? Mr Williamson: Sure. Senator WATT: But you think it was December? Mr Williamson: Yes.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	89
BI-57	Murray Watt	IGC - Ministerial comments to Department	Senator WATT: What about Minister Andrews? Did she or her staff ever express a view to the department about how the industry growth centres were going? Mr Williamson: Not that leaps to my mind. We can check if we have anything on record. Senator WATT: Never critical of the industry growth centres or wanting changes made or anything like that? Ms Looney: I'd need to take that on notice, sorry. I'd need to consult with my colleagues on that.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	89
BI-58	Malcolm Roberts	IISA Grant guidelines	Senator ROBERTS: That's initially what it was. Next question: in any of the grants programs that are administered by IISA, is there a requirement that the beneficiary is an Australian entity? Dr Cameron: I would have to take that on notice about the specific grant guidelines for each of the grants under the remit of the board.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	95

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-59	Anthony Chisholm	Medical and biotech patent application details	Senator CHISHOLM: How many medical and biotech patents are there in Australia? Dr Mitra-Kahn: You have to be careful in defining what you mean by medical and biotech patents. The World Intellectual Property Organization has a technology classification scheme. Underneath that, they have a definition for medical and biotech. In 2018, which is the last year we have full data for in terms of being published, total filings in Australia for biotech was 2,800, which is about nine per cent of total patent filings here, and for medical it's 4,067, which is 13½ per cent of total filings. So that's both domestic and international companies filing biotech and medical patents in Australia. For Australian applicants, those numbers are smaller. They add up to about 277 for biotech and 158 for medical technologies in that year. Senator CHISHOLM: They're applications or granted patents? Dr Mitra-Kahn: Those are applications in 2018. Senator CHISHOLM: Could you provide more detail about that on notice? Dr Mitra-Kahn: Absolutely	IP Australia	3/06/2021	98
BI-60	Jess Walsh	CSIRO Staffing	Senator WALSH: In relation to your staff, some are employed in ways that are largely attached to the government funding, and some are employed in ways that are attached to the independent funding. And some are employed, as I understand it, directly by you, and some are working on projects which could actually be located in the partner facility and may even be funded as part of your work but employed by the partner facility, and then you have some employees who are agency workers as well. So you've got a variety of ways in which your staff are employed and funded. Within that, some are researchers and some are other operational staff. Are you able to provide us with a breakdown that would make sense, within your organisation, of where your staff sit on that matrix I'm describing? Ms Zielke: Yes, we could take that on notice and come back to you. We've provided a range of responses to questions like that previously. I think that's just a slight variation and we can accommodate that. Senator WALSH: That could be broadly as at today and then also— Ms Zielke: As at the end of May is probably what we can commit to. But it reflects the highly collaborative nature of what we do. People are brought in to meet the need, depending on what their capability and expertise is. Senator WALSH: Yes. I understand you've provided this sort of information before, but some people are directly employed, but they might be on rolling contracts, for example, or on contracts, so if we could have— Ms Zielke: Whether it be labour hire or whether it be non-ongoing or temporary arrangements as opposed to permanent? Senator WALSH: Yes, all of that. Ms Zielke: Yes, we can provide that.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	101
BI-61	Bridget McKenzie	SMR Technology inclusion 2019-20	Senator McKENZIE: Why was SMR technology not included in the scope of the Aurecon costs and technical parameter reviews for 2019-20? Dr Mayfield: The current work is being done for 2020-21. I'd have to go back and find, on notice, what happened in 2019-20. Senator McKENZIE: I'd appreciate that. I'd like to understand whether one of the reasons for not including SMR in such analysis was that we currently have a prohibition on nuclear energy in Australia. Dr Mayfield: No, that's not correct.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	104
BI-62	Bridget McKenzie	Stakeholder engagement	Senator McKENZIE: Thank you. In terms of stakeholder engagement, has the CSIRO engaged with any vendors, such as NuScale, Rolls-Royce or General Electric, regarding the engineering cost analysis that they've undertaken? Dr Mayfield: I'd have to take that on notice. That's something that Aurecon or GHD would have done. They had primary responsibility.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	104
BI-63	Matthew Canavan	Coal production	Senator CANAVAN: How much coal do we produce? How much of the world's coal does Australia produce? Dr Marshall: I could give you that on notice.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	107
BI-64	Malcolm Roberts	References	Dr Marshall:...I was remiss for Senator Roberts. I had promised to give documentary evidence that we were in the top 0.1 per cent in our four core fields of science—that's this document I'm holding—and also that CSIRO puts Australia at No. 3 in the world for innovation organisations. We're the only organisation on the Reuters top-25 list and the only Australian organisation on the IEEE top-25 list. We rank seventh in Australia for academic excellence, but for innovation we rank No. 1. Senator ROBERTS: Thanks, Dr Marshall. I'd like to respond to that. CHAIR: I'll allow you to respond. Dr Marshall, is that answering questions that you'd taken on notice? Dr Marshall: Last time, Senator Roberts challenged the veracity of CSIRO's science excellence. He demanded documentary evidence. I'm just providing that. CHAIR: If that's a response to a question then we will need you to at least get the references to those documents sent to the secretariat. We don't need them tonight.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	108-109
BI-65	Matthew Canavan	CSIRO Edible insect report details	Senator CANAVAN: I've noticed that in the past you've been very successful at pulling out different recipe books. Are you planning to do something similar? Are you planning to put out a recipe book out for insects and bugs for Australians so they know how to prepare the delicacies? Dr Mayfield: I'm not aware of anything there. I'd have to take that on notice and ask. Senator CANAVAN: You don't have information about what types of wines go with different types of bugs or anything like that for us? One of the benefits here apparently—you put it on your Facebook page—is: Here's how eating insects is better for the environment. Compared to conventionally farmed animals like beef, pork and chicken, insects produce fewer greenhouse gases. Given that, and given that we all want to save the planet, did anyone here have bugs for dinner last night? Dr Marshall: Not last night, but last week I did. Senator CANAVAN: You did have bugs last week? Dr Marshall: Balmain bugs, though. Senator CANAVAN: Right. I'm not sure that fits into your category, consistent with saving the planet. So why aren't you eating bugs? Why aren't you following your own advice if you want to save the planet? No-one's consuming them. Why not? Dr Marshall: I've had grasshoppers. Senator CANAVAN: I have too, in China. More seriously, how much did this report cost? Dr Mayfield: I don't have that. I'd have to take it on notice. Senator CANAVAN: Take that on notice. How many people worked on the report in the CSIRO? Dr Mayfield: It'd be the same: I would have to take that on notice. Senator CANAVAN: On page 57 of the report, you had 16 people from the CSIRO listed as being thanked for their work on the report. Is that about right—about 16 people? Dr Mayfield: I don't know, but with most of our work we would do it with a team of people where people make various contributions, from major to minor. Senator CANAVAN: Okay. Please take on notice how many. In the report itself—I'm not seeking to denigrate any of your businesses here—you say the industry is only worth \$10 million a year in Australia annually. How, Dr Marshall, do you decide the CSIRO's priorities here and put what seem to be significant amounts of resources—apparently 16 staff—into a report on an industry worth just \$10 million a year? Senator CANAVAN: Can you take on notice how many downloads of the Spanish translation you've had from your website? Dr Mayfield: Yes, we can do that. Senator CANAVAN: You may as well add how many downloads of the English version there have been as well, if you could. CHAIR: You've probably boosted that! Senator CANAVAN: I've downloaded it today. I note that in the report you hosted a three-day bug symposium in Brisbane in August 2019 as part of the work here. How much did that cost? Dr Mayfield: I'd have to take that on notice.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	109-110
BI-66	Matthew Canavan	Bug symposium	Senator CANAVAN: If you could, take on notice how much the bug symposium cost and, also, where it was held. Also, if you could, take on notice any costs of catering—in particular, for individual events, and what was served at those events. What was the menu? I'd be particularly interested, of course, if there were bugs on the menu. Hopefully, there was no beef eaten at this three-day symposium! What is your view—we've already spoken a lot about carbon emissions and these things—do we have to reduce our consumption of beef to meet net zero emissions? Has the CSIRO done work on that	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	111
BI-67	Rex Patrick	Covid19 challenge model funding	Senator PATRICK: In terms of payments and benefits that flow from these, was it CEPI that funded it? Dr Marshall: Yes, we have a partnership with the Coalition of Epidemic Preparedness. CSIRO also put significant resources into that, as I mentioned earlier in the hearing. Senator PATRICK: Can I find out, perhaps on notice, how much you put into that particular program? Dr Marshall: Sure.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	112-113

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-68	Rex Patrick	Clinical trials company involvement	Senator PATRICK: COVAX was one of them. Were the University of Queensland involved in this at all? Ms Zielke: CEPI contracted us to undertake clinical trials on some of those, and there was also some other work that we were contracted directly for. We can provide that information. Senator PATRICK: Yes. If you could tell us the names of the companies involved I'd be interested. Obviously UQ then died off after a while. Did you say they were involved or not? Dr Marshall: Yes. We helped scale up the UQ vaccine and the AstraZeneca vaccine. We also worked with CSL to figure out how to manufacture both in the hope that UQ was successful. ... Senator PATRICK: That's one of the things that concerns me, actually. CEPI had not prioritised UQ's, yet COVAX was prioritised. That's the Flinders Uni stuff. It didn't even make it into the first RRF. Ms Zielke: Again, whilst I'll take that on notice, I think you will find—and I'm going from memory—that it wasn't as progressed as UQ's. So it was about at what stage it was in the process as well. The South Australian one was behind— Senator PATRICK: How did it get a priority from CEPI to go into the ferret model if it was behind UQ? Senator PATRICK: Was anyone in CSIRO involved in the MRFF decision-making process that led to the grant that went to UQ? Ms Zielke: No. I'll just clarify that we were initially going to partner with UQ to put forward an application together for the MRFF arrangement. We would have been a party, so of course we couldn't participate in the assessment. We didn't subsequently proceed. Senator PATRICK: Why did you not do that? Ms Zielke: I suppose I'd best take that on notice. I think it was more in relation to timing and use of our facilities, but I'll come back to you on that one. Senator PATRICK: So you'll also give me all of the companies that were prioritised to go through that? Dr Marshall: I don't think we had enough ferrets, to be honest! Senator PATRICK: Sorry? Dr Marshall: We didn't have enough ferrets to test another vaccine. Senator PATRICK: Sure. I understand. So you had to prioritise them— Ms Zielke: Novavax, not COVAX. I think now I'm realising that we're using— Dr Marshall: COVAX is a consortium arrangement. Senator PATRICK: Yes. Ms Zielke: So Novavax, I think, is what we were talking about, not COVAX. Senator PATRICK: Okay; that's the one from Vaxine Pty Ltd—Dr Petrovsky? Ms Zielke: I need to check that. Senator PATRICK: Just generally, in the broad, I'm really interested in what you did before COVID—the work you were doing—and then that period when Australia was selecting what it did, in terms of the UQ, AstraZeneca and so forth, and then perhaps, subsequent to that, what continuing work you have done since some of that initial prioritisation activity. I'm interested to see what you've been doing since— Ms Zielke: We'll also confirm the bits of that where we were in the decision-making process and where we weren't— Senator PATRICK: That would be really appreciated. Ms Zielke: because CEPI's decisions were taken by CEPI, not by us— Senator PATRICK: Sure. Ms Zielke: but we'll clarify that.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	113-114
BI-69	Janet Rice	CSIRO Labour hire	Senator RICE: And how about those who are employed in the categories of research scientists and engineers? Ms Zielke: We don't have scientists employed as labour hire. Senator RICE: You did have a year ago or two years ago, when I last asked this question—and I knew one of them personally. Ms Zielke: My apologies. I'll take that on notice. I thought our answer had been in the negative.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	116
BI-70	Janet Rice	UWA bid	Senator RICE: The uni of Melbourne was very happy for their bid to be made completely public, and I have seen that bid. I haven't seen the UWA bid. We were told at estimates last week that the CSIRO involvement with the UWA bid was more significant than it was with the uni of Melbourne bid. Without knowing the details, do you have any information about the different levels of engagement? Dr Mayfield: I personally don't have any real details for you today, but I'm happy to sort of— Senator RICE: Okay, if you could take it on notice, then—and whether there was a material difference in the engagement that CSIRO was proposing to have. That's certainly what was indicated to us at estimates last week. Dr Mayfield: I'm sure it comes down to the context of each of those bids as to what they were looking to deliver. It's inevitable that they'll be a little bit different, but I'd have to look into that for you. Senator RICE: Thank you—and what the value of the CSIRO's contribution would have been. Dr Mayfield: Sure.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	116
BI-71	Anthony Chisholm	Trustworthy system teams	Senator CHISHOLM: Okay. AI has been identified as a sector that is going to be really important in autonomous cars and so forth. What funding is being directed to ensuring that we have a system that's safe from hackers and is robust, I suppose, in its use? Ms Zielke: We could take on notice what work, if any, we are doing specifically in that area at the moment and come back to you with advice in relation to costs, value et cetera of that work.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	118
BI-72	Anthony Chisholm	Data61 Staffing	Senator CHISHOLM: Okay. I have one final question, which will probably be on notice as well: can you provide your staffing numbers for Data61 from 2015 onward? Ms Zielke: Yes, we can.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	118
BI-73	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO letter to Senator Roberts	Senator ROBERTS: Can you quantify that for me? Because it's never been quantified by anyone anywhere in the world. I want to know the specific effect of carbon dioxide on climate factors, including atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, ocean alkalinity, storm severity and frequency. I want to know the specific quantified effect. CHAIR: Dr Marshall, do you want to take it on notice, or do you want to say that you have already answered that question? Dr Marshall: I think I can dig up a letter that we already sent you but I'll happily take it on notice and send it to you again.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	119-120
BI-74	Matthew Canavan	CSIRO engagement with Wuhan Institute	Senator CANAVAN: That's fine. I don't need that. What other work have you done with scientists from the Wuhan Institute of Virology in the last few years? Ms Zielke: I would need to take that on notice. I don't believe it's a lengthy list. Senator CANAVAN: If you could take that on notice. Ms Zielke: Yes.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	120
BI-75	Matthew Canavan	Query - written prohibition	Senator CANAVAN: Sorry. Can you just answer that specific question: do you have a written prohibition within the CSIRO against gain of function research? Ms Zielke: I'll come back and confirm that. Senator CANAVAN: You can take that on notice. If you do have such a written prohibition, please take on notice when that was made—if it does exist. Ms Zielke: Okay.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	120
BI-76	Murray Watt	STEM job figures	Senator WATT: Okay. Could you provide, maybe on notice, some figures about the number of STEM jobs that are available in the current and future labour workforce? Could you tell us the number of people currently employed in STEM related fields and what the current level of vacancies or shortages is—however you want to define that? And what are the projections for the future? Dr Foley: Sure, we can do that, but it's probably something to take on notice. Senator WATT: Thanks. And maybe you could identify what the gaps are in the future, comparing how many we'll need versus how many we're expecting to have, based on current trends. Dr Foley: Sure.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	122
BI-77	Murray Watt	Commercialising research ranking	Senator WATT: Where do we rank in comparison to the rest of the world on commercialising research? Dr Foley: I'd have to check on that. It depends on what measure you use. Can I take that on notice? It's a very technical question.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	122
BI-78	Murray Watt	Funding of OCS	Senator WATT: I have some questions about your resourcing. What's the current level of funding allocated to the chief scientist in 2020-2021? Dr Foley: That's actually something for the department to answer, because I'm actually not part of the department. I'm in the department, not of the department. It's part of the departmental budget. Senator WATT: Are you able to look it up, Mr Williamson? Mr Williamson: Sorry, I don't think I have the numbers with me. I can take it on notice. But, yes, as Dr Foley said, the department provides funding for a small unit for the chief scientist—a staffing contingent, travel and other costs. From memory, that's at about the same level as it has been for the last couple of years. But I'll come back to you on notice on that. Senator WATT: Thanks. Could you provide the funding allocated to the office for 2020-2021, 2021-2022 and over the whole forward estimates? Mr Williamson: Happy to. Senator WATT: Thanks. Can we also get how many staff resources the office has for the 2021-2022 financial year? Mr Williamson: Sure.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	124-125
BI-79	Murray Watt	OCS Consultation	Senator WATT: And how that compares to 2020-2021? Dr Foley, were you or your office consulted about the funding that was allocated to you as part of this year's budget? Dr Foley: I wasn't consulted, but the office may have been. Senator WATT: Can you take that on notice, to find that out? Dr Foley: Sure.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	125

Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-80	Malcolm Roberts	OCS documents from 1996	Senator ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Dr Foley, for being here tonight. We're under a time deadline at the moment so I'll just give you a bit of background to understand why I'm making the request I'm making. You just said that the chief scientist's role is to provide evidence, presumably scientific evidence. I've asked chief scientists as far back as Dr Penny Sackett for evidence on climate and I had a presentation from Dr Finkel to me in 2017—that was in the company of Senator Arthur Sinodinos, the then science minister. Dr Finkel talked for about 20 minutes and then we asked him some questions. Dr Finkel then said, 'I'm sorry, I'm not a climate scientist and I don't understand it so we'll have another meeting later.' He asked me if he could bring a scientist. Keep that in mind, and the fact that I've done freedom-of-information requests from BOM and CSIRO, and I've had Parliamentary Library information from CSIRO. I haven't found any agency that has given me the empirical scientific evidence which proves that carbon dioxide from human activity affects the climate and needs to be cut. This shouldn't be an onerous task for you and your group, because not a lot has been sent to the government. I'd like you, please, to provide a list of the documents in which the Office of the Chief Scientist has provided scientific advice to ministers, including prime ministers, to MPs and to senators and containing logical scientific points proving that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut. Take it on notice, and I'll put the requirements I specifically need, in terms of a time line, on that. I'd like the date range for documents to be from the start of the Howard-Anderson government, on 11 March 1996, to the present. I'd like that list of documents, please. Dr Foley: I'm not sure how we'd go about that, but I'll take that on notice.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	125
BI-81	Rex Patrick	Contributing editor	Senator PATRICK: The title of the document is: The most promising vaccines for COVID-19. Dr Foley: That one? Yes. Senator PATRICK: So you're comfortable that you were a contributing author? Dr Foley: I wasn't a contributing author. I was one of the people who helped orchestrate contacts into getting the people who are the experts to be able to refer to that. Senator PATRICK: Do you know why they would have put you down as a contributing author? Dr Foley: I'll have to go back and check that. Senator PATRICK: I'll table the document, just for your benefit, if that's okay. Dr Foley: Sure.	Office of the Chief Scientist	3/06/2021	126
