

ENVIRONMENT COMMUNICATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE –BUDGET ESTIMATES – MAY 2015

ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

QoN No.	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Hansard Page or Written	PDMS Record
1.	Corporate CSD	Urquhart	Secondment of staff to the Ministerial offices	<p>Senator URQUHART: Have any departmental officers been seconded to the minister's office or the office of the parliamentary secretary?</p> <p>Ms Wiley-Smith: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you also take on notice to provide the details of those appointments, how they were made and whether they are temporary or permanent.</p> <p>Ms Wiley-Smith: Certainly.</p>	5 25 May	SQ15-162
2.	Corporate CSD	Urquhart	Remuneration for staff seconded to Ministerial-Offices	<p>Senator URQUHART: The other question in relation to that is who is paying for them. Are they on the department's books or have they been engaged under the MOP(S) Act and are therefore on the minister's books?</p> <p>Ms Wiley-Smith: Certainly. I will take that on notice. We do some temporary placements within the office, which is within the normal procedures. I think three months is the maximum amount of time that the department can pay for an officer who goes up to assist in the office, but I will clarify that.</p>	5 25 May	SQ15-163
3.	Corporate CSD	Urquhart	Discretionary Grant Programmes	<p>Dr Kennedy: There would be streams underneath those programs. I guess you want a break-out of all the various streams of the programs.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: All the administered programs—yes, we will be able to get that for you.</p>	7 25 May	SQ15-164
4.	Corporate CSD	Urquhart	Grant Applications	<p>Mr Thompson: Typically for competitive grants programs, the minister is the decision maker. That is the typical situation.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: In relation to each of those programs, is there an industry advisory body or some other form of advisory body that is involved in the assessment process for grant applications?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Again that would differ by program. I can talk about some of the programs in my part of the world which relate to biodiversity protection.</p>	7 25 May	SQ15-165

				<p>Senator URQUHART: I guess what I would like is an overall picture. If you need to take that on notice, then I am happy for you to do that. But I would also like the details of who those different advisory bodies are that are attached to each of the programs.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Certainly. Just to be clear and to give an example which might clarify the question, for the National Heritage Trust, we have the National Landcare Advisory Committee, which is an advisory committee. Typically they will be involved in giving advice on the design of the overall program but not be involved in the assessment of competitive grants. Typically that will be the case across most of the programs. You do not involve people who have a conflict of interest in advising on the grants themselves. For example, again under the national Landcare program, we involve community assessors, people who understand how these things work on the ground, to help shape the department's advice to the minister about what would be a suitable grant to fund.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Perhaps you can take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: We will take it on notice.</p>		
5.	Corporate PAID	Canavan	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Senator CANAVAN: Have there been any rules issued using that particular power under the Income Tax Assessment Act?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I cannot recall. I will have to take that on notice. But I can come back to you in the course of this estimates, if that helps you.</p>	10 25 May	SQ15-166
6.	Corporate PAID	Canavan	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Senator CANAVAN: That would be great. Referring to question 101 from the last estimates, you said that some organisations do provide audited financial statements but there does not appear to be any obligation on them to do so. You say that you reserve the right to request audited financial statements. Have you done that at any time? Have you expressly asked some organisations for those?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I will take this one on notice, too. Certainly, until a couple of years ago, I understand—I think this is covered in our submission—audited financial statements were provided more routinely. Of course, we are back in the camp of the crossover. There is a set of reporting requirements under that 75 per cent of registered environmental organisations; the charities are also providing these statements. So there was an attempt a couple of years ago to streamline that or to reduce the duplication. As to your specific question whether we have issued a notice to someone and said, 'Please provide us with an audited financial statement,'</p>	10 25 May	SQ15-167