BI-82	Matthew Canavan	Statements and articles	1. With reference to the 'Research Scientist – Protein Foods' position advertised for Coopers Plains, will CSIRO advise: (a) the FTE allocation to the 'Food Materials Team'; (b) the annual budget of the 'Food Materials Team'; (c) all expenditure incurred to date relating to 'the application of alternative proteins to mimic meat structure and texture' (broken down by public and private investment); and (d) all budgeted expenditure for programs relating to 'the application of alternative proteins to mimic meat structure and texture' (broken down by public and private investment)? Source: <a href="https://jobs.csiro.au/job/Coopers-Plains%2C-QLD-Research-Scientist-Protein-Foods/744257000/">https://jobs.csiro.au/job/Coopers-Plains%2C-QLD-Research-Scientist-Protein-Foods/744257000/</a> 2. With reference to 'The future of protein' article published on 16 February 2021 by CSIRO principle research scientist, Professor Michelle Colgrave, will CSIRO advise: (a) the FTE allocation to the 'emerging future protein initiative'; (b) the annual budget of the 'emerging future protein initiative'; (c) all expenditure incurred to date relating to 'emerging future protein initiative' (broken down by public and private investment); and (d) all budgeted expenditure for programs relating to 'emerging future protein initiative' (broken down by public and private investment)? Source: <a href="https://ecos.csiro.au/the-future-of-protein/">https://ecos.csiro.au/the-future-of-protein/</a> 3. With reference to the statement published in the Food Frontier 2020 Year in Review document attributable to Professor Michelle Colgrave that "as CSIRO undertakes our Future Protein Mission to fast track the growth of the Australian protein industry, having Food Frontier as an ally to work alongside is invaluable", will CSIRO advise: (a) the names of all joint programs worked on with Food Frontier; (b) all funding associated with programs associated with Food Frontier; (c) details of the internal approval process for CSIRO to 'ally' with an organisation founded by the reported Animals Australia activist Mr Thomas King and supported by extreme anti-meat and anti-livestock foreign companies; and (d) all events or public meetings jointly attended by CSIRO and Food Frontier (listed by date and individual event)? Source: <a href="https://www.foodfrontier.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/01/Food-Frontier-2020-Year-in-Review.pdf">https://www.foodfrontier.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/01/Food-Frontier-2020-Year-in-Review.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/profile/thomas-king">https://www.theguardian.com/profile/thomas-king</a> 4. With reference to CSIRO's innovation fund investment in the manufactured plant-based protein entity, v2food, will CSIRO advise: (a) the total investment made by the innovation fund into v2food; (b) what probity advice has CSIRO sought relating to the publication of articles and research promoting plant-based protein and CSIRO investment in v2food; (c) whether CSIRO's innovation fund holds any investment in meat manufacturing businesses; and (d) all investments made CSIRO's innovation fund into manufactured plant-based protein related entities (listed by investment size and entity)? Source: <a href="https://www.csiro.au/en/work-with-us/funding-programs/funding/main-sequence">https://www.csiro.au/en/work-with-us/funding-programs/funding/main-sequence</a> 5. With reference to CSIRO's investment in manufactured plant-based protein entities, will CSIRO advise whether research funded through livestock transaction levies or partnerships with livestock research development corporations has been provided to support CSIRO's investments or co-investments?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	9/06/2021	Written
BI-83	Larissa Waters	Coal fraud	ASIC has confirmed it is making inquiries in relation to the fraudulent certification of coal by ALS and has conducted raids on ALS and TerraCom. Two South Korean coal-fired power companies have recently banned the use of ALS in tenders for coal on the basis of concerns regarding the alleged fraud. •Has the Department had any contact with Chinese officials about this matter? Japanese? South Korean? •When China officially banned Australian coal in late 2020, was it in any way related to the allegations? •Australia has had a long-standing Technical Barrier to Trade issue with China relating to China undertaking additional testing of Australian coal. The government did not raise the issue at the last two WTO committee meetings - did DISER decide not to continue raising the concern due to the coal certification issue? •Has the Dept sought or received a satisfactory explanation from NATA about why it did not discover the alleged fraud itself? •Understand that NATA has been in touch with ALS and other accredited coal certification agencies saying that appropriate policies, procedures and safeguards are now in place to prevent this occurring again. What are those policies, procedures and safeguards?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	9/06/2021	Written
BI-84	Larissa Waters	CCUS Fund	•How many applications were received for the Carbon Capture Use and Storage Development Fund? •How many applications involved projects with an Enhanced Oil Recovery or Enhanced Gas Recovery component? •Are the projects announced on 8 June 2021 all the funded projects, or will further announcements be made? •What conditions are imposed in the grant agreement to require additional private investment in the approved project?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	9/06/2021	Written
BI-85	Larissa Waters	Beetaloo investments	The \$50M allocated for the Strategic Beetaloo Basin plan is open for tenders between \$75,000 and \$7.5M. Looking at the Beetaloo Cooperative Drilling Program - grant opportunity guideline, can you confirm that the eligibility criteria do not require consideration of: •An applicant's environmental history? •Whether the applicant uses shell companies or has subsidiaries in tax haven jurisdictions? •Support from relevant First Nations communities? •An applicant's commitment to emissions reduction? Compliance with Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) standards for reporting climate-related shareholder risks?. The guidelines require applicants to declare actual and perceived conflicts of interest. •Would the fact that an applicant has made a significant donation to the Liberal or National party constitute a conflict of interest for the purposes of compliance with grant guidelines? •One of the biggest investors in the region is Empire Energy, which is run by Paul Espie. Mr Espie is Chair of the Liberal Party's Menzies Centre and has made donations totalling around \$230,000 to the Liberal party over recent years. Would Empire Energy be eligible to apply for a grant? Would a conflict of interest declaration need to be made?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	9/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-86	Slade Brockman	Endangered species research	1.What research is CSIRO currently conducting (alone or in collaboration) regarding the population levels of shark species on the west coast of Australia? Please outline the methodology, timing and (if any) outcomes of this research? 2.Is similar research being undertaken elsewhere in Australia? If so please outline the methodology, timing and (if any) outcomes of this research? 3.What confidence interval is expected from the current population research into sharks (if any underway)? How does this compare to the confidence interval of previous research undertaken in this area? 4.Do CSIRO researchers in this area have a view on the population level that would allow a species to be removed from an endangered species categorisation? 5.Has CSIRO research ever informed the removal of a species from a endangered species category or being moved into a less threatened category? If so please provide details?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	10/06/2021	Written
BI-87	Matthew Canavan	CSIRO Clarification of evidence	Senator CANAVAN: With your indulgence, Chair: from the evidence last night—this is nothing to do with Geoscience Australia—I want to at the earliest opportunity provide this to the committee and seek through you Minister, to have CSIRO review their evidence last night. Last night, CSIRO told this committee: ... we don't undertake research on live bats at ADCP. Yet a paper jointly published by scientists from the CSIRO and the Wuhan Institute of Virology in 2011 stated: Wild caught P. alecto bats were trapped in Southern Queensland, Australia, and transported alive by air to the Australian Animal Health Laboratory in Victoria, where they were euthanized for dissection using methods approved by the Australian Animal Health Laboratory Animal Ethics Committee. For reference, that paper is entitled 'Type III IFNs in pteropid bats: differential expression patterns provide evidence for distinct roles in antiviral immunity'. It seems to have been published in the Journal of Immunology in March 2011. Given the seeming inconsistency between the statement in this paper and the evidence CSIRO gave last night, I ask you, Minister, to ask the CSIRO to urgently clarify their evidence to this committee. Senator Reynolds: I will do so, Senator Canavan. Senator CANAVAN: I want to make another point about the CSIRO's evidence last night. The CSIRO suggested to this committee that the work they've conducted with scientists from the Wuhan Institute of Virology was limited to work on the Hendra virus. That was, indeed, at least the implication I took from reviewing the evidence this morning. However, I have been alerted to a paper from the CSIRO in 2016 and an associated media release issued by the CSIRO, which is entitled 'Bat super immunity to lethal disease could help protect people'. The media release states: For the first time researchers have uncovered a unique ability in bats which allows them to carry but remain unaffected by lethal diseases. The media release goes on to say: Bats are a natural host for more than 100 viruses, some of which are lethal to people, including Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), Ebola and Hendra virus, however, interestingly bats do not get sick or show signs of disease from these viruses. The associated paper is co-authored by scientists including Peng Zhou, Lin-Fa Wang and Jie Cui, all scientists who have reportedly worked at the Wuhan Institute of Virology. I ask the CSIRO to urgently clarify their evidence to this committee on this work as well. Was their collaboration with scientists from the Wuhan Institute of Virology limited to the Hendra virus, or did it include work on other viruses, as seemingly indicated in this paper? Minister, given this evidence, as I am sure you are aware, declassified Five Eyes intelligence released in January this year revealed that the Wuhan Institute of Virology has engaged in research for the Chinese military. I ask you and this department and the science portfolio: what protections does the Australian government have in place to protect against any Australian government funded research being used for gain-of-function purposes overseas and/or for the military purposes of the Chinese Communist Party? Senator Reynolds: Thank you, Senator Canavan. On the first two papers that you have cited, I've just had confirmation from the minister's office that they are now seeking that information from CSIRO. We will endeavour to get that back to you as soon as possible. I will take that second question on notice and get back to you. Obviously, I have to make sure that I get the right information for you. As you know, the federal government does have comprehensive measures in place, not just in the defence sphere but also in foreign interference legislation and others. I will get back to you. Senator CANAVAN: Thank you, Minister.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	4/06/2021	5-6
BI-88	Rex Patrick	Basis of confidentiality	Senator PATRICK: I will ask this question of NOPTA. I want to get a broad view here. Why is the information confidential? I don't want the answer to be because the legislation says. I want to actually get to the root or the fundamental principle as to why you would have that information confidential. Dr Heap: I guess it is to do with competitive advantage for the companies. We operate on the principle that we are like any other company that might get access to information, so there is no preferential treatment provided. We only get access to information when it becomes public. Otherwise it remains the property of NOPTA. Senator PATRICK: That still doesn't go to the reason. The only thing you talked about was that it might create competitive advantage. These facilities have a long-term cycle. It's not like even monthly data would in some way affect the commercial competitiveness of this information. In the UK, it is no longer confidential. The Wood review looked at this and said, 'Actually, it is a public resource. It's owned by the public, in effect, licensed to a company.' I'm trying to get to the root cause of why we might keep this information confidential. I say that noting that there is legislation going through the parliament at this time with the offshore act. To be honest, I am thinking about putting an amendment to the act. I am trying to get an understanding as to why it would be confidential other than that it is in the legislation. Dr Heap: I will have to take it on notice. We obviously implement the legislation as it is. Senator PATRICK: I understand that. It is not a criticism of you. I am trying to get an understanding of what might cause those provisions to be in the act. Dr Johnson: There is no greater clarity that we can provide to you at this time. We will take it on notice.	Geoscience Australia	4/06/2021	7
BI-89	Rex Patrick	Airacobra-1 database details	Senator PATRICK: Some of these wells you have. I am looking at one called Airacobra-1. The well status is suspended. It is onshore. Its rig release date was 10 January 2010, which says to me for 11 years it has been sitting in an unplugged state. Is that how I read that database properly? Dr Heap: Possibly. I will give you some context. We are the custodian of a lot of that information on behalf of others. People can go to a one stop place to get all that information without having to go to multiple places within government. That doesn't necessarily mean that we have the information behind that to be able to make a call on your question about whether that commercial operator has walked away from that well or not. It is really up to the regulator to do that. Senator PATRICK: I have been to your building. I have seen the rocks in the foyer. I know you are all nerdy geological people. I figured someone would be looking at this data and using it in some way. That wasn't an insult. I have an engineering background. Dr Johnson: We will take that as a great compliment. The question you are asking is about the definitions and terminology pertaining to environmental regulation. We would have to direct you to the environmental regulator. In that case, that is NOPSEMA. Senator PATRICK: The onshore stuff is not. Dr Johnson: You are talking onshore? Senator PATRICK: I have a mix of these. Your database covers onshore and offshore. We have 346 suspended offshore sites without plugs. It seems odd to me. I get that you are not responsible for the onshore stuff. It's actually much harder for me to ask questions of anyone on the onshore stuff because it is a state matter. Dr Johnson: We would be happy to take the question on notice and dig into exactly what that terminology means and provide you with some clarity as best we can.	Geoscience Australia	4/06/2021	9

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-90	Anthony Chisholm	Coal exports to China	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Could you give us a sense of the arc of history on this? How many have we been talking about over the last six months? Mr Trotman: You are probably testing my memory on that. I think it was roughly, in the last six months, up to 80 ships waiting to be discharged. In the last six months, it has reduced progressively down to 16 now. I would probably like to get back to you with more detail on that. I might take some of that question on notice and give you the specifics over the last six months. Senator CHISHOLM: Sure. Of the 16 waiting now, would you be able to say what the longest one of those ships has been waiting? Mr Trotman: I don't have that information. Those sort of questions are probably best asked of the department of foreign affairs in the foreign affairs, defence and trade committee. The officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade probably have better access to that information. Again, I can take that on notice. If there is information that we can provide, I will get back to you. Senator CHISHOLM: With regard to the ships that have been waiting throughout the last six months, do you know how long the longest has had to wait? Mr Trotman: Again, I don't have that information available. It's probably, again, best asked of officials in the foreign affairs portfolio. If I can take that on notice and get back to you with that information, I will certainly do the best I can. Senator CHISHOLM: What sort of collaboration do you have with the foreign affairs and trade department on this? Mr Trotman: We do work closely with the post in Beijing. We have a number of departmental officials who are ministerial counsellors based in our embassy in Beijing. Through those counsellors, we receive intelligence and information about contacts with relevant traders and exporters. Again, that information is also shared across government. Principally, the lead on managing this particular issue is in the foreign affairs portfolio. Mr Sullivan: We'll take that on notice and try to get you as much accurate information that is up to date as possible. Senator CHISHOLM: Has the government received any official information about coal import quotas in China that would apply to Australian coal this year? Mr Trotman: I don't have any particular information available. Again, I would have to take that on notice because I don't want to mislead you. It might be that we have received information and it just hasn't been passed through to me. We obviously keep track. Senator CHISHOLM: You would have thought it would be pretty significant information if they did pass on something like that. Mr Trotman: Indeed. Senator CHISHOLM: It would filter down. Mr Trotman: That is why, again, I can take that on notice and come back to you on that. We do actually monitor the situation. We rely on the latest information that we receive from our post. We also rely on intelligence that we receive from the latest trading houses and the information that is then passed on to the various trading houses and through the media.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	9-10
BI-91	Anthony Chisholm	Humanitarian Issues/DFAT	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: I imagine that that would be more in the realm of the foreign affairs department? Mr Trotman: Indeed. Senator CHISHOLM: Do you know if they have been active on it? Mr Trotman: I would have to take that on notice. I wouldn't want to speak on behalf of the foreign affairs officials.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	10
BI-92	Murray Watt	Coal breakdown of forecast	<p>Senator WATT: Sure. This issue has been starting to get some media attention. I want to take you to a couple of articles. I have copies if anyone needs them. There was an article in the Courier-Mail on 27 April headlined 'China turns off the tap: Brutal coal ban impact revealed'. It states: Australia's coal trade with China has plunged from more than \$1 billion a month to just \$30 million in the first few months of the year— I don't think we've had any figures around this sort of measure today. Have you got any update on the dollar value of Australia's coal trade with China and how that compares to, say, early last year? To save you having to say it again, I acknowledge that there has been some diversion of that trade to other countries. Mr Karunaratna: We haven't done the dollar figure calculation. We tend to do an overall forecast of our revenue in the Resources and energy quarterly. I will get what we forecast for the current year. We forecast, in terms of values, metallurgical coal will be \$23 billion in 2020-21. That is going to increase to \$31 billion by 2025-26 in real terms. Senator WATT: This is just to China? Mr Karunaratna: No. That is total. I don't know if we have broken it up by country. I might have to take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	12
BI-93	Murray Watt	Departmental and Ministerial contact with BHP	<p>Senator WATT: Mr Sullivan, in light of comments like this from Mr Basto, what is the situation around the market? Is everything fine because we've got other markets? Mr Sullivan: I think Mr Basto and I go back almost a debate. If that was taken from a speech on the perspective of BHP, perhaps the best thing for me to do is look at the speech and the statements by Mr Basto with respect to BHP. The evidence I have been giving and the analysis and insight colleagues have provided is that, using coal as the specific example, the gap is quite small in terms of what we've made up. The evidence I've given is that the government is investing money to try to increase that diversification base more broadly across the resources sector and to consolidate the diversification that has happened to date. With respect to the individual circumstances of BHP and BHP's customer base, perhaps it's best I take on notice Mr Basto's speech. I can follow it up with BHP and, as was offered, get the context and get a reconciliation between what we are seeing at macro levels and what is happening at that micro level. Senator WATT: Has anyone from the department or the minister or his office met with BHP or spoken with BHP about these concerns? Mr Sullivan: The answer would be yes. In terms of the dates of when that happened and who, I will have to take that on notice. Senator WATT: I want to continue from where I was at. I thank Senator Canavan for acknowledging that the response to the issues that seem to have caused problems with China has been adopted on a bipartisan basis. The last statement from Mr Basto I want to put to you is towards the end of the article, where he is referenced as saying: the longer the stalemate continues with China, the more pressure it would place on miners to cut production no matter how competitive they tried to make themselves. His quote is: I think it's important to work in being competitive but you will start to see some production being taken out of the market because high cost producers will have to do that. Mr Sullivan, again, has that risk to production been raised with you or any of the other officers here by mining companies? Mr Sullivan: I can't speak for every consultation that officers here have undertaken with mining companies. I think I have already agreed to take on notice to look at the speech that you referred to with respect to advice that we've got from other companies. With regard to the specific issue about longevity, this has a longer term impact. I think I have already given evidence to say that we are trying to look at this through that prism of how we diversify and consolidate the resources sector trade profile in the medium to long term, given what has happened in the short term. As for the increasing pressure on some miners with respect to that medium to longer term outlook, we're not seeing that in the figures we are putting together in our outlook. I will go back to where I have taken that on notice to get a sense of where those concerns are being raised.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	15,19
BI-94	Murray Watt	BHP Representation's to the Government for Minister	<p>Senator WATT: Well, I haven't asked this question: have BHP or other mining companies already made representations to the government, be it ministers or the department, that in fact the diversion of coal to other markets hasn't made up for what they've lost in China? Senator Reynolds: I will take that on notice for the minister.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	15
BI-95	Murray Watt	BHP Representation's to Department	<p>Senator WATT: Mr Sullivan, about the department? Senator CANAVAN: You don't get to direct your questions to individual witnesses. They are all to the minister. CHAIR: That is correct. Senator WATT: Can I ask whether the department— Mr Fredericks: The department will take that question on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	15