				I do not know that but I will follow it up for you.		
7.	Corporate PAID	Canavan	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Senator CANAVAN: My final question relates to the last estimates. In question 102 I was asking whether anyone has been taken off for noncompliance with a certain section of the act. You said that last year you warned an organisation that it could be breaching the relevant section and later on the organisation agreed and consented to its removal. Which organisation was that?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I will take that on notice.</p>	10-11 25 May	SQ15-168
8.	Corporate PAID	Canavan	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Dr Kennedy: They do have those powers. We can refer a matter that is arising under the Register of Environmental Organisations where an organisation, we feel, may not be behaving in line with any number of laws, and it is up to them whether they use those powers to investigate. But they do have those powers.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Finally, to be clear, did you see the GetUp! board papers that were referred to in The Australian?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: I think you took it on notice last time, but you have not explicitly answered that question.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I do not know off the top of my head whether we sought through the Friends of the Earth or asked them for comment on those board papers, but we did not communicate directly with GetUp!</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: I ask you again to take on notice whether you saw those board papers. I do not think that is going to any great secrecy. It goes to the board papers themselves and whether or not you were able to examine them, as presumably The Australian was able to.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: As public documents, and whether we looked at them through the course of the investigation.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: I do not think they were public documents, but certainly the journalist at The Australian seemed to have access to them.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: Okay. I will take that on notice.</p>	11 25 May	SQ15-169

9.	Corporate CSD	Waters	Reduction in staffing numbers - percentage	<p>Senator WATERS: Are you saying that you have lost more than 16 per cent of your workforce currently?</p> <p>Ms Wiley-Smith: Yes, we have.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Do you have a figure that more accurately reflects that?</p> <p>Ms Wiley-Smith: I will have to actually come back. I only have more recent figures around the last 18 months. We can have a look at what happened before that.</p>	13 25 May	SQ15-170
10.	Corporate PAID	Waters	Register of Environmental Organisations	<p>Senator WATERS: Again, it seems to me that pretty much everything is above board, but I understand that that is what we have inquiries for. Has there been any evidence that the department has tracked where any groups on that register have in fact endorsed any political party, as opposed to criticised decisions that have a poor impact on the environment, no matter which government is in power?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: I am not aware of our routinely investigating whether organisations on the register are supporting or engaged in any way with political organisations. But, to be absolutely clear, because there is a long history of this register going back to 1992, I will take on notice whether any such activities have occurred in the past.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you, because I am certainly not aware of any myself. But you are saying that that is not precluded anyway; even if there were, that would not be against the rules. Is that correct?</p>	15 25 May	SQ15-171
11.	Corporate CSD	Waters	Efficiency Dividends	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. If you could just provide for me, please, a list of all of the efficiency dividends imposed on the department and on portfolio agencies since 2007-08.</p>	17 25 May	SQ15-174
12.	Corporate CSD	Waters	Total FTE staffing in the Department, EACD; Compliance and Enforcement Branch and approvals and monitoring section	<p>Can you please provide an update on the total level of FTE staffing in the Department?</p> <p>Can you please provide an update on current FTE staffing levels the Environmental Assessment and Compliance Division?</p> <p>How many FTE staff are in the Compliance and Enforcement Branch?</p> <p>How many FTE staff are in the approvals monitoring section?</p>	Written	SQ15-364

13.	Corporate CSD	Carr	Australian Government ICT Sustainability Plan	The Plan states in that general use office paper used by Government departments and agencies must be made from 100% post-consumer recycled content by July 2015. Which Departments will be will be compliant with that policy as of July 2015? Which Departments will not be compliant with that policy as of July 2015?	Written	SQ15-390
14.	Corporate CSD	Carr	Australian Government ICT Sustainability Plan	Has the Government received any representations from industry or other Stakeholders about the desirability of retaining the ICT Sustainability Plan? If so, please summarise the nature and extent of those representations.	Written	SQ15-391
15.	Corporate CSD	Carr	Australian Government ICT Sustainability Plan	Has the Commission of Audit's proposal to abolish the ICT sustainability plan been rejected? If so, have stakeholders (including Government departments) been informed?	Written	SQ15-392
16.	Corporate CSD	Ludwig	PORTFOLIO WIDE QUESTION - Non-Australian Citizens Employed .	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Department/Agency's policy with regard to hiring non-Australian citizens? 2. Does the agency have a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) policy? If yes, please provide a summary. 3. How does the Department/Agency determine whether a person is a non-Australian citizen? 4. How many staff who were not Australian Citizens have been hired by the Department/Agency since the Federal Election in September, 2013? Please break the numbers down by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Levels at which they are employed 2. Immigration Status (Visa) 3. Cultural Background 4. Linguistic Background 5. How many were hired to satisfy CALD targets? 	Written	SQ15-393
17.	Corporate CSD	Ludwig	PORTFOLIO WIDE QUESTION- Departmental Dispute Resolution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are disputes between departmental and/or agency staff mediated? 2. Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc). 2. Amount paid to each firm since the last budget. 3. When the contract with the firm commenced. 4. When the contract with the firm will expire. 	Written	SQ15-394

				<p>5. Why the firm was selected to provide the service.</p> <p>6. Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute.</p> <p>3. How are code of conduct violations by departmental and/or agency staff mediated?</p> <p>4. Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include:</p> <p>1. The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc).</p> <p>2. Amount paid to each firm since the last budget.</p> <p>3. When the contract with the firm commenced.</p> <p>4. When the contract with the firm will expire.</p> <p>5. Why the firm was selected to provide the service.</p> <p>6. Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute.</p>		
18.	Outcome 1 Director of National Parks	Siewert	Declarations of Interest -	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Were declarations of interest made through the planning process? You said then there were provisions, and I ask whether they were in fact made. How many and when?</p> <p>Mr Clark: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Could you take on notice for all the panels how many declarations of interest were made, if they were made during the public consultation process and when they were meeting as panels for each of them, please? I do not know whether it is appropriate to give them against the names, but certainly the expertise they were representing if you cannot give me the names.</p> <p>Ms Barnes: For this information we would have to consult with the chairs of the review, because they are running the process. We will consult with them and see whether they were implementing the guidelines.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: That would be much appreciated. I presume that there was a process, when the people were appointed—and I appreciate that you may not be able to answer this because you have told me already it was the minister and the parliamentary secretary—and I presume those potential conflicts of interest were considered at the time of appointment of the panel members?</p> <p>Ms Barnes: We cannot answer that.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Could you perhaps take on notice the process and the time of appointment for considering the conflict of interest for those appointments? That would be appreciated, thank you.</p>	59 25 May	SQ15-183

19.	Corporate PAID	Urquhart	Intergenerational Report	<p>Senator URQUHART: Did they? That's very good, at this late hour of the night. I guess my question is, was it largely ignored, considering the lack of environmental and climate focus of the IGR?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I think it is very hard for us to answer that. The normal way documents are done within government is that comments go back and forth between departments, and it is really the originating department's responsibility for that material. We provided ongoing comments and had good interaction with Treasury, but it is really up to Treasury.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So you did not get an email back with a gold star or anything like that on it?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We may have.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You may have? Do you want to take that on notice?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I think we have answered that one.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am sure the department gets the public service equivalent of an elephant stamp every time they engage with Treasury.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: An elephant stamp! Good, I would like to see the elephant stamp, I do like elephants. Will the department make its contributions public or can it be tabled to the committee?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We would not normally make that public. That is a document that goes also to cabinet. It is like us showing our input into deliberative material for cabinet. I do not think it is appropriate.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: These are drafting documents, essentially.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I understand that. But are you able to maybe assist the committee with providing some feedback on the type of content that you may have—</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I feel very reluctant to do that. It would be the same as showing as deliberative material goes to cabinet what our views have been in that process. We do not normally show that. That is part of the internal and healthy discussion within government about the drafting of material. That material would have also gone to the cabinet in some process. If you require it, I will take it on notice, but I would rather not take it on notice if you will accept that answer.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I would like you to take it on notice if you can.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I will take it on notice.</p>	98 26 May	SQ15-243
-----	----------------	----------	--------------------------	---	--------------	----------