BI-96	Matthew Canavan	China coal prices	<p>Senator CANAVAN: We weren't, of course, getting prices double what we see today when China was buying our coal, so that is probably the best example. Have sought to get information of some form about what China is paying for coal now? I doubt you would have a highly comprehensive data set of that. Do you have any qualitative indications of what they are paying for coal, given they are not buying from our markets? Mr Sullivan: I think we are getting anecdotal reports. My colleague might have some more information. Mr Karunaratna: We have some charts. I don't have the numbers on the charts to be able to say what the difference is. I am happy to take that on notice and give you the numbers.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	16

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-97	Matthew Canavan	India's coal forecast	<p>Senator CANAVAN: I am happy to let you know, Chair, that I am moving on. We spoke earlier about other countries that had picked up the slack, so to speak. Do you have figures on our market share of Indian thermal coal imports? Can you update it? What share of all Indian thermal coal imports is Australia's thermal coal? What are the latest figures you have on that? Mr Karunarathna: The latest figures in the last six months with the diversification have really changed that number. I don't have the percentage shares, but I have the six-month to date numbers. In terms of total coal, Indian has imported nine billion tonnes. That is up from around two billion. Senator CANAVAN: Are you sure it is nine billion? Mr Karunarathna: Nine million megatonnes. It used to be around two. Japan is around 40 and South Korea is around 17. Senator CANAVAN: But you don't have an up-to-date figure on the total size of Indian coal imports? I would need that figure as well, not divided by how much they import. Mr Karunarathna: I might have to take that on notice. Mr Fredericks: We do have some numbers on India's forecast for met coal, which I think is in the REQ Senator CANAVAN: I was asking about thermal. I realise that we have a well-established met coal position in India. I believe we're the primary supplier of their metallurgical coal needs. We have traditionally supplied only around five per cent of India's thermal coal import needs. Could you take on notice what has been the change in our market share for Indian thermal coal imports from before China's coal bans in the most up-to-date figures we have? Does that make sense? Mr Karunarathna: I'm happy to take that on notice. I am looking at total imports for India. In 2020, for thermal coal, it was 165 megatonnes. In 2021, it was 185 megatonnes. I quoted a figure of around—</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	17-18
BI-98	Rex Patrick	Production data for offshore oil and gas (also taken be Geoscience)	<p>Senator PATRICK: I was asking for production data for offshore oil and gas. Do you keep a track of that? Mr Karunarathna: We track LNG production overall and oil production overall. I don't recall that question from you, Senator, on this. Mr Sullivan: There was a question earlier today. Senator PATRICK: I was asking Geoscience Australia if they keep track of the monthly production of oil and gas. Mr Karunarathna: We don't keep it on a monthly basis. We do forecasts of oil and gas production. We can look at how frequently we collect that data and put it on notice. Senator PATRICK: How do you collect that data, from whom and what is the regularity with which you collect it? Mr Karunarathna: In very broad terms, we take consultant reports with trade data and we take ABS data. There is a challenge inherent in all this. None of the data globally lines up because different countries report differently. We try to piece that together to come up with a story of where production is heading globally and within Australia. Senator PATRICK: That implies—maybe this is to the secretary—that we're not actually getting proper measures of what is coming out of our oil and gas. It's almost second-hand or in some way aggregated. Do we see that as a problem? Mr Karunarathna: I don't want to characterise the data that we use for our forecasts as the only data available. I want to make that clear. We can always investigate more precise sources on production figures. We use it for a very specific purpose, which is to do our forecasting. We need to make sure that things balance on a global basis. Senator PATRICK: Sure. Mr Karunarathna: That's different to if you were thinking about things from a domestic perspective. Senator PATRICK: In some sense, again, it's about measuring what we are actually extracting. We are getting the maximum national benefit from wells. It is about understanding what the resource is that we have, even though it's licensed to other companies. Mr Fredericks: I heard your question to Geoscience Australia. To assist you, I think we ought to put on notice an answer which sets out the data sources that relate to, as I know you are asking, the level of extraction from Australian onshore and offshore minerals and energy resources. That's what you are after. I understand that. We will put on notice as much information as we can on the data sets that are available in relation to all of that across the portfolio. That will pick up NOPSEMA, Geoscience Australia, NOPTA and the department. Senator PATRICK: Can you also attach to that which of that data is confidential by way of legislation and what of it is, in essence, publicly available? Mr Fredericks: That's correct. I know you had this exchange with Geoscience Australia. Some of that data in its substance is confidential as a consequence of legislation. We will do our best to identify a class. Of course, we won't go into any detail if we're subject to confidentiality. Senator PATRICK: Sure. I hope you understand my line of questioning here. There is legislation going through the parliament that could be amended in relation to confidentiality. It is in line with what they are doing in the UK as a result of the Wood review. It is a public resource. Is it truly commercially sensitive? It is those sorts of issues. Mr Fredericks: We'll give that on notice for you across the portfolio.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	19-20
BI-99	Rex Patrick	Critical Minerals Facilitation Office - Funding and expenditure	<p>Senator PATRICK: What has been your annual expenditure since that time? Mr Hutchinson: I can provide some detail on that or I can talk you through the broad streams of work that we're progressing. Senator PATRICK: I will come to that next. I want to focus on money first. They are not reported anywhere as far as I can see. Mr Hutchinson: I can take on notice the precise figures on annual expenditure. Senator PATRICK: How about we do that. Basically, since inception, what has been the annual spend in each of the financial years and to date for this financial year? Where is the totality of the critical minerals work program laid out? Where would I find that? Mr Hutchinson: Again, we can come back to you with some more detail. My understanding is that the department's previous annual statement should include some detail on our work program. If not, I am happy to outline some of those facts for you now and come back to you with more detail. Senator PATRICK: It is not in the annual report. You say it is in where? Mr Hutchinson: I would have thought it is in the annual report. If not, I can find where it is and come back to you. Mr Fredericks: I want to look at that issue. The Critical Minerals Facilitation Office is a branch within the department. On the question about finances, I know from recollection that there was a budget measure that provided about \$16 million, I think, over four years. I will correct this on the record if I need to. I am pretty sure it is departmental funding. When we come back to you notice, what we will be setting out for you is essentially the departmental funding that has been allocated within the department to a branch. It is important that the branch functions as an office. That is important. At the end of the day, in budgetary terms, it is a branch. It is funded departmentally. It has had the benefit of the budget measure in the past. We will set that out for you. The second issue—I will take it on notice; I want to check it—is that I thought in the last annual report there was a description about the work of the Critical Minerals Facilitation Office. I will check that and draw your attention to it.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	20-21

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-100	Rex Patrick	Core objectives	Senator PATRICK: What are your core objectives for 2021-22? Mr Hutchinson: I would like to come back to those three work streams that I basically talked about before, which is the specific project facilitation, the broader industry support and then the international engagement. In terms of objectives on the first one, it is really about working directly with companies in order to move their projects along the pipeline. As you would appreciate, depending on the specific project and the specific mineral, some of these are quite complex and have a lead time of 10 years or more. What we would like to see are the projects that are most advanced and the most prospective moving from whatever stages they are at to the next one or the next one. In that regard, we're working directly with around 60 companies at the moment to help them with their different projects. They all face different barriers and have different needs. I would point to some pretty good successes recently in terms of letters of support from Export Finance Australia, for example, to the Arafura Nolans Bore project and a letter from Minister Tehan to Iluka about their Eneabba rare earths refinery. Both of those letters are the culmination of significant work with those companies to help scope up the project proposal, do some due diligence and help them identify markets and opportunities. Those letters are then welcomed and used by the company to help progress their offtake discussions and financing discussions domestically and internationally. We would like to see that success replicated across a range of fronts, not just in rare earths. Senator PATRICK: On notice, can you perhaps provide the committee with some objectives that you intend to achieve in that stream by the end of next year? Mr Hutchinson: Absolutely. Senator PATRICK: That is just about me being able to come back and say, 'Did you achieve that? If not, why not? What were the issues?' Mr Hutchinson: Absolutely. Senator PATRICK: You said there are two more streams. Mr Hutchinson: Yes. The first one is around working directly with specific companies to help them overcome the barriers their projects are facing. The second one is around broader industry support. On that front, the hubs and precincts work fits into that, as does the ethical certification scheme and the work the Australian government is doing through the international standards organisation to ensure that the regulatory framework internationally and the standards framework creates a playing field that Australian companies can compete in. Some work I would point to in addition to that is a \$4.5 million research and development program. This includes a range of projects underway with the CSIRO, Geoscience Australia and the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation. I'm happy to provide some more detail, perhaps on notice, if you want to hear about those. Senator PATRICK: Yes. On notice. Fantastic.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	23-24
BI-101	Rex Patrick	Delineation of offices	Senator PATRICK: Thank you. I put oversight as a responsibility I have ahead of flights. Just let me work my through. I am not trying to hold things up. You are talking about a map of that capability. You are trying to understand what that capability is. Are you building a map of our mining capability in respect of these minerals? Mr Hutchinson: Just to make sure I am understanding your question correctly, do you mean the capability of given firms to develop a map— Senator PATRICK: Yes. This is from a national perspective, understanding what the capability is across the country. Mr Hutchinson: We are not developing a formal map of that for a couple of reasons. Firstly, the capability gap will depend on the particular deposit and the particular mineral. They often need, effectively, a bespoke approach per deposit. Secondly, instead of a map, what we prefer to do is, as we're working with each firm that is interested in developing their deposit, have detailed discussions with them about their skills gaps and capability needs and how we can assist. In many cases, the private sector is very capable of lining up the experts, the expertise and the skills they need. Where they have a challenge with that, they come and talk to us. As a policy coordination point within government, we work across different agencies, including the home affairs taskforce. Senator PATRICK: I am mindful of the chair's request. I am trying to understand the delineation between Minerals Australia and your office. Mr Hutchinson: I will take that on notice, if that is okay. We can provide you with a written description of how the two entities function in this space and complement each other. Senator PATRICK: Who has the lead on engaging industry in respect of that delineation? Mr Hutchinson: Certainly. We can address that as well. The Critical Minerals Facilitation Office takes the lead in engaging and coordinating with industry on their critical minerals projects, as identified by the Australian list. We do that in active participation with many different agencies as the need arises. Senator PATRICK: I look forward to that question on notice. Thank you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	25
BI-102	Murray Watt	Northern Australia Skills Mapping	Senator WATT: They called for \$50 million to address the skills gap in Northern Australia. Was there anything in the budget that addressed that? Ms Lee: Yes. Part of piloting the regions of growth approach is to look at skills mapping across Northern Australia. That is an initial step in determining what the skills gaps are and, therefore, I guess, working towards how best to address those skills gaps. Senator WATT: Can you remind me how much was allocated for that? Ms Lee: I would have to take that on notice. It is part of a \$9.3 million investment specifically in regions of growth.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	27
BI-103	Murray Watt	Advisory group meeting dates	Senator WATT: Well, we'll all wait and see how much premiums will actually reduce in Northern Australia. No-one from the government has yet been prepared to promise that there will be any reduction in premiums. We'll wait and see. Can you please inform us how many times the advisory group met in its 12 months of operation? Ms Lee: The group met formally four times in 2020. I can provide dates. Senator WATT: Thanks. Ms Lee: On 19 March— Senator WATT: Do you want to do that on notice in terms of the dates? Maybe on notice, could you please advise what work the advisory group undertook—published work, community engagement and those types of things, presentations to ministers, state and federal? Could you provide that on notice? Ms Lee: I am happy to do that. Senator Reynolds: Would it be helpful if we also put on notice for the regions of growth all of the other things the officials have said we are doing for the north? Senator WATT: Sure.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	28
BI-104	Murray Watt	Conran review recommendations	Mr Fredericks: I think so. So obviously state premiers as well. My recollection is that the Conran review recommendation was the recommendation that the minister accepted in this case. Senator WATT: Is that right, Ms Lee? Ms Lee: In part, yes. Senator WATT: What do you mean by 'in part'? Ms Lee: The Conran review recommended that it was time limited, meaning it would function for a further 12 months. Minister Pitt accepted that recommendation but decided to do meetings less formally. Senator WATT: Why did he decide that? Ms Lee: I guess it is a question for the minister to answer. I can only suggest that, during the time the recommendations were made, there were still COVID-19 travel restrictions in place that were making both travel and video conferencing difficult. Senator WATT: Really? You have surely been on as many Zooms as I have. That surely isn't a— Mr Fredericks: There's truth in that. In fairness, at the end of the day, it is a decision that the minister made. We as officials can't talk to that. Senator WATT: Sure. I realise the minister is currently absent. In her absence, I might ask on notice for an explanation of why the decision was made and, in particular, in a slightly different manner from what was recommended in the Conran review. Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice. If I have caused the minister a problem, we'll come back to you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	29
BI-105	Murray Watt	Indigenous Reference Group	Senator WATT: Even though you are not overall responsible for it. Was the Indigenous Reference Group set up for a certain time period, or is it a standing group? Ms Lee: I would have to take it on notice. I think it was set up for a specific time period. Senator WATT: I thought it was as well. I don't have the dates. That also means that the terms of those appointed to the Indigenous Reference Group will come to an end at a certain point, whatever that might be. In fact, it might even be this year. Ms Lee: Yes. I would have to take it on notice to give you an accurate date. Senator WATT: Has any decision been made whether to extend the Indigenous Reference Group? Ms Lee: Not that I am aware. Senator WATT: So there has been no decision to end it, but equally there hasn't been a decision to extend it? Ms Lee: That's my understanding. Senator WATT: I will check this. As I say, it may even expire mid-way through this year. Ms Long, you don't know that? Ms Long: No. I will take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	30-31
BI-106	Murray Watt	State breakdown	Senator WATT: Can you give me a state breakdown of that? Mr Wade: In terms of state breakdown for transactions that have hit financial close, do you want me to give you all the projects? Senator WATT: Maybe just for time you could table the list of projects. Mr Wade: Yes. I will table them.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	4/06/2021	33

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-107	Murray Watt	Drawdowns target	Senator WATT: What is your target for the next 12 months for drawdowns? Mr Wade: I will have to take that on notice. Again, drawdowns are subject to the drawdown profiles of the various parties. To be fair, we're a prudent financier. We expect equity to go in first and other requirements to go in first. They might go to schedule. They might be a bit later. We will make sure when we draw down those funds on behalf of the taxpayer that they are prudently drawn down. Senator WATT: Can you please break down that \$342 million by state and territory? Mr Wade: Yes, I can. In terms of the Northern Territory, that number is \$99.8 million. In terms of Queensland, that number is \$70.2 million. I must note, as I said, that is on eight projects. Again, JCU has just started drawing down. Senator WATT: That was \$70.2 million? Mr Wade: Yes, \$70.2 million. In Western Australia, with those three projects, it is \$172.4 million. Senator WATT: I am focusing on Queensland. Did you say there are nine projects in Queensland that have drawn down funds? Mr Wade: The projects that are drawing down or have hit financial close are CQU— Senator WATT: Is CQU the Rockhampton one or the one that is multicampus? Mr Wade: CQU is a multicampus deal. To be fair, the bulk of that, which is very exciting— Senator WATT: Yes, it is. Mr Wade: I think we touched on it before. Half of that is actually digital infrastructure, which has helped position CQU for COVID-19 for students. Senator WATT: Mr Wade, again in the interests of time, if it is possible to table that for us— Mr Wade: That is fine. Senator WATT: Maybe across all the states the ones that have drawn down funds. Mr Wade: Yes. We've got all those details. Ms Evans: I think we are offering to take it on notice rather than table it.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	4/06/2021	34
BI-108	Murray Watt	NAIF Recruitment	Senator WATT: Who made the decision not to engage a recruitment consultant? Was that the minister? Ms Evans: I will have to take that on notice. The department is able to take whichever approach it likes. In this case, we've done it through our own networks and through talking with the states and territories affected by the Northern Australia agenda. Senator WATT: Ultimately, someone had to make the decision. Ms Evans: Yes. Senator WATT: It's pretty customary to engage a recruitment consultant for this type of role given the kind of money that is involved and the salary that is involved. Was it ultimately the minister who decided not to engage a recruitment consultant? Ms Long: That's correct. Senator WATT: Did the department recommend that a recruitment consultant be engaged? Ms Evans: We canvassed the option of that. Senator WATT: Did you make a recommendation? Ms Long: I would have to take that on notice. Senator WATT: Because you don't remember? Ms Long: That's correct.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	35-36
BI-109	Murray Watt	MO Stakeholder engagement	Senator WATT: Which stakeholders did the minister and his office consult to assist them decide who would be getting paid \$120,000 a year to oversee \$5 billion of taxpayer funds? Ms Long: I would need to take that on notice. Senator WATT: Do you know of any? Ms Long: I understand that there were conversations with jurisdictions. I am not sure if my colleague can provide further information. Mr Fredericks: I think we'll take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	36
BI-110	Murray Watt	Ministerial process for NAIF candidate	Senator WATT: Did the minister consult Senator Canavan on who should be the new chair of the NAIF board? CHAIR: There is no way the minister could answer that question. Senator WATT: Can you take that on notice if you don't know the answer? Senator Ruston: Yes, of course.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	36
BI-111	Murray Watt	Departmental knowledge of process	Senator WATT: Does anyone in the department know? Mr Fredericks: No. We don't know. We'll take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	36
BI-112	Murray Watt	Content of proposal	Senator WATT: I am sure you are aware that the company's website says that this power hub consists of a 157 megawatt wind farm with approval for a 100 megawatt battery and a network upgrade. So a battery is part of the project, is it? Mr Wade: I can only comment on the proposal that was provided to us. It did not include a battery. Senator WATT: They were not seeking funding; is that what you are saying? Mr Wade: I can comment only on the proposal that was given to us that reassessed— Senator WATT: They were seeking a loan to deliver a wind farm and a network upgrade? Mr Wade: I will have to take that on notice because it does touch on commercial-in-confidence information.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	4/06/2021	37
BI-113	Murray Watt	NAIF advice to Minister	Senator WATT: Could you please table the advice provided to the minister so we can clear up whether he was ever told that there was a battery in this project, Mr Wade? Mr Wade: I will have to take that on notice.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	4/06/2021	40