20.	Outcome 1 Director of National Parks	Singh	Percentage of marine protected areas	<p>Senator SINGH: I am specifically asking about the marine protected areas. Thirty-six per cent of Australia's marine areas are covered by marine protected areas, and so I am specifically asking about those. You have 36 per cent. You have the five marine reserve networks. We all know that the management plans have been revoked from those five marine reserve networks. What I am trying to ascertain is, out of the 36 per cent of marine areas that are covered by marine protected areas, of the five marine reserve networks what amount is made up of that 36 per cent? I am sure you have information there about the five marine reserve networks, because they once had management plans and so I am sure you are aware of the marine protected areas.</p> <p>Ms Barnes: The Commonwealth marine protected area estate comprises 60 reserves in total. It covers over 3.1 million square kilometres. It includes the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and, of course, Heard Island and McDonald Island marine reserves. Then there are the other ones that I manage. I can get you the hectares of the reserves. They are all still in the marine system and they are all protected but they do not have management plans. I can get you a breakdown of the hectares that have management plans across that whole marine protected area estate as a follow-up. I do not have that with me at the moment.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: If you could relate it to the 36 per cent of waters that are within Australia's jurisdiction which now make up the marine protected estate.</p> <p>Ms Barnes: Yes. The 36 per cent of the waters is 100 per cent of the Commonwealth marine reserves.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Yes, but are we clear on what you are taking on notice?</p> <p>Ms Barnes: Yes. I think I know.</p>	64 25 May	SQ15-184
21.	1.1 BCD	Waters	Funding \$2M over 10 years	<p>Senator WATERS: I am certainly not acknowledging that. I would like to know how much of that funding is new since 2013. Maybe Mr Thompson could assist with that if Dr Reichelt does not have that information to hand.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Not off the top of my head. I can take that on notice and come back tomorrow.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I will pursue that, because it does seem a little disingenuous. Of that \$2 billion over the next 10 years about \$500 million is to be spent on marine safety, and clearly that is warranted, but it is not directed at water quality and yet the minister has been marketing that money as first and foremost about improving water quality. Do either Dr Reichelt or Mr Thompson know how much of that \$2 billion is, in fact, going to water quality?</p>	54 25 May	SQ15-180

22.	1.1 BCD	Waters	Water quality in the GBR	<p>Senator WATERS: Hence my question to get some specificity on how much is dedicated to water quality specifically.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I think that would be difficult for us to determine with any great accuracy, because a number of the activities identified there would cross into water quality. Some of the research activities and education activities would cross into water quality as well. There are others, for example, the Queensland Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts, which does water quality report card modelling. That is clearly about water quality. But some of the others would have elements addressing water quality.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So, you are not too sure? Should I come back to that or can you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I can seek to get a more definitive breakdown, but I am managing expectations about how well we will be able to do that.</p>	54 25 May	SQ15-181
23.	1.1 BCD	Heffernan	Green Army - Manpower	<p>Mr Thompson: Manpower has a longstanding presence in Australia as an employment service provider. We contract Manpower and some of the other service providers, including Conservation Volunteers Australia, to establish teams of 10, one team leader and nine participants. So we pay per 10.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN: Yes; but could you give me the details of how much we pay per team, what the competitive process is and who were the tenderers to that process?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Sure. I will take that on notice. We can provide that.</p>	44 26 May	SQ15-216
24.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Community Heritage and Icons Grants	<p>Senator URQUHART: Thank you. Before you start, Mr Sullivan, I just wondered what were the areas and what they were for, but also a list of the groups that have received funding, including how much and for what purpose?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: I will have to take some of the matters on notice. The detail is publicly available in terms of what I am about to say, but I can take the detail on notice. In terms of the Community Heritage and Icons Grants, following on from Mr Oxley, in terms of the lowering the constitutional risk the objective is to support community engagement and raise awareness of places that are listed on Australia's National Heritage List for their outstanding heritage value to the nation. In terms of the scope, there are 103 places on Australia's National Heritage List. The outcomes that the government is looking for are improved community engagement, improved access to these sites, better information about those, and storytelling that goes with that. The Community Heritage and Icon Grants program was open to individuals and communities. The annual appropriation for that is \$467,000. With respect to 2014-</p>	51 26 May	SQ15-218