BI-114	Murray Watt	Ministerial knowledge of content of proposal	Senator WATT: The minister provided a statement of reasons to the NAIF, setting out why he vetoed this project. Presumably, it's along the lines of what he said publicly—that it didn't include dispatchable power. Even after that, neither the NAIF nor the department has informed him of the very clear fact on this company's website—that a battery is part of the project? Mr Fredericks: We have traversed this ground. We provided advice. In relation to the battery question, Ms Evans's evidence is clear. We provided advice, as you would expect us to, based on the proposal considered by the NAIF and provided for the minister's consideration. Senator WATT: Again, when the minister vetoed this loan, did anyone from the company advise the minister or his office that, in fact, this project did include a battery, even if the loan didn't? Senator Ruston: Clearly, I would have to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	41
BI-115	Murray Watt	NAIF Public Disclosure	Senator WATT: Last time, we talked about a public interest disclosure which had been made. I don't think we ever got to the bottom of the nature of that. Leaving aside those formal complaints—I don't know the right person to ask—have any complaints about bullying of NAIF staff been made to members of the board since the beginning of last year? Mr Wade: Not that I am aware. I will take that on notice.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	4/06/2021	43
BI-116	Rex Patrick	Data confidentiality	Senator PATRICK: That was the act that you pointed me to in the last set of hearings. There was a question on notice. Maybe the department did it. I understand that it is a regulation that makes this data confidential. I am trying to get to the genesis of the reasoning behind that. I am foreshadowing that, in relation to the bill going through the House at the moment, I may seek to make amendments to that act on the basis that this is a public resource, these projects are long term and there should be some transparency, from a public perspective, as to what is being taken from the different tenements. Indeed, we need to understand whether or not we are achieving maximum benefit not from a commercial perspective but a national perspective in relation to those tenements. I wonder if there are any underlying reasons you can go to as to why this information should be held confidential from the public? Mr Waters: You are quite correct in pointing out that the regulations require data to remain confidential. I am sorry that I am unable to enlighten you as to the genesis of why that occurred. It predates my appointment and may well have its genesis way back under a previous regime. I regret that I can't enlighten you any further. Senator PATRICK: Can you take it on notice? I am seeking some advice that may assist me in what I might do in relation to that bill.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	44

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-117	Rex Patrick	Policy paper	Ms Illman: Correct. As Mr Waters said, the resource management administration regulations sunset in 2024. In order to head off that sunset, we are undertaking a policy review now. As I indicated at the last hearings, we engaged a consultant. We received the report in December last year. We are currently pulling together the policy paper, which we will publicly consult on, on the contents of proposed amendments to the regulations. Senator PATRICK: So the consultant work is done. Can you provide that to the committee on notice, please? Ms Illman: I will take that on notice. ... Senator PATRICK: Are those reports available? Could a sample of those reports be given to the committee? Mr Waters: The reports are confidential. We use them to advise the joint authority ministers— Senator PATRICK: Sure. Mr Waters: in whichever jurisdiction it might be. We also use them to inform ourselves of discussions with the project operators. I don't believe that they would be available to the committee in that raw form. Senator PATRICK: I understand that you are saying they have a confidentiality about them. Of course, if you listened to the chair when he first opened the hearing, you would know that they are not reasons the Senate accepts for not disclosing information to a committee. I ask that you take on notice that request that I have made. The minister can make the appropriate claim. I hope that there is transparency here, noting that this is about the optimising of the economics of these fields, which are Australian taxpayers' resources. Keeping that sort of information secret, being polite, is regrettable. Mr Waters: We will take it on notice. Mr Sullivan: We will take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	44-45
BI-118	Rex Patrick	Boundary negotiations Australia and Indonesia	Senator PATRICK: Fantastic. Thank you. I want to go to another issue. The bulk of this has been answered in foreign affairs yesterday, so I will narrow the questions that I have prepared. There are boundary negotiations going on between Australia and Indonesia that are complicated by negotiations taking place between Indonesia and East Timor. Can you provide details of any tenements that are affected by those particular negotiations? If there are tenements affected by those negotiations, what would be the effect of any changes being discussed on those tenements and, indeed, on compensation for the owner of the tenement? Mr Waters: I'm not aware of any tenements that are affected in that way. I would have to take on notice the remainder of your question to try to ascertain whether or not there is any impact. Senator PATRICK: Sure. Actually, the answer is pretty simple. If there are none, I don't think anything flows from that. I will ask you to check that. Mr Waters: I'm happy to do that. Senator PATRICK: DFAT were not able to give me details of exactly what areas were affected, hence the reason I am being a bit vague or loose in my questioning. Mr Waters: I'm happy to take it on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	45
BI-119	Rex Patrick	Government decision on Northern Endeavour strategy	Senator PATRICK: Geoscience Australia has given evidence to this committee that they don't know what is in this field. That was their evidence to the committee, or certainly what is on either side of the line. Also relevant in terms of context is that whilst the original owner may have been involved in that proposal, the proposal addressed the concerns of the Walker review, which was critical about perhaps not having the correct capital and having only one source of income, that being the Northern Endeavour. Whilst I accept that you have an operator, perhaps there is an apprehension there. The proposal addresses the concerns raised by the Walker review. I would have thought that, in all circumstances when presented with a commercial proposal to get out of the situation you are in, you would still be willing to change your mind. You are about to impose a levy on industry to deal with this issue. I don't particularly like the oil and gas industry. They rape us in terms of taking our resources and give little in return in terms of PRRT and corporate tax. I am not a big fan of them. Nonetheless, there's a prospect here of jobs being created, fuel security issues being addressed and perhaps a remedy other than a levy on the industry. Are you in a position to say categorically that you are not intending to reconsider any commercial proposal? Mr Fredericks: That is a matter for government. Government has made the decision. It is reflected in the budget papers, as you know. It is why we are having the discussion. Senator PATRICK: But, with new information, is the government agile enough to make a new decision? CHAIR: Senator, I'm sure you're in a position to communicate that to the minister. To be fair to the officials, it is difficult for them. Senator PATRICK: Hang on. I've just had officials say, 'This is our position. We've made our decision.' CHAIR: No. The government has made the decision. Senator PATRICK: I am asking: can't you change it? The government has made a decision. Maybe I'll ask the minister. Senator Ruston: Here I am. Senator PATRICK: I think it is a principle of government that, when presented with new information, you might make a new decision. Senator Ruston: I am obviously to take on notice the position and proposition you have put forward. I also suggest you have probably already raised the matter with Minister Pitt.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	46-47
BI-120	Rex Patrick	Issues raised with Iloyds international	Senator PATRICK: Okay. Can you perhaps describe to the committee what the issues were and how you are remedying those issues? I am talking about the concerns you had with the veracity of Lloyd's international application of its rules and processes and resulting information. You are saying that some of them were addressed through UPS and some of them through direct conversations with Lloyd's. Can you provide a list of the concerns and how you are satisfied that each of those concerns has been addressed in some way or are being addressed? Mr Smith: I think that is a question that is probably best to take on notice, given the time.	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	4/06/2021	50
BI-121	Rex Patrick	NOPSEMA similar concerns	Senator PATRICK: Did NOPSEMA find any similar serious concerns regarding the veracity of Lloyd's register application of the Montara Venture, the Pyrenees Venture and/or the Nganhurra? Mr Smith: I will take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Were they issued with a prohibition notice? Mr Smith: The certification has nothing to do with the prohibition notice. The prohibition notice issued to the Northern Endeavour was issued before the certification review was even undertaken. It related to issues regarding the topsides of the facility. The certification services provided by Lloyd's related to things such as the tanks and the hull. The two are not connected in any way.	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	4/06/2021	51
BI-122	Rex Patrick	Walker Review and UPS role	Senator PATRICK: Sure. I am disappointed in the priorities being shown here. UPS was the operator of the vessel. This may be to the department as well. The FPSO was being operated under their safety case. Why didn't Mr Walker's investigation also inquire into UPS's role in this whole situation? Mr Gaddes: That is a tricky question to answer. It is an independent review. Mr Walker was— Senator PATRICK: But there are terms of reference associated with any review. It was their safety case that was at issue, yet Mr Walker didn't examine that. Mr Gaddes: With the passage of time, I think we can take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Okay. Fine.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	51

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-123	Rex Patrick	Decommission	Senator PATRICK: In terms of the decommissioning of the vessel—this really relates to the levy being imposed—is there any consideration being given to requiring a titleholder to produce a costed decommissioning and plugging and abandonment plan before they get approval for extraction? That is so the government understands the liabilities going in. I know you are trying to plug off certain gaps with the legislation going through the parliament at the moment. I am looking at the circumstances. You've had to do a whole bunch of investigations as to how you might deal with this vessel now. That is going to have to take place in any circumstance. Why not know about that upfront before you approve someone's extraction licences? Mr Fredericks: That is a fair point. Obviously, that is highly relevant to the legislation that is now being presented to the parliament, as you know. I do understand that you are asking that question to aid your consideration of the legislation. The slight difficulty we have here is that we have excused the relevant part of the department that does the decommissioning. But we're happy to take that on notice to the extent that we can assist.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	4/06/2021	52
BI-124	Anthony Chisholm	Research on impact of seismic sounding on fisheries	1.What is the status of the institute's research on the impact of seismic sounding on fisheries and marine life? 2.When will the outcomes of the research be made available publicly? 3.Does the institute take a position on NOPSEMA's guidelines in relation to environmental management when it comes to the approval of seismic surveys? Do they reflect the latest peer-reviewed science? 4.I also have some questions on the RV Cape Ferguson. If a decision on the future of the RV Cape Ferguson is not made this year, what impact will this have on the institutes research programs? 5.Has AIMS applied for funding from the Government for a refit of the RV Cape Ferguson? If so, what has the feedback been to date?	Australian Institute of Marine Science	11/06/2021	Written
BI-125	Anthony Chisholm	Staffing split	Question: Are you able to provide us with a breakdown that would make sense, within your organisation, of where your staff sit on a matrix of directly employed to contracted, I'm describing (see below)? At estimates Senator WALSH: In relation to your staff, some are employed in ways that are largely attached to the government funding, and some are employed in ways that are attached to the independent funding. And some are employed, as I understand it, directly by you, and some are working on projects which could actually be located in the partner facility and may even be funded as part of your work but employed by the partner facility, and then you have some employees who are agency workers as well. So you've got a variety of ways in which your staff are employed and funded. Within that, some are researchers and some are other operational staff. Ms Zielke: Yes, we could take that on notice and come back to you. (3 June, p. 101)	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-126	Anthony Chisholm	STEM numbers	a.Question: Could you provide, maybe on notice, some figures about the number of STEM jobs that are available in the current and future labour workforce? Could you tell us the number of people currently employed in STEM related fields and what the current level of vacancies or shortages is—however you want to define that? And what are the projections for the future? (3 June, p.122) b.Question: Where do we rank in comparison to the rest the world on commercialising research? Dr Foley: It depends on what measure you use. Can I take that on notice? It's a very technical question. c.Question: Can you provide the budget allocated by the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources for the Office of the Chief Scientist? At estimates: The department provides funding for a small unit for the chief scientist—a staffing contingent, travel and other costs. From memory, that's at about the same level as it has been for the last couple of years. But I'll come back to you on notice on that. (3 June, p.122)	Office of the Chief Scientist	11/06/2021	Written
BI-127	Anthony Chisholm	Ministerial meetings with stakeholders and site visits	1.Since Minister Porter was appointed as Minister for Industry, Science and Technology, excluding government agencies, how many business stakeholders has he met with? Provide a number and list of the stakeholders. 2.Since Minister Porter was appointed as Minister for Industry, Science and Technology, how many business stakeholder site visits have been undertaken? Provide a number and list of stakeholders as well as location.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-128	Anthony Chisholm	COVID-19 Vaccine	1.According to records published on AusTender, the Department of Industry awarded a \$2,209,000 to McKinsey for "Professional advice on a business case for an onshore COVID-19 vaccine." a.Why hasn't this report been made publicly available? b.When will the Government make the report publicly available? 2.Have industry and prospective stakeholders seen the McKinsey report? 3.The Minister's 21 May media release states the Government's, "...market analysis also shows there are gaps and challenges to scale-up, which mean it's not currently possible to commercially manufacture mRNA treatments locally." What are the gaps and challenges to which the Minister is referring? Were these identified in the McKinsey report? How does the government plan to overcome these gaps and challenges – what measures has it put in place to address them? 4.With respect to the specific Budget measure on page 134 of Budget Paper No. 2, how much money has the Government allocated over the forward estimates to COVID-19 Vaccine Manufacturing Capability? Please provide a breakdown for each financial year. 5.Does the budget measure on page 134 of Budget Paper No.2 relate to mRNA manufacturing? If not, what is the money going towards? Surely you can put some guardrails around what this budget measure is doing. 6.How many companies have formally expressed interest in the Government's COVID-19 vaccine budget measure? 7.Appearing on the ABC Four Corners program, Minister Hunt said, "Supply has been an absolutely critical part of our national strategy from the outset. We foresaw what's occurred in Europe and North America, without even knowing what would be the specific outcome – we could see vaccine nationalism, international supply chain challenges, countries withholding vaccines... I'm absolutely reaffirmed that the need for domestic production was a fundamental component." When was the Department of Industry first approach to commence work on Australian potential to manufacture the COVID-19 vaccine? 8.If the Government could foresee the need for a domestic vaccine manufacturing capability and supply chain issues, why did it take until 21 May 2021 for the Government to request EOIs from potential mRNA vaccine production? Why can't the Government tell Australians how much money it has set aside for COVID-19 Vaccine Manufacturing Capabilities as outlined in Budget Paper No.2?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-129	Anthony Chisholm	Government Digital Economic Strategy	Blockchain as Part of the Strategy: 7.What is allocated to Blockchain development in this strategy? Where will the support for Blockchain development come from and do you think that a lack of serious investment by Government in this space will leave Australia falling behind the pack? 8.The National Blockchain Roadmap says on page 8, "There are opportunities across our economy which can be seized and enabled by the use of blockchain technology: to create jobs, to create new economic growth, to save businesses money, and to improve our overall productivity". However the DTA says on its website, "Blockchain is an emerging technology... however without standardisation and additional work, for many uses of blockchain, there are currently other mature technologies that may be more suitable". Does the Department of Industry and the DTAs inconsistent view on the potential of blockchain act as a hinderance to any digital economy strategy?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-130	Anthony Chisholm	Procurement Strategy	1.What role does the Department have with respect to Commonwealth procurement? 2.Industry received \$2.6 million to 'support and strengthen Australian business participation in Commonwealth procurement.' How will this money be administered? Will businesses have access to the money? 3.Is Finance involved in any way in the work that's being done on this? 4.There is funding for 'scans of procurements to map any common "pain points" for SMEs'. Why has industry been made responsible for this? What are the "pain points" the department has identified? 5.Why is industry administering this money, not Finance? Or even Treasury now that SMEs have been moved? 6.The Budget also states this money has been allocated for "increased communication of procurement opportunities to potential suppliers". What problem or issue is trying to be resolved? 7.What work does Industry undertake with Finance to inform Australian companies of their compliance obligations with respect to Commonwealth procurement rules? 8.Why does the Department of Industry need \$2.6 million to work with another government agency and perform a task such as increasing business participation in Commonwealth procurement? Why wasn't the Department doing this previously?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-131	Anthony Chisholm	Research and Development Tax Incentives	1.What formal advice did the Department provide to the Minister's office in relation to RDTI? 2.Is the Department aware of the concerns of industry regarding claiming the R&D Tax incentive for software development, despite the fact many firms need the software R&D for their hardware to work? 3.Has the Department provided advice to Government with respect to this? If so, what was that advice? 5.What engagement has the Department had with the ATO in determining what software expenses are claimable under RDTI? 6.What steps has the Government taken to boost the spend of Australian companies on R&D? In Australia the average is 1.79 per cent, versus the OECD average of 2.37 per cent. 7.A submission by Atlassian to the Senate Inquiry into Financial Technology and Regulatory Technology (Submission 201) said, "The RDTI as it currently stands has not, at its core, kept pace with the nature of software development, or the context and frameworks within which it occurs," when commenting on RDTI for software. How would the Department respond to these comments?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-132	Anthony Chisholm	Cyber Skills partnership Innovation Fund	1.Who is the final decision-maker for grants from the fund? 2.When will potential recipients be able to apply for grants from the new funding provided in the budget? 3.When will grants be paid to recipients from the new funding provided in the budget 4.What is the new total budgeted funding for the fund? 5.How much has been paid out from the fund to recipients, to date? 6.Can you provide a list of all recipients of grants from this fund to date, including the electorate they are in?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-133	Anthony Chisholm	Co-funded grants to support community and business driven projects that build AI capability	1.Have grant guidelines been drafted for this fund? 2.If yes, have they been circulated for consultation? When did that occur? 3.If not, when will they be drafted? 4.Were the guidelines provided to Finance for their advice? If not, why not? 5.When are they to be finalised? 6.How will eligibility be determined for grants? 7.Who will be the final decision-maker for grants from the fund? 8.If a Minister is not the final decision-maker for grants, will the Minister or their office be informed of recipients of grants from the fund? 9.When will potential recipients be able to apply for grants? 10.When will grants be paid to recipients?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-134	Anthony Chisholm	Boosting Female Founders program	1.What is the total dollar amount of the grants awarded so far? (The amount of money allocated for Round 2 of the Program was \$11.6 million). 2.Do you believe this amount of money is appropriate given the ongoing and chronic underrepresentation of women in STEM industries and professions in Australia. 3.What has been the administrative and associated costs for the Department in relation to the management of this grants program? 4.How many grants have been awarded through the program so far? 5.What is the success rate for applications (i.e. the number of grants awarded vs the number of applications)? 6.Does the Department know how much time it would take for an application to complete the process? IF NUMBER IS HIGH: Do you think this provides an unnecessary administrative burden on early stage firms which could act as a deterrent for female founders to apply. 7.InnovationAus published an article on 26 May 2021 saying Women in STEM rates a 'national emergency'. Do you think the Department is doing enough to support women in STEM fields? 8.With this program announced in 2018, why did it take so long for this program to be rolled out? 9.How will the long-term success of this initiative be evaluated? 10.How much money will be spent on advertising and activities related to the promotion of this program?