				<p>15, that is now fully allocated. The first round opened on Friday, 6 February 2015, and applications closed on 20 March 2015. We received 45 applications, which were assessed through a competitive grants process. I understand that you have asked for an outline as to those processes, so I will not go into that as the department has already taken it on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: No, but a list of the areas?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: On 19 May the minister announced 30 successful projects with funding totalling \$283,425. What I do not have is the list of all of those 30 projects, so I will take that on notice. Additional funding was made under the Community Heritage and Icons Grant as well with \$50,000 being provided to the Australian Heritage Council, \$80,000 provided to the Federation of Historic Societies, and \$50,000 provided to ICMOS.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So, there was \$467,000 available all-up. Has all of that been spent or committed through that program?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: Just to correct the record, I said it had all been fully allocated. There is currently \$3,575 that is unallocated, and uncontracted for this financial year.</p>		
25.	1.1 BCD	Singh	Reef Trust	<p>Senator SINGH: Isn't the Reef Trust design compromised by its planned utilisation of offset money in contravention of the EPBC offsets policy?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I do not believe we would be doing anything that is in contravention of another area of government, but if there are any issues in that regard we will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Is that it? Is that the answer?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I have taken it on notice.</p>	108 26 May	SQ15-245
26.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Landcare Program	<p>Senator URQUHART: Mr Sullivan, I am sorry to keep butting in. You are answering some of my questions. The small-scale average and the large-scale project average—you said 6.7—</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: Million trees.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What is the small-scale average and the large-scale average?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: In terms of average of costs? I will get back to that, Senator.</p>	109 26 May	SQ15-246
27.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army – public liability insurance	<p>Senator URQUHART: It will not be revised down. So what is the department's total spend to date on personal accident and public liability insurance for the Green Army?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: We will have to take that on notice. I do not have that level of detail.</p>	111 26 May	SQ15-247

				<p>Senator URQUHART: Maybe you could also take on notice how much the insurance costs per participant and what the forecast spend is for insurance up to and including the 2018-19 year?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: Certainly, we can take that on notice.</p>		
28.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army – successful applicants	<p>Senator URQUHART: What is the ratio of successful applicants, at the scale of shire council or larger, over the past rounds as opposed to local Landcare groups or similar? I know that initially there were very few local community groups that were successful, so what is the level of successful applicants now?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: In terms of round 1 and round 2?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Over the past rounds—yes.</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: Unless Ms Pidcock has a breakdown of the types of organisations that have been funded under those two rounds, I do not have those figures with me. I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Could you take that on notice? And if Ms Pidcock has a copy of that, could we have a copy of the groups?</p>	111 26 May	SQ15-248
29.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army - projects	<p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to break that down further as to how many participants there are, where they are engaged and how they relate to the projects that Ms Pidcock spoke about?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: We will have to take that on notice to get you the detail about the number of participants.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That is fine, if you can provide that.</p> <p>Ms Pidcock: It is a rough average of between eight and nine participants per project.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, but if you are able to break that down I am happy for you to take that on notice. I would also like an indication of how many participants have achieved certificate qualifications. That was also taken on notice earlier this month, so I am not sure whether you are still working through that one.</p>	112 26 May	SQ15-249
30.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army	<p>Senator URQUHART: There is also another one that was taken on notice and that was how many participants are continuing from round 1 into round 2, which you have already got on notice. I am assuming that will be part of that package?</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I am also happy for you to take this on notice, but this was also taken earlier this month: details of the nature of the training that participants are undertaking in their training plans and perhaps some case studies. It links into that competencies stuff.</p>	113 26 May	SQ15-250

				Mr Sullivan: Can I suggest that trying to put that together for an overall picture for over 13,000 people, and it will be more than that now, will be really difficult but perhaps a couple of case studies will give you an outline.		
31.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – List of species working on	Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide us with a list of the species you are focusing on? Mr Andrews: Yes, I can give you a list. Senator URQUHART: I am just conscious of time. Mr Andrews: I need to be clear, though: I have focused more on the threats than on the species. By tackling the threat of feral cats, for example, I can assist multiple species. So the threats are the way to go to get the maximum return.	118 26 May	SQ15-402
32.	1.1 BCD	Rice	Letter re leadbeaters possum letter	Senator RICE: Do you know of briefings or correspondence between Zoos Victoria and VicForests about Leadbeater's possum? Mr Andrews: Yes, Zoos Victoria gave me a copy of a letter that the CEO of Zoos Victoria wrote to the acting CEO of VicForests. Senator RICE: Can you tell me what was in the correspondence? Mr Andrews: I am not sure whether it is appropriate for me to reveal third-party advice. Senator RICE: Perhaps in general. Mr Sullivan: I think, just as a general principle, if that were, for example, a freedom of information request, we would have to seek approval of the third party even if it were in our gift or we were sent a copy of that letter. I think it is unfair to Mr Andrews, who is continuing to operate in good faith where he is given access to a whole range of information, to then ask him to talk about the content of that correspondence, which is between Zoos Victoria and VicForests. Senator RICE: Certainly. It seems to be of relevance, though, in terms of his role in advising on the conservation of Leadbeater's possum. Does the information from Zoos Victoria concern the impact of logging activities by VicForests on Leadbeater's possum? Dr de Brouwer: I think that is straying into the subject matter of the letter. Senator WATERS: Can we not ask about that? Is this not estimates? Dr de Brouwer: It is someone else's correspondence. It is not our correspondence or someone corresponding with us. Senator RICE: But it was correspondence that was given to the commissioner in his role as the Threatened Species Commissioner for critically endangered species.	119 26 May	SQ15-403

				<p>Senator Birmingham: But not necessarily given to the commissioner to reveal the contents to the whole world.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can we seek some advice on whether we can ask that?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We can take it on notice, but I think Mr Sullivan's point is correct. If the request was done as a FOI request, the law would require us to ask permission.</p>		
33.	1.1 BCD	Rice	20 Million Trees – tree planting	<p>Senator RICE: Does your tree planting—your assessment of their likelihood of survival—take into account soil health? I am told there is observed decline and premature death of normally long-lived trees in urban areas.</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: I would have to take that on notice in terms of the absolute inner-urban proposals. Let me take that on notice.</p>	123 26 May	SQ15-255
34.	1.1 BCD	Waters	NRS Properties in Western Australia	<p>Senator WATERS: Great. Can you provide on notice if they specifically discuss the interaction between those two plans. I want to move to some NRS properties in Western Australia. Can you give me the number and the names of the NRS acquisition projects that have been completed in WA but have not yet been formally gazetted as a protected area?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I do not have that detail here, but we can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I am interested in whether the provision of CfoC or NHT funding to acquire those properties to include them on the NRS had as a condition the requirement to covenant them or otherwise protect them. My understanding is that they normally do. Can you take on notice whether the contracts for the properties that have not yet been gazetted have that clause and, if so, why it has not been complied with?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: We can take that on notice. Most of the contracts would have some caveat, as you indicated.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: That will take some time because those contracts go back to 2000 and 2001. Was that question with respect to Western Australia?</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, just WA. I am particularly interested in projects that are occurring on pastoral leases. My understanding is that many of those leases are due to expire.</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: I have a lead in to that, but it will not overcome the need for the question on notice. There is an active process within the Western Australian government that has been going for some time with respect to the transfer of</p>	124 26 May	SQ15-256

				properties purchased that were covered under the Pastoral Act of Western Australia in terms of re-gazetting those. There is an independent board that needs to give its approval to change the primary land use from pastoral activities to conservation as the primary purpose.		
35.	1.1 BCD	Waters	Water quality under Reef 2050	Ms Parry: They are based on modelling; that is correct. Senator WATERS: Have there been any changes to the modelling assumptions in recent times? Ms Parry: I would have to take that question on notice.	125 26 May	SQ15-257
36.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Australian Biodiversity Conservation Strategy	What is the main theme of the updates to the Australian Biodiversity Conservation Strategy? What areas will be, or are being, focused upon?	Written	SQ15-285
37.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Program Funding - National Landcare Program, 20 Million Trees and Green Army	In terms of the total funding of the National Landcare Program, 20 Million Trees and the Green Army, how much of that is being directed toward recovery actions for commonwealth listed species and ecosystems and other protected matters? How much of that total funding is being directed toward enduring change in land management arrangements as opposed to temporary contracts?	Written	SQ15-291
38.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Landcare Program – reduced funding	Landcare is a proven and popular method of community engagement and action resulting in environmental restoration. Given Landcare is a key plank in the government’s long term approach to land management, why has its funding been reduced in successive budgets?	Written	SQ15-293
39.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Landcare Program – contractual or management practices	How have contractual or management practices changed as the new consolidated program has been rolled out?	Written	SQ15-295
40.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Landcare Program – grant programs	Are there any grants rounds open under the National Landcare Program? If so, what are these? How many more landcare grant rounds will there be over the forward estimates?	Written	SQ15-297