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-135	Anthony Chisholm	Modern Manufacturing Strategy	1.In the Treasurer's 11 May Budget address, he stated the 2021-22 Budget will help create more than 250,000 more jobs by the end of 2022-23. How many of these jobs will be created in manufacturing? 2.How many of these jobs will be in: a.The Australian space industry? b.Medical technology product manufacturing? c.Resources technology and critical minerals processing? d.Food and beverage? e.Recycling and clean energy? 3.Since 1 October 2020, how much money has been spent under the Modern Manufacturing Strategy? How many jobs has the MMS created since 1 October 2020? 4.Since 1 October to EOFY how much money has been budgeted under the Modern Manufacturing Initiative? a.How much has been spent? 5.Since 1 October to EOFY how much money has been budgeted under the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund? a.How much has been spent? 6.Since 1 October to EOFY how much funding has been budgeted for the Supply-Chain Resilience Fund? a.How much has been spent?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-136	Anthony Chisholm	Modern Manufacturing Initiative	1.Across the six priority areas, how many applications for funding have been made? 2.What was the median value of the applications? Please provide this as a breakdown per priority area. 3.How many applications have been processed and provided with funding? What is the total value of expenditure to date under the MMI? 4.The MMI has two streams of funding, Manufacturing Integration Stream and the Manufacturing Translation Stream. Both streams attract co-funded grants of between \$1 million to \$20 million, up to 50 per cent of the eligible expenditure. a.How much funding was set aside for the Manufacturing Integration Stream? How much was spent? b.How much funding was set aside for the Manufacturing Translation Stream? How much was spent? 5.How many projects received funding under the Manufacturing Integration Stream? What is the total value of this expenditure? 6.What types of projects were funding under the Manufacturing Integration Stream? 7.How many projects received funding under the Manufacturing Translation Stream? What is the total value of this expenditure? 8.What types of projects were funding under the Manufacturing Translation Stream? 9.According to the Department website funding will be available under the Manufacturing Collaboration Stream. When will funding be made available? How much funding will be available under this stream? Will the funding be in the form of co-funded grants? 10.What is the purpose of the Manufacturing Collaboration Stream? 11.According to page 38 of the Portfolio Budget statement, \$380,000,000 has been allocated for 2021-22 financial year. How much of this funding has been allocated for medical products? a.How much funding has been allocated for Space? b.How much funding has been allocated for Resources Technology and Critical Minerals Processing? c.How much funding has been allocated for Food and Beverage? d.How much funding has been allocated for Defence? e.How much funding has been allocated for Recycling and Clean Energy? 12.What are the key performance indicators for the initiative? How is the Department measuring the success of the program as a whole? How is the Department measuring the success of the program in each of the key priority areas? 13.In a media release on 1 October 2020, the Prime Minister and Minister for Industry promised the MMI would assist manufacturers to "scale up and create jobs." How many jobs does the Government intend to create across the six priority areas? What evidence is there that the MMI has helped businesses "scale up"? How many would you classify as having scaled up? What is the departmental target for the number of businesses you aim to scale up?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-137	Anthony Chisholm	Modernisation Fund	1.What was the total value of expenditure on Round 1 of the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund? 2.How many direct jobs in manufacturing did Round 1 create? 3.How much money from Round 2 of the MMF will be spent by 1 July 2021? 4.The budget papers indicate in 2021-22 \$37 million will be spent. Is this correct? 5.According to previous testimony provided at the last estimates in March, \$52.8 million will be spent this financial year on round 2 of the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund. Is the Government on track to spend \$52.8 million by 1 July this year? 6.How many jobs will Round 2 of the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund create? 7.Round 2 of the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund closed on 21 January this year. How many applications were received? Provide a breakdown of the number of applications by priority area. 8.Since 21 January, how many applications have been approved?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-138	Anthony Chisholm	Supply-Chain Resilience Initiative	1.On 30 November 2020 the Government opened consultation on the supply Chain Resilience Initiative. How many submissions were made? 2.According to the Department website, consultation was undertaken to identify essential goods and services critical to Australians at time of crisis. What are those goods and services? 3.Website also indicates consultation was undertaken to “map industry supply chains and Australia’s manufacturing capabilities.” What are Australia’s manufacturing capabilities? Will the Department release what it learnt about restructuring industry supply chains? 4.Of the \$107.2 million budget for this initiative how much has been spent on consultants? 5.On page 39 of the portfolio budget statement, \$2 million is budgeted for 2020-21 financial year. What was this \$2 million spent on? 6.Funding under this program is scheduled to commence from 1 July this year. The Department site indicates “guidelines outlining eligibility and merit criteria will be made available in the first half of 2021. Have these guidelines been published? If not, why not? When will they be published? 7.What are the funding arrangements? Will Australian businesses be required to co-fund?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-139	Anthony Chisholm	Indigenous Reference Group	Q. Can the Office of Northern Australia confirm when the IRG’s term is due to end? Q. Does the Government intend to extend the IRG when its term expires? Q. Please provide an update on implementation of the Northern Australia Indigenous Development Accord?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-140	Anthony Chisholm	21-26 Five Year Plan and Refresh	On the 6th of May this month The Government released its plan for the next 5 years of the Northern Australia Agenda. The plan focuses on three areas: •Investing in ‘Regions of Growth’ (\$9.3M for piloting the program in the following four regions Mount Isa to Townsville; Cairns to Gladstone; Beetaloo Basin to Darwin Port; and Broome to Kununurra to Darwin) •Improving digital connectivity (\$68.5M for ‘Connecting Northern Australia’) •Northern Australian Development Program to help business diversify (\$111.9M in grants) Q. Can you explain in detail what the ‘Regions of Growth’ program will involve? Q. Can you give some explanation as to why the regions of - Mount Isa to Townsville; Cairns to Gladstone; Beetaloo Basin to Darwin Port; and Broome to Kununurra to Darwin – were chosen for the pilot program? Q. What was the criteria for regions to be chosen? Q. The four regions identified in the pilot program are extremely large, and funding is to be rolled out over 5 years, how much of an impact is \$9.3 million expected to have when it’s so widely spread? Q. How much funding will each region receive? Is it to be spread evenly across the four regions? What exactly will the funds be used for? Q. What kinds of digital infrastructure will benefit from the \$68.5 million committed to ‘Connecting Northern Australia’? Which regions in Northern Australia will benefit from this funding? Looking at the Northern Australia Development Program: Q. Can you give some example on what businesses will be able to use these grants on? Q. What are the criteria around the grants? Q. What is the cap on the grants? Q. How many jobs do you estimate these three initiatives will create? Please provide a breakdown per program.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-141	Anthony Chisholm	Budget Announcements	Minister Pitt’s budget media release said the 2021-22 Budget will “investing in job creating projects, skills and infrastructure for the next phase of northern development.” Q. While his release lists national skills measures – there is no mention of any specific investment for the North in skills. Is this correct? Q. How much of the \$500 million JobTrainer fund do you expect to be spent in Northern Australia?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-142	Anthony Chisholm	General questions on projects and investments	Q. Can NAIF please provide a table of how many projects, by state, have reached the Investment Decision stage? Please provide the name of each project, its value, the Federal electorate in which it is situated and the amount of NAIF funding approved for each project. As at 25th March 2021, only two First Nations projects have reached the Investment Decision Stage. These two decisions total \$40 million and represent only 1% of the NAIF’s total funding. Q. Is this still the case? Q. Can you advise if there are any other Indigenous-led projects currently in the pipeline? A question on notice received from the NAIF in response to the Select Committee into the Australian Government’s Northern Australia agenda boasted that the agency was on track to release \$400m by June 2021. Q. Are you on track to release \$400 million by June this year?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	11/06/2021	Written
BI-143	Anthony Chisholm	NAIF Staffing	In response to a Question on Notice from our last round of estimates in March, it was noted that there were 12 vacancies at the NAIF – two due to employee resignations and 10 of which were new positions. Q. Are any of these 12 roles still vacant? Q. Are there any other vacancies at the NAIF currently, in addition to those listed in March? Q. How is recruitment for these roles progressing? Q. What will the cost of the recruitment for these 12 (possibly more) positions cost? Q. Can you provide a list of all current vacancies at the NAIF? Q. Will there be any new roles created as a result of the NAIF Amendments Act 2021, in addition to the 10 already discussed? IF YES: Q. How many? Q. How much do expect the recruitment of these roles to cost?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	11/06/2021	Written
BI-144	Anthony Chisholm	Legislation	Q. Please provide an update on the development of the updated NAIF Investment Mandate. When can we expect to see the updated NAIF Investment Mandate released? Q. Please provide an indication of some of the more significant changes being made to the Investment Mandate? Q. Will the Investment Mandate include any sort of rate of return for equity investments? The Regulatory Impact Statement included in the Explanatory Memorandum for the recent NAIF legislative amendments projects that the NAIF should be making 16 investment decisions per year. Q. Can you explain how these numbers were determined? Q. The Regulatory Impact Statement also projects that 2 equity investment decisions will be made each year. Can you explain how this number was determined?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	11/06/2021	Written
BI-145	Anthony Chisholm	NAIF Costs	Can the NAIF provide and update on its administrative costs: Q. How much has been spent on travel by members of the NAIF Board in the past financial year? Q. How much has been spent on travel by NAIF executives in the past financial year? Q. How much has been spent on salaries for NAIF executives and Board members in the past financial year? Can we have this broken down by position? Q. How much did the NAIF spend on catering events in the last financial year? Q. How much has NAIF spent on recruitment costs in the last financial year	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	11/06/2021	Written
BI-146	Anthony Chisholm	Global Resources Strategy	1.Can you please tell us what the \$20 million will be spent on, and over what period? 2.Are there specific targets involved in this strategy? 3.Where are the proposed new markets for resources? 4.Does the strategy involve work that has traditionally been done by Austrade and other agencies? 5.Is this the first strategy within the Department that is aimed specifically at diversifying Australia’s resources exports?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-147	Anthony Chisholm	Rum Jungle Mine	1.The financial implication of this measure are not disclosed in the Budget. Why is that? 2.There have been estimates in the media (see attachment) that the total cost of rehabilitation could reach \$500 million? Are these accurate? 3.How much has the Federal Government already spent on the rehabilitation of Rum Jungle? 4.Over what time period will these rehabilitation works take place? 5.Will the works support employment and training opportunities for the site’s traditional owners?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-148	Anthony Chisholm	Junior Minerals Exploration Incentive	1.Has the Department completed an impact assessment of the JMEI for 2017-18 as required under the Treasury Laws Amendment (Junior Minerals Exploration Incentive) Act 2018? 2.If so, has the impact assessment been published on the ATO website as required? 3.If not, why not? (Submissions were called for in July 2020). 4.Does the Department plan to conduct an impact assessment of the JMEI every year as required? 5.Can you please tell us how many exploration companies and/or projects the JMEI has supported since inception in 2018? 6.Has the JMEI generated any exploration success for any of these companies?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-149	Kim Carr	R&D Tax Incentive	1. What evidence (such as industry reports, surveys, or other data) has the Government used to support its decision to remove the \$4 million cap and reduce the number of intensity levels from three to two? 2. In the planning around these changes, did the Government consider implementing any of the other recommendations or suggestions proposed by reports on, or inquiries into the RDTI since 2016, or put forward by industry representatives such as: (a) Introducing a collaboration premium? (b) Increasing the refundability threshold from \$20 million to \$50 Million – or at least, as the cap was set in 2009, (more than a decade ago) having some review and adjustment? (c) A refundable offset for all size organisations as some countries including Ireland have done? 3. Would the Government consider introducing quarterly R&D tax credit refunds to help these businesses? 4. What are the barriers to introducing quarterly payments? 5. What additional costs would the Government/Department incur in implementing such a proposal? 6. Has the Government/Department considered a potential collateral benefit of this proposal – and a potential save to the Government’s bottom line – that it would encourage companies to plan and document their R&D activities on a more regular basis than may otherwise occur – improving compliance rates and integrity within the system? 7. While reducing the number of tiers from three to two improves the potential return from the RDTI to companies with large operations in Australia, does the Government/Department acknowledge that any intensity measure must discriminate against businesses who base the bulk of their operations – and jobs creation – in Australia? 8. Can the Department supply an up to date annual breakdown of the cost of the RDTI? 9. Can this be matched to BERD for the equivalent periods? 10. Have the outcomes of successful appeals against adverse findings against RDTI claims in the last three years led to any changes in assessment processes or advice to potential claimants under the RDTI? 11. Can the Department supply an annual breakdown of RDTI compliance activities undertaken since 2012 in terms of: (a) Number of audits undertaken; (b) Number and percentage of audits that found inappropriate or fraudulent claiming; (c) Penalties applied to cases under (b); (d) Total \$ amount recovered from inappropriate or fraudulent claimants; (e) Penalties applied to R&D consultancies. 12. What external consultancies have been engaged to assist with the administration of the RDTI and on what contract terms?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-150	Kim Carr	CRC Program	1.When will the Government announce the outcome of the last round of CRC applications? 2.When will the Government announce the opening of applications for the next round of CRCs? 3.Has the Department had any engagement with the Department of Education in regard to the alignment of the CRC program with Education Minister Tudge’s recently announced “University Research Commercialisation” initiative? (a)How will potential overlap and duplication between this initiative and the CRCs be managed? (b)Is this initiative intended as a longer term replacement for CRCs? 4.Similarly, can you explain the alignment between the CRC program and the Modern Manufacturing Initiative (MMI) and its associated priorities? 5.Is there any intent to bend the CRC program to align with the MMI priorities – or other Government policy priorities as has been the case with CRC(P)s? 6.The last public good CRC, the Autism CRC is coming to an end. Does the Government have any plans for making “public good” a CRC priority again? 7.What external consultancies have been engaged to assist with the administration of the CRC program and on what contract terms? 8.When will the \$88.1 million in funding be transferred to new research centre for natural hazard resilience and disaster risk reduction? a.On what date did the Bushfire and Natural Hazards CRC finalise its winding-down process? b.How many staff from the BNHCRC have continued over to the new research centre?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-151	Kim Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	1.The 2021-22 Budget includes an extra \$5 million for the Commission. How will this be allocated? 2.What is the Commission’s current staffing level? 3.Are there plans to increase the number of staff? a.If so, by how many? b.What duties will be assigned to these extra staff? 4.What proportion of complaints brought to the Commission by domestic producers in 2020-2021 involved: a.Steel or steel products? b.Aluminium or aluminium products? c.Plastics or plastic products? d.Other building products? e.Paper and fibre products, including paper procured by Government departments and agencies? 5.How many complaints were upheld in each of these categories? 6.What were the source countries of products on which complaints were upheld, in each category? 7.What duties or counter-measures were imposed when complaints were upheld? 8.Can the Commission estimate the likelihood of products in these categories being dumped into the Australian market during the 2021-22 financial year? 9.If so, what is the estimated cost to Australian producers of increasing dumping activity?	Anti-Dumping Commission	11/06/2021	Written
BI-152	Kim Carr	General questions and Lighting questions	a)Is it correct that the Australian Building Codes Board (ABCB) is currently revising the National Construction Code (NCC 2022) residential energy efficiency rules? b)As at June 2021, what industry stakeholder organisations have been consulted? c)Have you also consulted groups representing consumers? d)When will the consultation process be completed? e)What is the due date for finalisation of the Revised code? f)When will the draft Revised Code be published for public comment? Lighting a)Does the current revision assume the ongoing inclusion of lighting efficiency requirements? b)Has the revision process considered the concerns of the Australian lighting industry? c)How many times have you met with the lighting industry to discuss how lighting issues are addressed in the revised rules? d)What have been the major themes of the lighting industry’s input? e)Has the lighting industry argued for the removal of ‘lighting’ from the revised National Construction Code, because: lighting energy use is now only 4% of total home energy use; the NCC is out of date as it considers only the total amount of lighting power installed; and the NCC does not adequately recognise the growth in use of more efficient LED lighting in most new and renovated houses? f)Has the ACBC ever measured the impact on housing affordability – and specifically on affordability of modern, efficient household lighting – of current NCC rules?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-153	Kim Carr	Street Lighting	a)What are the functions of the Greenhouse and Energy Minimum Standards (GEMS) Act 2012 and GEMS Regulator? b)Is the deployment of smart controlled street lighting lower in Australia than comparable countries, including New Zealand? a.If yes, why? c)Has the GEMS Regulator acted to prioritise the updating of the National Energy Rules to accommodate smart controlled street lighting systems which would generate significant savings in energy and greenhouse gas production? d)Is it correct that since 2016 the GEMS Regulator has spent over \$465,000 on consulting fees for work on street lighting issues? e)What were the outcomes of these projects and how have they influenced recent policy?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written
BI-154	Kim Carr	Global Science and Technology Diplomacy Fund	a.What programs have been absorbed into the Global Science and Technology Diplomacy Fund, announced in the 2021-22 Budget? b.Please provide a breakdown -- by (former) program, by year – for the savings of \$7.6 million over 2021-22 and the outyears, as identified in Budget paper #2 (page 139)? c.When will the details of the Global Science and Technology Diplomacy Fund be published? d.Will proposals which include Chinese partners and collaborators be eligible to apply to the Global Science and Technology Diplomacy Fund?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	11/06/2021	Written

Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-155	Louise Pratt	General questions, funding, subsidisation and material injury	<p>1.What funding has the Anti-Dumping Commission been allocated for 2020-2021; 2021-2022? 2.How many FTE and contractors are employed by the Anti-Dumping Commission for 2020-2021? 3.What is the average time to complete an assessment of an application/claim for 2019-2020; 2020-2021? 4.How many applications/claims did the Anti-Dumping Commission receive in 2019-2020; 2020-2021? 5.For 2019-2020, how many claims proceeded to the following case types: a.Investigation, b.Final Report, and c.Exemption. 6.For 2020-2021, how many claims proceeded to the following case types: a.Investigation, b.Final Report, and c.Exemption. 7.What was the average time to complete a case for 2019-2020? 8.What was the average time to complete a case for 2020-2021? 9.How many cases in 2019-2020 were found to have subsidisation from a government? 10.How many cases in 2020-2021 were found to have subsidisation from a government? 11.How many cases in 2019-2020 which were found to have subsidisation from a government, were for the following commodities/industries: a.A4 copy paper, b.Aluminium extrusions, and c.Precision pipe and tube steel. 12.How many cases in 2020-2021 which were found to have subsidisation from a government, were for the following commodities/industries: a.A4 copy paper, b.Aluminium extrusions, and c.Precision pipe and tube steel. 13.For 2019-2020, what was the total amount of material injury caused by dumped or subsidised imports to the following commodities/industries: a.A4 copy paper. b.Aluminium extrusions, and c.Precision pipe and tube steel. 14.For 2020-2021, what was the total amount of material injury caused by dumped or subsidised imports to the following commodities/industries: a.A4 copy paper. b.Aluminium extrusions, and c.Precision pipe and tube steel.</p>	Anti-Dumping Commission	11/06/2021	Written
BI-156	Bridget McKenzie	CSIRO engagement with ANSTO	<p>1.CSIRO has previously stated that "GHD's source was unclear" (GenCost 2019-20, pg 4) regarding the continually used CAPEX figure of \$16,487/kW for nuclear Small Modular Reactors in the latest GenCost 2020-21. Did the CSIRO engage with the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) to assess the accuracy of the CAPEX figure? If not, why not? 2.ANSTO and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) recently signed a collaboration research agreement to evaluate the economics of SMR technology. Will the CSIRO ensure that data from this project will be used as its primary source for nuclear technology data in future GenCost reports?</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-157	Rachel Siewert	Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan	<p>1.Does NOPSEMA's acceptance of the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan on 5 February 2021 provide an authorisation for Woodside to conduct activities outside Production Licence Area WA-28-L? 2.Did Woodside consult the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment about the sea dumping aspect of the activity? 3.Noting: •Woodside's Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan accepted by NOPSEMA on 5 February 2021 states that "the activities that form the scope of" the Plan include activities that will occur inside Production Licence Area WA-28-L; and •The Plan also states the impacts and risks associated with towing the Nghanurra riser turret mooring and its installation as an artificial reef (ie. activities outside WA-28-L) were considered; and •NOPSEMA's Key Matters Report on the Nghanurra Operations Cessation indicates the only activities authorised by the acceptance of the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan are those that will occur inside Production Licence Area WA-28-L; and •NOPSEMA's website states the proposed reef site is in a vacant petroleum title area, a.B Is it correct that, while acceptance of the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan by NOPSEMA provides authorisation for decommissioning activities for the Nghanurra riser turret mooring within Production Licence Area WA-28-L, it does not authorise the proposed activities outside WA-28-L, including installation of the riser turret mooring as an artificial reef, as described in the Plan? b.If the answer to a. is no, what provisions of the OPGGS Act or its Regulations authorise the proposed activities outside WA-28-L, in particular installation of the riser turret mooring as an artificial reef? c.If the answer to a. is yes, is it also correct the proposed installation as an artificial reef is therefore not within the scope of the NOPSEMA Program under the OPGGS Act that is endorsed under Part 10 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999? If not correct, on what basis is the proposed installation within scope? 4.Did NOPSEMA obtain any independent review from any heritage expert of Woodside's 'World Heritage Property Values and Threats Assessment' in the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan? If not, why not? 5.What matters did NOPSEMA rely on in concluding (as stated in paragraph 3 of Key Matters Report: Nghanurra Operations Cessation ) that the environmental impacts and risks associated with the riser turret mooring being deployed as an artificial reef "will be suitably managed under another credible regulatory regime (i.e. an artificial reef permit under the Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act (1981))"? 6.B Is this the first occasion on which NOPSEMA has accepted an Environment Plan for offshore disposal of a riser turret mooring? If not, on how many prior occasions has NOPSEMA done so, and in relation to each occasion: a.Which company submitted the plan; b.At what location was the mooring disposed of; and c.What plastics (type and weight) were contained within the mooring? 7.If polyethylene and polypropylene are abandoned in and around the riser turret mooring, the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan indicates the degrading particles and fragments will float away from the proposed artificial reef location where they will undergo further breakdown into microplastics (p. 463). Did NOPSEMA consider the possibility that these microplastics could be ingested by foraging marine turtles at locations other than in waters in the immediate vicinity of the artificial reef? a.If so: i.On what basis did NOPSEMA accept that the activity is not inconsistent with Action A3 in the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia? ii.Why did NOPSEMA not insist that Woodside alter the activity so it would not be inconsistent with Action A3 in the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia? b.If not, why not? 8.Marine debris prevention is everyone's responsibility. Why is Objective 1 in the Threat Abatement Plan for the impacts of marine debris on the vertebrate wildlife of Australia's coasts and oceans "not relevant" to the action described in the Environment Plan? 9.The fate of the second most abundant element in the riser turret mooring's steel, manganese, is not discussed in the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan. Did NOPSEMA consider the potential for the manganese in the riser turret mooring's steel to cause toxic contamination? a.If not, why not? b.If yes, please answer question 2. 10.Noting: •an Australian Government paper found a potential for manganese to be toxic in freshwater ; •a Chinese and Korean study found the leaching of manganese from steel is slow and constant, and occurs faster in marine than fresh water ; •in hypoxic (deep water) conditions, manganese could dissolve faster •a Swedish study found even low concentrations of manganese in the natural environment can cause effects on bivalves' immune systems ; •an Australian study found concentrations of dissolved manganese in seawater as low as 0.7 mg/L caused the flesh of one species of coral (Acropora spathulate) to disconnect and fall off the coral skeleton after 48 hours of exposure to 0.7 mg/L manganese in seawater ; and</p> <p>•under Australian &amp; New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh &amp; Marine Water Quality processes, toxicant default guideline values for manganese in marine water and sediment have been approved for review, a first but necessary step toward their publication, did NOPSEMA ask Woodside what the concentration of manganese will be at the surface of the riser turret mooring, the point where the concentration will be the greatest as it dissolves out of the steel? a.If so, what was Woodside's response? b.If not, why did NOPSEMA not ask this key question? 11.What monitoring has been required that will ensure Woodside (or any other future owner or operator) will know if/when manganese starts to contaminate The Ningaloo Coast World Heritage Area? What is the parameter to be monitored, and what threshold has been set that will trigger management action to manifest manganese contamination? 12.The Key Matters Report: Nghanurra Operations Cessation states that the control measures being implemented to reduce impacts from plastics and foam contaminants include (inter alia) the "Development of a Marine Debris Monitoring and Management Program consistent with the objectives of the Marine Debris Threat Abatement Plan" (Program) . Which of the following elements of the Program did NOPSEMA consider mitigate the impacts from plastics and foam contaminants? Was it the: a.plastics offsets program? b.funding of research? c.funding of an education program(s)? d.publication of information relevant to other regulatory processes? 13.Before NOPSEMA accepted the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan on 5 February 2021, had NOPSEMA seen any document confirming that the State of Western Australia has agreed to accept the ownership of and liability for the integrated artificial reef? a.If so: i.Did the document make explicit that Western Australia (WA) has accepted it will own the artificial reef and hold the responsibility to manage its impacts? ii.Which agency and level of authority in WA signed off on the confirmation? iii.Does the document make clear that the WA Treasury and/or the WA Cabinet are aware of and accept liability for the integrated artificial reef? b.If not: i.Why not? ii.Did you seek written confirmation from WA that WA will manage ongoing impacts? iii. Did the response give NOPSEMA assurance that WA understands and accepts these responsibilities? 14.Has NOPSEMA seen evidence that demonstrates Recfishwest has adequate financial resources available for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of the integrated artificial reef? a.If so, what evidence has NOPSEMA seen? b.If not, why did NOPSEMA not insist on seeing such evidence? 15.Has NOPSEMA seen any written agreement(s) between Woodside, Recfishwest and/or the WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the transfer of ownership of the integrated artificial reef discussed in the Nghanurra Operations Cessation Environment Plan? a.If so, what document(s) has NOPSEMA seen? 16.Noting Recfishwest is the applicant for the Sea Dumping Act permit, what, if any, consideration did NOPSEMA give to the capacity of Recfishwest to comply with permit conditions in deciding the permit would provide suitable management of environmental risks associated with the riser turret mooring?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	11/06/2021	Written

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-158	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO documents sent to Ministers	As CSIRO's Chief Executive, Dr Larry Marshall agreed at Senate Estimates on Thursday 3 June 2021, please provide a list of the documents in which CSIRO has provided scientific advice to Ministers including PM's, to MP's and to Senators and containing logical scientific points (see below*) proving that CO2 from human activity needs to be cut. As read aloud on Thursday 3 June 2021, please provide, on notice, CSIRO's specific formal policy advice on climate. I need to know the basis for current policies already destroying people's jobs, livelihoods, lifestyles and cost-of-living. As agreed on Thursday 3 June 2021, I require the following as read out in senate estimates: i. Type of document: e.g. letter, report, reference, article, journal paper, email; ii. Date that CSIRO provided the documents on a timeline in chronological order; iii. Recipients' names and titles; iv. Identification of document provided being: title, date, authors' names, publisher; v. Identification of, and specific location of, the logical scientific points upon which CSIRO's advice is relying. By logical scientific point* I mean the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving cause-and-effect. By location within a reference document I mean page numbers, sentences and/or data table especially when your point relies on reference to another document such as a UN IPCC report or State of the Climate Report; vi. The date range for documents is from the start of the Howard-Anderson government on 11 March 1996 to the present. As read aloud at Senate Estimates, Malcolm Robert's FOI request on CSIRO in 2013 for documents sent to Ministers between 2005 and 2013 revealed no correspondence on climate from CSIRO's Chief Executive to Ministers. Senator Roberts' recent Parliamentary Library request has failed to identify any documents from CSIRO to MPs containing logical scientific points proving causation. Malcolm Roberts' FOI request on BOM in 2013 failed to identify any documents or advice containing logical scientific points from BOM to Ministers. Malcolm Roberts' requests of previous Chief Scientists as far back as Dr Penny Sackett and, Dr Finkel's presentation to Senator Roberts in 2017 failed to provide any logical scientific points proving that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-159	Malcolm Roberts	Basis for scientific advice to governments on policy	As discussed with Dr Marshall at senate estimates: a. In 1996 or since, has CSIRO received requests from Ministers or their departmental or other advisers for advice on climate? b. If so, did Ministers or their advisers specify the format for the advice they requested from CSIRO? c. If so, what was the format and basis for the advice they requested? And did CSIRO comply with the requested format? d. If not, on what basis and format did CSIRO provide its advice? e. Specifically, did Ministers or their advisers request, and did CSIRO provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity in Australia on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? i.e. did Ministers request CSIRO to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from Australian human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from Australian human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect. f. Specifically, did ministers or their advisers request, and did CSIRO provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity globally on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? i.e. did Ministers request CSIRO to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect. g. Does CSIRO have and does it follow any specific guidelines or standards for providing scientific advice to governments or government agencies when government's intention is to use such advice in formulating policy? h. If not, on what quantified basis does CSIRO provide specific scientific advice when it is known or reasonably anticipated that CSIRO's advice will be the basis for climate or energy policy or for climate or energy policy initiatives? i. Is CSIRO directly, implicitly or morally responsible for watching over and checking government policy for soundness and accuracy? i.e. if CSIRO is aware of government policy not founded on or contradicting logical scientific points does CSIRO have responsibility directly, implicitly or morally? j. Has CSIRO ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed climate policies? k. Has CSIRO ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed energy policies based in turn on CSIRO's climate projections? l. Has CSIRO been involved in or consulted on the government's tracking of progress in implementing policy to measure policy effectiveness? m. Does CSIRO have any defined or implicit responsibility to question governments implementing policies not based on CSIRO advice and not consistent with or contradictory to empirical scientific climate data? n. What is CSIRO's understanding of the basis for government climate and energy policies? o. Has CSIRO provided governments with any policy structure as a foundation for climate and energy policies? Why has CSIRO never specified the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors including atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? So that in conjunction with the budget, Senator Roberts can fulfil his responsibilities to his constituents and assess the basis for costly climate and energy policies and assess progress and effectiveness of climate and energy policies Senator Roberts requests that CSIRO, specify the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on each of the climate factors together for each factor with the specific logical scientific points proving cause-and-effect.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-160	Malcolm Roberts	Past and present temperatures and rate of temperature change	According to CSIRO what is the rate of warming in Australian atmospheric temperatures using BOM data for the following periods: i. 1910 to present? ii. Last 42 years starting with 1979? iii. Last 26 years starting with 1995? Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change. 3.2 According to CSIRO what is the rate of warming in Australian atmospheric temperatures using University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH) data from NASA satellites for the following periods: i. Last 42 years starting with 1979 ii. Last 26 years starting with 1995 Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change. 3.3 According to CSIRO what is the rate of warming in global atmospheric temperatures using BOM/GHCN/NOAA data for the following periods: i. 1910 to present ii. Last 42 years starting with 1979 iii. Last 26 years starting with 1995 Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change 3.4 According to CSIRO what is the rate of warming in global atmospheric temperatures using UAH satellite data for the following periods: i. Last 42 years starting with 1979 ii. Last 26 years starting with 1995 Please specify the rate of temperature change in degrees per decade. Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to determine the rate of temperature change	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-161	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO's projected future temperatures	Looking at 100 years of data CSIRO has only projected a linear trend for the future temperatures. What are the 95% confidence intervals on the predictions based on this trend? CSIRO claims a current and ongoing warming trend, somewhat linear. Is CSIRO advising the public and parliamentarians that a linear trend of Australian air temperatures and secondly of global atmospheric temperatures is a realistic and accurate forecast of the future? Is CSIRO advising that a linear trend extrapolating along a linear trend is the way to predict future temperatures? Where are the error bounds on the forecast based on the linear trend you're calculated and projected? Is CSIRO advising the public and parliamentarians that this linear trend line represents a statistically significant and narrow band for future temperatures in Australia, and secondly, globally? Are you asserting that the residuals resulting from CSIRO's linear trend are random and so support the linear trend as a valid statistical model of the period? Note: Residuals mean the difference between the latest empirical measurements/observation and the model's equivalent projection for the same date based upon previous measurements/observations. 4.1 What is CSIRO projecting for temperature for the years 2100 and 2120 for various levels of human CO2 production including: i. Business as usual ii. Paris "Agreement compliance" globally? Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to make the temperature projection. 4.2 What is CSIRO projecting as the rate of temperature rise from now through to 2100 and 2120 for various levels of human CO2 production including: i. Business as usual ii. Paris "Agreement compliance" globally? Please specify the statistical methods and parameters/assumptions used to make the temperature projection.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-162	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO advise government on energy policies	Did CSIRO advise government on energy policies and specifically provide for the government estimated costs of various intermittent electricity generators such as solar and wind and their costs and benefits? What will be the effect on climate factors, particularly global atmospheric temperature if we fully implement all the government's policies at federal level and at state level? What will be the effect on other climate factors such as ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity? 5.2 Your cost estimates put the full cost of solar below that of coal. If that's true, did CSIRO recommend the discontinuing of all subsidies favouring solar and wind? If not why not? 5.3 CSIRO has been publicly discredited for its study's assumptions and omissions. One respected economics, finance and policy commentator, Terry McCrann, argued that CSIRO's analysis was dishonest because it added a carbon dioxide tax so that, quote: "we prove wind and solar are cheaper than coal because we make coal artificially more expensive." Isn't he correct? In a revised analysis CSIRO similarly claims wind/solar are cheaper than coal yet, having changed its advisors, does so by increasing the capital, finance and operating costs of coal, while reducing the costs of wind and solar. Is this not cherry picking variables to justify a pre-determined conclusion? These revised figures contradict experience in Australia and overseas so what is CSIRO's justification for these changes? Combining tailored assumptions with omissions can develop conclusions contradicting reality. Please provide the basic assumptions and associated assumptions used for each form of energy compared in your study. The assumptions include but are not limited to: i. Asset lives for each type of generator; ii. Capacity factors for each type of energy generator; iii. Reliability of generation for each type of generator; iv. Costs of each type of energy generator; v. The life cycle production of carbon dioxide for solar, wind, coal, gas, nuclear generators and hydro generators	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-163	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO assess other nations' climate and energy policies	Has any federal or state government asked CSIRO to assess specifically the impact of other nations' climate and energy policies on electricity and energy prices and on those nations' economic performance? I ask this especially in light of the fact that the Paris Agreement is really a Clayton's "Agreement" in that it each country is free to stipulate what it will do regardless of other nations'	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-164	Malcolm Roberts	Graph of atmospheric temperatures	Dr Mayfield stated previously that there has been an inflection in the graph of atmospheric CO2 concentration. Could CSIRO please advise the dates of that inflection? Please explain why CSIRO rules out natural factors as the cause of each inflection? I want the logical scientific point proving cause-and-effect in both 2009 following the global financial crisis in late 2008 and 2020 during the severe global recession as a result of nations locking down in their actions to control the COVID-19 virus. 8. In the graph of atmospheric temperatures that Dr Marshall displayed in senate estimates on Th.03.06.21, why did the 1998 El Nino temperature spike not appear to be comparable to the El Nino spike of 2016? In early 2017, the 1998 El Nino spike was universally shown in graphs of atmospheric temperature to be similar to or very slightly lower than that of the 2016 El Nino spike. Yet Dr Marshall's graph appeared to have the 1998 spike removed altogether and much cooler than 2016. Senator Roberts noted this during CSIRO's presentation to him in Sydney when he remarked that the first time during that presentation that a graph of atmospheric temperatures was presented the graph showed no spike in 1998, the next graph of atmospheric temperatures showed the 1998 spike of similar height to the 2016 spike and then the third time a graph of atmospheric temperatures was shown it depicted no spike in 1998. Why is there such inconsistency about the 1998 temperature despite Al Gore and the UN IPCC making such a public spectacle of the 1998 spike that they described as evidence of unusual and unnatural warming due to carbon dioxide from human activity?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	11/06/2021	Written
BI-165	Malcolm Roberts	Reports and correspondence provided to Ministers	Reports and correspondence on climate that Chief Scientists have provided to Ministers For a period of many years Ministers have said that on the subject of climate science they rely upon advice and reports from the Chief Scientist. Please provide a list of the documents in which Chief Scientists have provided scientific advice to Ministers including PM's, to MP's and to Senators and containing logical scientific points (see below*) proving that CO2 from human activity needs to be cut. Please provide, on notice, Chief Scientists' specific formal policy advice on climate. I need to know the basis for current policies already destroying people's jobs, livelihoods, lifestyles and cost-of-living. I require the following: a. Type of document. eg, letter, report, reference, article, journal paper, email; b. Date that the Chief Scientist provided the documents on a timeline in chronological order; c. Recipients' names and titles; d. Identification of document provided being: title, date, authors' names, publisher; e. Identification of, and specific location of, the logical scientific points upon which the Chief Scientist's advice is relying. By logical scientific point* I mean the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving cause-and-effect. By location within a reference document I mean page numbers, sentences and/or data table especially when your point relies on reference to another document such as a UN IPCC report or State of the Climate Report; f. The date range for documents is from the start of the Howard-Anderson government on 11 March 1996 to the present. Malcolm Roberts' Freedom Of Information request on BOM in 2013 for documents sent to Ministers between 2005 and 2013 revealed no correspondence on climate from CSIRO's Chief Executive to Ministers. Malcolm Roberts' Freedom Of Information request on BOM in 2013 for documents sent to Ministers between 2005 and 2013 identified no documents or advice containing logical scientific points on climate from BOM to Ministers. The FOI request found that BOM provided 17 documents to MPs and none of the documents included evidence of causation and many were merely UN updates and various correspondence. Senator Roberts' recent parliamentary Library request failed to identify any documents from CSIRO to MPs containing logical scientific points proving causation. Malcolm Roberts' requests of previous Chief Scientists as far back as Dr Penny Sackett and, Dr Finkel's personal presentation to Senator Roberts in 2017 failed to provide any logical scientific points proving that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut.	Office of the Chief Scientist	11/06/2021	Written

**Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-166	Malcolm Roberts	Basis for scientific advice to governments on policy	<p>The following questions cover the period 1996 to the present and refer to the Chief Scientist at the time then holding the office of Chief Scientist. In 1996 or since, did the Chief Scientist or his/her office receive requests from Ministers or their departmental or other advisers for advice on climate? If so, did Ministers or their advisers specify the format for the advice they requested from the Chief Scientist? If so, what was the format and basis for the advice they requested? And did the Chief Scientist comply with the requested format? If not, on what basis and format did the Chief Scientist provide its advice? Specifically, did Ministers or their advisers request, and did the Chief Scientist provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity in Australia on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? ie, did Ministers request the Chief Scientist to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from Australian human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from Australian human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect. Specifically, did ministers or their advisers request, and did the Chief Scientist provide any advice quantifying specifically the effect of carbon dioxide from human activity globally on climate factors such as atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? ie, did Ministers request BOM to advise on the specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors per unit of human carbon dioxide? And if so, please provide the specific, quantified relationship between carbon dioxide from human activity and each climate factor together with the associated specific logical scientific points proving the specific quantified effect Does the office of Chief Scientist have and does it follow any specific guidelines or standards for providing scientific advice to governments or government agencies when government's intention is to use such advice in formulating policy? If not, on what quantified basis does the Chief Scientist provide specific scientific advice when it is known or reasonably anticipated that the Chief Scientist's advice will be the basis for climate or energy policy or for climate or energy policy initiatives? Is the Chief Scientist directly, implicitly or morally responsible for watching over and checking government policy for soundness and accuracy? ie, if the Chief Scientist is aware of government policy not founded on or contradicting logical scientific points does the Chief Scientist have responsibility directly, implicitly or morally? Has the Chief Scientist ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed climate policies? Has the Chief Scientist ever been involved in doing cost-benefit analyses for government on proposed energy policies based in turn on the Chief Scientist's climate projections? Has the Chief Scientist been involved in or consulted on the government's tracking of progress in implementing policy to measure policy effectiveness? Does the Chief Scientist have any defined or implicit responsibility to question governments implementing policies not based on the Chief Scientist's advice and not consistent with or contradictory to empirical scientific climate data? What is the Chief Scientist's understanding of the basis for government climate and energy policies? Has the Chief Scientist provided governments with any policy structure as a foundation for climate and energy policies?</p> <p>Why has the Chief Scientist never specified the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate factors including atmospheric temperature, ocean temperature, rainfall, drought frequency and duration, storm frequency, extreme weather severity and frequency, flood frequency and severity and other climate factors? So that in conjunction with the budget, Senator Roberts can fulfill his responsibilities to his constituents and assess the basis for costly climate and energy policies and assess progress and effectiveness of climate and energy policies Senator Roberts requests that the Chief Scientist, specify the quantified specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on each of the climate factors together for each factor with the specific logical scientific points proving cause-and-effect.</p>	Office of the Chief Scientist	11/06/2021	Written
BI-167	Malcolm Roberts	Office of Scientific Integrity and Quality Assurance	<p>In March Supplementary Senate Estimates hearings the current Chief Scientist confirmed that she is aware of the concept of an Office of Scientific Integrity and Quality Assurance. Reportedly, Lancet published a paper claiming that around half of scientific papers today are questionable because peer-review is really effectively buddy-review and is scientifically tainted. Is the Chief Scientist aware of that publication? Acclaimed American physicist Professor Will Happer discusses the proven concept of Red Team vs Blue Team as used in critical American defence projects. In implementing that concept, the American government funds two opposing teams, specifically: • The Red Team proposes and advocates for the project and the science underpinning the project; while • The Blue Team's role is to question and prove the Red Team's science invalid. According to Professor Happer and American defence and science experts this process produces robust scientific advice that is thoroughly tested and increases accountability. Has the office of Chief Scientist ever considered this system? If so, what were the conclusions and specifically the advantages and disadvantages of the process? If not, why not? Has the Chief Scientist considered a requirement for each department proposing policies claimed to be based on science to post the science on the departmental website? If so, what were the Chief Scientist's conclusions and specifically the advantages and disadvantages of the process? If not, why not? Wouldn't full public scrutiny be far more rigorous than secretive peer-review that relies on peers that authors nominate or are from within a narrow field of science and are effectively colleagues of the authors? After almost half a century the UN's climate claims are still being thoroughly questioned and often condemned. Steve Koonin, former Obama Science Adviser now advocates openly adversarial debate and open peer review. Do you agree that fresh and diverse perspectives and debate are vital in science and that objective debate is a vital part of the scientific process? Are you aware of the Inter-Academy Council's August 2010 report that is scathing in its condemnation of the UN IPCC's Fourth (science) Assessment Report and that subsequent reports have not rectified the IAC's correct findings? Are you aware that highly respected researchers within the field of medical research publicly state that the field is riddled with conflicts of interest? Are you aware of reports that commercial interests have led to fads that plague the field of research into food and nutrition?</p>	Office of the Chief Scientist	11/06/2021	Written
BI-168	Rex Patrick	FPSO's were inspected at Lloyds Register International	<p>In Senate QON (SI-87 24 Oct 2020) it was confirmed that the following FPSO's were inspected at Lloyds Register International offices under warrant on 16 May 2019: A. Montara Venture B. Pyrenee Venture C. Nghanhurra NOPSEMA has also confirmed that inspection reports have been prepared for each of the above FPSO's for the inspections conducted. (Senate QON BI-179 6 Nov 2020). In relation to these inspections of these three (3) FPSO's at Lloyds Offices under warrant: 1. Can NOPSEMA confirm that the "prepared" inspections reports were provided to the "Operator" and "Titleholder" for each respective FPSO as required by the OPGGS Act? 2. On what date were these provided to each of the respective Operators and Titleholders? 3. Did the inspectors find any performance issues in regard to Lloyd's work? 4. What were the "Conclusions" and "Recommendations" for each report?</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	15/06/2021	Written
BI-169	Rex Patrick	Regulatory Advice & Class Status	<p>1.As at 11 June 2021 are the Lloyd's inspections up to date? a.If not, what action has the Task Force taken? b.Who has the Task Force informed? c.Which organisations has the Task Force sought advice from and when? 2.The Task Force is currently operating the Northern Endeavour under an EPBC exemption issued by Minister Ley. This exemption stipulates some conditions about the exemption is the Task Force in compliance with those conditions? a.If so, on what basis is the Task Force confident it is in compliance? b.If not, has Minister Ley been informed of the situation? i.When and how was the Minister informed? 3.Can the Task Force advise who is providing advice on class related matters? a.What is the current status of inspections for Northern Endeavour?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-170	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Temporary Operations Insurance	When the P & I Insurance was renewed in February (due date: 6 February 2021) the following points were relevant: •Class was Suspended 1 January 2020 due to overdue survey of 3P COT. •Annual Survey Overdue: Due Date 24 July 2020 – Survey window 24 April 2020 to 24 October 2020 •24 Overdue Conditions of Class relating to Excessive Corrosion of the hull and piping including the main deck, ship's side and most water ballast tanks. •Class Notation changed to "Laid Up" to avoid Class "Withdrawn" status? 1.Were these points disclosed to the Insurer when the insurance was renewed? a.Have they been advised subsequently?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-171	Rex Patrick	Proposals in relation to Northern Endeavour	1.During the hearing Mr Gaddes advised that advice was received from Woodside on decommissioning and UPS in regards to a commercial restart and that these were peer reviewed. Who undertook the peer reviews of those two pieces of advice? 2.Did APPEA or another industry group provide any proposals or input for dealing with Northern Endeavour going forward? a.If so, how many? b.Did the Task Force seek any?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-172	Rex Patrick	NOPSEMA Inspection Report	1.Can the Task Force confirm they've seen the Inspection Report that NOPSEMA produced in regards to the inspection on Lloyd's? So you would be aware that they found: "... serious concerns regarding the veracity of Lloyd's Register International's application of its rules and process and the resulting information. The implications of this is it calls into question the reliability of the information provided to the operator of the facility and the extent to which they may use it to assess risk of structural failure which could lead to catastrophic consequences to both personnel and the environment." a.Has the Task Force queried NOPSEMA about their findings? b.What advice has NOPSEMA provided to the Task Force on this matter? 2.If the Task Force accepts that NOPSEMA is a credible regulator, then they held serious reservations about the activities of Lloyd's and them having properly executed their obligations and responsibilities, correct? a.Can the Task Force confirm it's currently relying on Lloyd's certification for safety of the vessel? b.What action has the Task Force taken to ensure that the issues NOPSEMA found are no longer relevant? i.What advice has NOPSEMA provided the Task Force in regards to these issues being relevant or not?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-173	Rex Patrick	Decommissioning Levy	1.Can NOPSEMA outline the nature and number of engagements with industry to date regarding the establishment of a levy? a.Who's has NOPSEMA engaged with? 2.Has NOPSEMA received feedback from industry regarding the decision to institute a levy for decommissioning? a.Have any alternative proposals to cover future decommissioning been put forward?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	15/06/2021	Written
BI-174	Rex Patrick	Walker Review	1.Can NOPSEMA outline their role in assisting with the establishment of the Walker review? a.Excluding providing testimony, what actions and activities did NOPSEMA undertake in relation to the Walker review? 2.Did NOPSEMA provide any potential candidates for the review? a.If so, how many and who? b.What involvement did NOPSEMA personnel in identifying Mr Steve Walker as a candidate for the "Independent review into the circumstances leading to the administration and liquidation of Northern Oil and Gas Australia (NOGA)"? i.Did NOPSEMA have any input into defining the scope of the review? 3. Noting UPS was the operator, and the FPSO was being operated under their Safety Case, why didn't Mr Walker's investigation also inquire into UPS' role in the Northern Endeavour debacle? a.Why did NOPSEMA not ensure or recommend that UPS' role was also included in the review? 4.Is NOPSEMA aware of which other individuals assisted Steve Walker with preparing and finalising the report? a.Which other parties or individuals do they know assisted in writing the report?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	15/06/2021	Written
BI-175	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Roles	1.What is NOPSEMA's role and what are the related responsibilities in relation to Northern Endeavour? 2.In relation to Northern Endeavour, which entities does NOPSEMA deem: a.To be the owner? b.To be the regulator? c.To be the Operator?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	15/06/2021	Written
BI-176	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour Safety Case	1.Did the Safety Case for Northern Endeavour require the FPSO to be in Class? 2.Have any engineering calculations been undertaken regarding the 4,000 corrosion anomalies?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	15/06/2021	Written
BI-177	Jordon Steele-John	Mine Rehabilitation	1.In the recent federal budget the government committed to the "full" rehabilitation of the former Rum Jungle uranium mine site near Batchelor, south of Darwin. The funding is overdue and welcome. However the dollar allocation was undisclosed - marked as nfp (not for publication) due to commercial in confidence/ tender negotiation considerations. a.When are the full funding details for the Rum Jungle rehabilitation works expected to be made public? b.What is the scope of works to be advanced through this funding? And what is the timeline for these works? c.Have contractors and service providers been engaged? If not, when is it expected that this may occur? Who are these parties? d.What are the approvals process from this point? e.Is the funding a one-off or staggered allocation? f.Is the funding contingent on any project performance or key dates? g.How will the federal and NT govts interact and manage this project? Which party is the primary driver of the project? Relevant excerpt from recent Budget papers: RUM JUNGLE REHABILITATION PROJECT The Government will provide funding over 11 years from 2021-22 to conduct full rehabilitation works at the former Rum Jungle mine site near Batchelor, Northern Territory. The financial implications for this measure are not for publication (nfp) due to commercial sensitivities. This measure builds on the 2020-21 Budget measure titled Rum Jungle Rehabilitation Project — additional funding.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-178	Kristina Keneally	Executive Management	1.In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021: a.The total number of executive management positions b.The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. c.The change in the number of executive manager positions. d.The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-179	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial Functions	1.In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, can the following be provided: a.List of functions. 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	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-180	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial Meals	1.In relation to any breakfasts, luncheons, dinners or other meals hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, can the following be provided: a.List of dates and types of meals. 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-181	Kristina Keneally	Departmental Functions	1.In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 can the following be provided: a.List of functions. 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-182	Kristina Keneally	Executive Office Upgrades	1.Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-183	Kristina Keneally	Facilities Upgrades	1.Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment. 2.If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). 3.If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-184	Kristina Keneally	Staff Travel	1.What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-185	Kristina Keneally	Legal Costs	1.What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-186	Kristina Keneally	Secretarial Travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-187	Kristina Keneally	FOI	1.Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for the following years: a.2013-14; b.2014-15; c.2015-16; d.2016-17; e.2018-19; 2019-20, and; f.2020-21 to date. 2.For each year above, please provide: a.The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full; b.The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part; c.The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and d.The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under the Freedom of Information Act. 3.For each year above, please also provide: a.The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and b.The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request). 4.For each year above, please also provide: a.The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the Oaic; and b.The number of times has the Oaic overturned – in whole or in part – the Department's decision to refuse access to material. 5.Please provide the staffing (both ASL and headcount) of staff at the Department who work exclusively on FOI requests, broken down by APS level (e.g. three EL1s, four APS6s, one SES) for each of the following years: a.2013-14; b.2014-15; c.2015-16; d.2016-17; e.2018-19; f.2019-20, and; g.2020-21 to date. 6.For each of the years above, please also list the number of officers who are designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Department. 7.In the past 12 months, has the Department seconded additional resources to processing Freedom of Information requests? If so, please detail those resources by APS level. 8.Please provide the number of officers who are currently designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Minister's office. 9.Please provide the number of FOI requests currently under consideration by the Department. Please also provide the number of these requests that are currently overdue in response. 10.Does the department consult or inform the Minister when it receives Freedom of Information requests? If so: a.How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and b.Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister. 11.Has the Department consulted or informed another Department or agency about any FOI request in the past twelve months. If so, please provide the legal basis on which that consultation occurred (e.g. third party consultation, transfer of request).	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-188	Kristina Keneally	Market Research	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 each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. d.Contract date period 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	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-189	Kristina Keneally	Advertising and information campaigns	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 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 Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-190	Kristina Keneally	Promotional Merchandise	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 2.Can an itemised list of all Austender 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-191	Kristina Keneally	Collateral Materials	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on collateral materials, including banners, publications, maps, charts and high visibility or protective clothing for events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits, including Ministerial events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 2.For each event or function where the Department/agency expended funds on collateral materials, provide details of the event, including the date and location of each event, and details of the types of materials.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-192	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial Overseas Travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, please be provided including: 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-193	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial Domestic Travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all domestic travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, please be provided including: 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-194	Kristina Keneally	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; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 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 Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-195	Kristina Keneally	Departmental Equipment	What was the estimated value of all Departmental equipment that was lost, damaged, stolen or written off during each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-196	Kristina Keneally	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including: a.Date commissioned. b.Date report handed to Government. c.Date of public release. d.Terms of Reference. e.Committee members and/or Reviewers. 2.How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost. 3.The background and credentials of the Review personnel. 4.The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel 5.The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review. 6.How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level. 7.What is the current status of each report. When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-197	Kristina Keneally	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 31 May 2021. 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	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-198	Kristina Keneally	Appointments - Briefs Prepared	1.How many times has the Department prepared a brief for statutory authorities, executive agencies, advisory boards, government business enterprises or any other Commonwealth body which includes a reference to a former Liberal or National member of parliament at a state, territory or federal level. 2.For each brief prepared, can the Department advise: a.The former member. b.The board or entity. c.Whether the request originated from the Minister's office. d.Whether the appointment was made.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-199	Kristina Keneally	Stationery	1.How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-200	Kristina Keneally	Media Monitoring	1.What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to each Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Austender 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. 2.What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Austender 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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-201	Kristina Keneally	Communications Staff	1.For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following: 2.By Department or agency: a.How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location. b.How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. c.How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. d.How many are graphic designers. e.How many are media managers. f.How many organise events. 3.Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios. a.If yes, why. b.When was it established. c.What is the set up cost. d.What is the ongoing cost. e.How many staff work there and what are their classifications.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-202	Kristina Keneally	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	15/06/2021	Written
BI-203	Kristina Keneally	CDDA Payments	1.How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021? 2.How many claims were: a.Accepted. b.Rejected. c.Under consideration. 3.Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide: a.Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations b.The date payment was made c.The decision maker.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-204	Kristina Keneally	Congestion Busting	1.Can the Department/agency advise how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks. 2.Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-205	Kristina Keneally	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; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021? 2.Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-206	Kristina Keneally	Staffing	1.How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at each of 30 June 2019 and 30 June 2020, 31 May 2021? 2.How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing. 3.How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. How many were: a. voluntary b.involuntary. 4.How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies. 5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff. 6.How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021. 7.How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-207	Kristina Keneally	Comcare	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021 can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status. 2.Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the each of the periods; 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-208	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Commission	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-209	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Ombudsman	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-210	Kristina Keneally	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-211	Kristina Keneally	Public Interest Disclosures	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, and 1 January 2021-31 May 2021, how many public interest disclosures have been received.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-212	Kristina Keneally	Travel and Expense Claim Policy	1Please produce a copy of all travel and expense claim policies. 2Please produce a copy of all claim forms. If the forms are digital, please provide a screen shot of each section, including all dropdown options.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-213	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of Interest	1Please produce a copy of all travel and expense claim policies. 2Please produce a copy of all claim forms. If the forms are digital, please provide a screen shot of each section, including all dropdown options.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-214	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of gifts and hospitality	1Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of gifts as at 31 May 2021?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-215	Kim Carr	Funding, revenue, and refunds	1. What is DISER's total allocation to the ADC for 2021-22. Please provide a table with the following, for each FY since the ADC was established: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departmental funding allocation</li> <li>• Anti-Dumping and countervailing duties collected.</li> <li>• Revenue collected because of ABF compliance activity.</li> <li>• Duty refunds provided.</li> <li>• Total (Duty collected less refunds provided)</li> <li>• Total duty collected less refunds less departmental allocation.</li> </ul> 2. ("The department will support business growth, investment, and job creation by implementing a package of measures to simplify and strengthen the Anti-Dumping system so that it remains effective and efficient, funded at \$5.0 million over the forward estimates and \$1.4 million ongoing from 2025-26") [1] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this on top of departmental allocations?</li> <li>Will the ADC have discretion on how this funding is spent?</li> <li>Why is the bulk of the implementation money earmarked (\$4.7 million over four years from 2021-22 (and \$1.3 million per year ongoing) to the Anti-Dumping Commission, to provide importers and local manufacturers advice on whether goods are subject to Anti-Dumping duties? [2]</li> </ol>	Anti-Dumping Commission	15/06/2021	Written
BI-216	Kim Carr	Reform agenda, Travel overseas and Trade Remedies Index	Reform agenda - Is it intended that the reform package, including legislation, will be introduced/ implemented soon? Travel overseas - Are ADC investigators still unable to travel overseas because of COVID-19 for verification purposes or have they been provided exemptions given the operational imperative to have onsite verification? - If still unable to travel, what is the plan to get this up and running again, has the ADC requested/ received advice? - Are all staff who are/ will be undertaking international travel already vaccinated? Trade Remedies Index Does the Index allow the following questions to be answered, and if so can you please provide the answers. - In comparison to the dumping/injury period, please provide a breakdown since 2013 of the volume reduction (by percentage) of commodities imported after: a. An investigation was initiated. b. Duties were put in place. - Can you provide a breakdown of the volume reduction from the countries subjected to duties compared with the total volume reduction in imports of the commodity over the past 12 months. a. If this is possible, can you commence with an analysis of A4 Copy Paper [PDF 168.23 KB], Hollow Structural Sections [PDF 856.32 KB], Wind Towers [PDF 808.76 KB], PVC Flat Electric Cables [PDF 673.9 KB], Clear Float Glass [PDF 686.59 KB] and Pineapple Fruit - Consumer & FSI [PDF 199.63 KB]?	Anti-Dumping Commission	15/06/2021	Written
BI-217	Sarah Hanson-Young	Radioactive waste issues	Background: ANSTO received \$59.8 million to 'support the interim storage of intermediate level solid radioactive waste' in the recent federal budget. •What is the \$59.8 million going to facilitate? •What ILW is going to be treated and where and how is it intended to be stored on the ANSTO campus? •When is the next spent fuel reprocessed waste return expected back from the UK? •What is the current management plan for this waste? •After this return what further waste returns are expected from any international sources?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	15/06/2021	Written
BI-218	Sarah Hanson-Young	Extended interim storage at ANSTO	In June 2020 the CEO of the federal nuclear regulator ARPANSA told a Senate Inquiry that current ILW storage at ANSTO is consistent with best practise and that intermediate level "waste can be safely stored at Lucas Heights for decades to come" 1. Does this assessment, coupled with the recent budget allocation - remove the need for urgency in relation to moving ILW to any facility at Kimba?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	15/06/2021	Written
BI-219	Sarah Hanson-Young	National radioactive waste management facility (NRWMF) tender	ANSTO has put out a tender for the planned NRWMF on 11th December 2020: <a href="https://www.tenders.gov.au/Atm/ShowClosed/0d75755d-5100-42ae-86e9-4eb72486fa36?PreviewMode=False">https://www.tenders.gov.au/Atm/ShowClosed/0d75755d-5100-42ae-86e9-4eb72486fa36?PreviewMode=False</a> According to a statement from the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency - "ANSTO is seeking an engineering partner to support them in progressing from the current generic concept design to a site-specific schematic for the facility in Napandee". •What is the status of the tender agreement? Has there been a successful tenderer? oWho is this party? oWhat is the status of the contract process? oWho is the approved or leading contractor? •What is the tender value? •What is the scope and timeline of proposed works? •Is it possible/appropriate/consistent with government tender practise to lock in such an approach when the specific site has not been secured and is under active contest? •How can a site-specific design and development be advanced in the absence of a secured site? •What provision/ contingency does the contract make for the scenario where this site is not able to be further advanced or secured? HIFAR de-commissioning Dismantling the old reactor at Lucas Heights would mean a much larger volume of ILW heading to Kimba. •what is the current status of decommissioning works for the former HIFAR reactor? •How far advanced is this work and what is the decommissioning timeline? •What is the volume and composition of the combined materials that will arise from the decommissioning? •When might this material be expected to be removed from Lucas Heights and moved to any national waste facility? •In what form/packaging would any such transport occur? Extended Storage ANSTO told the Senate Inquiry into the Pitt Amendment (Adi Patterson, June 30, 2020) that a delay with the national facility would necessitate ANSTO building an ILW storage extension by 2027. Related to this: •What are ANSTO's plans in relation to advancing the contingency for extended ILW storage capacity by 2027? •While ANSTO has previously responded that this a federal government matter surely on a matter of storage of ANSTO wastes at ANSTO's campus any federal government consideration would be informed by ANSTO advice. This would also be appropriate and consistent with the agencies stated and legislated advice-to-government role. Given this, what advice have you provided to government and what contingency plans have you made?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-220	Sarah Hanson-Young	Waste facility at Kimba (ARWA)	On the ARWA website you state that as well as advancing the planned national radioactive waste facility at Kimba ARWA will 'lead a separate process to site a facility to permanently dispose of Australia's intermediate-level waste'. •Is that process advancing in parallel to the planned national facility or will come later? •(If later) can you see how there is community concern that in the absence of a proven pathway for the long-term management of ILW and over the likelihood of the ILW becoming 'stranded' waste at Kimba? •What is the status of ARWA's Adelaide office? •Will the agency be primarily/solely based in Adelaide?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-221	Kristina Keneally	Briefings	1.Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives. If so, can the following be provided: a.The subject matter of the briefing. b.The location and date of the briefing. c.Who proposed the briefing. d.Attendees of the briefing by level/position	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-222	Kristina Keneally	Acting Minister Arrangements	1.Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister from 24 August 2018 to 30 May 2021. 2.Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-223	Kristina Keneally	Departmental Staff Allowances	1.Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-224	Matthew Canavan	SARS virus research	Senator CANAVAN: Has the CSIRO ever been involved in research into coronaviruses of any nature? Ms Zielke: The SARS virus that we were talking about previously. So we can take that on notice.	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	3/06/2021	120
BI-225	Murray Watt	Date of internal complaint and date of discussion with COS	Senator WATT: Mr Fredericks, has anyone in your department expressed discomfort or an unwillingness to meet with Minister Porter since his appointment? Mr Fredericks: Yes. There has been one issue raised to that effect. We have to be careful about confidentiality with personal issues. I will get Ms McCulloch to deal with it at a general level. Ms McCulloch: We are aware of one complaint, one issue, which we dealt with through our normal workplace safety policies and support for staff. It is only one. Senator WATT: This is one complaint? Is that the right word? Ms McCulloch: I don't want to go into individual matters, Senator. It was one issue raised by one person in relation to dealing with the minister. Senator WATT: Since his appointment to this role? Ms McCulloch: That's right. Senator WATT: I respect that we don't want to get too many personal details here. That involves a departmental officer? Ms McCulloch: That's correct. Senator WATT: Who did not want to engage with Minister Porter? Ms McCulloch: That's correct. Senator WATT: Was there any reason given? Ms McCulloch: I'm not going to go into those matters. It is a matter of confidentiality. Senator WATT: When did that occur? Ms McCulloch: I would have to take that on notice. That is a detail that I don't have with me. Senator WATT: Was it soon after the minister's appointment or more recent? Ms McCulloch: I would have to take that on notice. I don't have that detail. ... Senator WATT: Have we been able to clarify when that complaint was made, roughly? Ms Bryant: Sorry, Senator. I don't have those details. It was quite a few weeks ago. Senator WATT: So quite soon after the minister was appointed to the role? Ms Bryant: I wouldn't say it was very close to him being appointed either. I will just have to check. I can go and get you those details straight away and come back if you need them. Senator WATT: I appreciate you said it wasn't investigated as such. The HR department or that part of the department handled the complaint? ... Senator WATT: Was the matter raised with Minister Porter? Mr Fredericks: No. It wasn't. Ms Bryant: Not by me. Senator WATT: What about with his office? Ms Bryant: Yes. I made a phone call to the office. Senator WATT: You spoke to his chief of staff? Ms Bryant: Yes. Senator WATT: Can we get the date of that conversation as well, please? Ms Bryant: Certainly.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	3/06/2021	24
BI-226	Rex Patrick	Australian Industry Mapping	1.Does the department have, or have access to a 'map' of the Australian industrial base? a.Is this a departmental tool? b.Does it map the industries capabilities and capacities? c.If not, is the department developing a 'map' of Australian industry, with the relevant industrial capabilities and capacities? d.If so, when will the first cut be ready? 2.Has the department developed a listing of industrial capabilities that are of strategic and/or sovereign importance for Australia? a.Has a 'map' of the relevant Australian industrial base been developed? i.If yes, is there an implementation plan? ii.If not, is one being developed and when will it be ready?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-227	Rex Patrick	R&D Tax Incentive	1.How many companies are registered for the R&D tax incentive? a.How many are SME's? 2.What has the trend been over the past 5 financial years? 3.How does the department utilise the information captured about the nature of the R&D activities being undertaken by the entity? 4.What does the department do with the information it collects about the business activities of the entities registered for R&D? a.What categories are there? b.Of the registered companies how many are: i.Information and Communications Technology (ICT)? ii.Medical? iii.Medicine? iv.Space equipment? v.Renewable energy? vi.Battery/Energy storage? 5.Does the department capture any information about the returns that have come from the intellectual property developed under earlier R&D activities that benefitted from the tax incentive?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written

## Industry Questions on Notice Index Budget estimates 2021-22

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
BI-228	Rex Patrick	INDUSTRY – SPACE INDUSTRY	Launch Application Fees 1.When will the decision be made on whether to extend the launch application fee waiver? 2.Has the Space Agency put forward any proposals to defer charging fees for launch applications until the industry hits a defined target/level of maturity? a.If so how many and when were they proposed? Overseas Satellites 1.Has the Agency set any guidelines regarding the notification periods for: a.entities launching foreign/overseas satellites ahead of the launch date? b.foreign entities wanting to have their satellites launched in Australia ahead of the launch date (noting packing, shipping and customs clearance times)? Investment To provide additional guidance regarding the questions taken on notice during the hearing of 3 June 2021 and in reference to the Economic Snapshot of the Australian Space Sector 2016-17 to 2018-19. Could the Space Agency please: 1.Advise from which budget items/funding programs does the almost \$1.1 billion of Australian Government funding come from? a.Can a breakdown be provided? b.Please explain the level of involvement the Agency has in the allocation/commitment of this funding? 2.Explain: a.the sources of the "Industry" investment (\$627.5M), and the levels of both domestic and foreign industry investment? b.the nature of this industry investment (foreign entities setting up, acquiring a stake in an Australian business, contracting an Australian business to do something, etc)? 3.Elaborate on the nature of the \$136.5 million investment from International Space Agencies? a.Explain how has this funding been committed (Govt to Govt, commercial transaction to an Australian company, etc) Govt Funding - Growing Australia's Space Industry 1.What has been delivered by the \$3.4M expenditure through the Growing Australia's Space Industry fund this FY? 2.What are the objectives/deliverables for the \$8.5M budgeted for FY 2021-22? a.What are the associated KPI's? Govt Funding - Space Infrastructure Fund 1.What has been delivered by the Space Infrastructure Fund through the \$6.8M of expenditure this FY? Govt Funding - International Space Investment 1.What did the International Space Investment funding deliver with the \$4.5M of expenditure in FY 2020-21? 2.What is planned to be delivered from the \$7.1 M budgeted for the 2021-22 financial year?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	15/06/2021	Written
BI-229	Rex Patrick	Resource extraction reports	Senator PATRICK: I want to ask, firstly, about resource extraction reports. I want to understand what information is contained in those monthly production reports. Dr Johnson: Which monthly production reports are you talking about? Senator PATRICK: Resource extractions. Dr Johnson: As in announcements by companies for production figures? Senator PATRICK: My understanding is that you keep a track of what is produced from different sites. Dr Johnson: We do that on an annualised basis. We publish the production figures aggregated in a document that we call Australia's identified mineral resources. That includes the annual production figures for individual commodities. Senator PATRICK: How do you receive that information? Is that done on a monthly basis? How is that done? Dr Heap: We spend the best part of the year going through company reports tabled through the Australian Securities Exchange and other documents that they publish. We collate that information as they publish that information throughout the year. So it is basically a compilation exercise to provide an annual estimate of the total amount of resource that is either in the ground plus what their ore reserves might be. Senator PATRICK: My understanding is that the method used in annual reporting here in Australia, unlike the United States, is, in some sense, at the discretion of the company. Instead of reporting to a particular defined standard, as they do in the US, that doesn't happen here. I wonder whether or not that is an accurate way of getting access to this information. I wonder why you simply can't have proper access to that information. Dr Johnson: I want to clarify. Are you referring to resource figures or production figures? Senator PATRICK: Production figures. Dr Heap: We might have to take that on notice. Dr Johnson: We might have to take that on notice. We are clear on the comparison between the US and Australia with respect to resource figures, but we will need to look into the differences in how production figures are reported. Senator PATRICK: They are interrelated, clearly, because as you extract and produce, the resource depletes? Dr Johnson: Yes. But typically, unless it's a very small resource, what is produced in a single year will be a relatively small fraction of the total resource. So the resource base won't change hugely year on year, as a general comment. Senator PATRICK: You don't see any direct and/or confidential information from companies? Dr Johnson: No. In each instance, under the mining act of any given state jurisdiction, the state is the regulator. If any government body were to directly see production figures, it would be state based. Senator PATRICK: But offshore? Dr Heap: No. We don't receive any mining information from offshore. Dr Johnson: Are you talking about oil and gas extraction? Dr Heap: With oil and gas, yes. To correct the record— Senator PATRICK: Sorry. I might have steered you down the wrong pathway. Dr Heap: To correct the record, yes, we do receive information from offshore resources for oil and gas from the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator.	Geoscience Australia	4/06/2021	6
BI-230	Rachel Siewert	mRNA vaccine production in Australia	What steps and when did the Government take to explore the mRNA vaccine production in Australia?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	24/06/2021	Written