				This question was asked in QON4 from March but was not answered accurately.		
41.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Australian Biodiversity Conservation Strategy – research information	I note the growing and various amount of climate change information and scenarios that have been developed across Government and in Research - how has this information been incorporated into the National Reserve Strategy and Australian Biodiversity Conservation Strategy? In particular, how are the well-understood changes that will occur in reserves and the biodiversity space generally being addressed to ensure these values are maintained in an appropriate way?	Written	SQ15-299
42.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Reef Trust	Has the Department finished its arrangements to provide potential investors with the opportunity and transparency to support donations?	Written	SQ15-303
43.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Reef Trust - offsets	Do you have any staff in the Department who have been tasked to frame any offsets that have or will be been paid into the Trust as evidence of the effectiveness of the Government's management of the Reef to the World Heritage Committee?	Written	SQ15-305
44.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Reef Trust – initiatives Trust Funds are being used for	Can you tell me what initiatives, including those in the Turtle and Dugong Plan, Trust Funds are being used for?	Written	SQ15-306
45.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Reef Trust - Wet Tropics Tender	Can you provide updates on the Reef Trust Wet Topics tender and the Grazing Project?	Written	SQ15-307
46.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army – projects fund through rounds	Can you run us through the kinds of projects that have been funded through the Green Army Rounds to date and give an update on where these are at in terms of development? When are we likely to see a comprehensive report or audit of the outcomes and outputs of these projects?	Written	SQ15-294

47.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Green Army – threatened species	How many projects that have been funded primarily promise specific outcomes for threatened species, rather than merely reference threatened species as indirectly benefiting from a given project?	Written	SQ15-298
48.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	20 Million Trees	How many trees have been established by the program to date? Where are the main plantings, and of what species of tree? Have any of these projects been adequately fenced? Was a consultation process undertaken with community and practitioner stakeholders on the need for fencing? If not, why not? Has fencing been made a co-investment component of the small-grants program? If not, why not? If none, what protections are there for these trees and nascent wildlife corridors, and the wildlife within them?	Written	SQ15-302
49.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner	Are you also able to clarify how you will ensure that funding for species recovery is allocated to priority activities identified in threatened species or ecological community recovery plans?	Written	SQ15-309
50.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – Summit in July 2015	The Minister has said you will chair will hold a one-day National Threatened Species and Feral Animals Summit at Melbourne Zoo in July this year. How are preparations proceeding for this event? Can you walk us through what the summit focus will be? How much will it cost and who will be invited? Has the agenda been determined yet? If so, can you summarise it?	Written	SQ15-308
51.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – feral cat problem	What success have you had so far in tackling the feral cat problem?	Written	SQ15-310
52.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner - trajectories	Do you have an inkling for which threatened species are the most likely to see their trajectories improve to 2020, per the Minister's hopes?	Written	SQ15-311

53.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – highest priority actions	What are the highest priority actions you have identified to secure those species in the wild for at least 100 years? What stakeholders have you been working with to identify those actions?	Written	SQ15-312
54.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – research priorities	What are the research priorities for the Threatened Species National Environmental Science Programme hub? What work will it be undertaking to contribute to threat identification and cost-effective responses?	Written	SQ15-313
55.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner - summit	What stakeholders apart from states and territories are being consulted during preparations for the Threatened Species Summit? Why? What outcomes are you hoping for from this summit?	Written	SQ15-315
56.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner – feral cat problem	You have written in your report that you will coordinate resources from the National Landcare Program and the Green Army to tackle the feral cat problem. How is that coordination process going?	Written	SQ15-316
57.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	Threatened Species Commissioner -	In your report you mention the Government's goal of ending mammal extinctions by 2020. While this is laudable, can you tell me – the Bramble Cay Melomys and the two Christmas Island species aside – when was the last mammalian extinction on the Australian mainland?	Written	SQ15-317
58.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	What steps, if any, are being undertaken by the Commonwealth to ensure adequate levels of protection for freshwater ecosystems are incorporated into the NRS? If none, what alternative programs are in place to achieve this protection?	Written	SQ15-318
59.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	Is there any more funding for Indigenous Protected Areas? Are there any areas currently being considered and consulted about with respect to dedicating them as IPAs? If yes, where are they, where are you up to in the three to four year consultation process, and who are you consulting with? How will the Department ensure the increase in land managed, if any, is managed effectively in line with Australia's international obligations and to reduce threats?	Written	SQ15-320

60.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System – terrestrial land	In relation to QON 19 where the Department states that Australia has already met its target of 17% of terrestrial land protected by 2020 - is it the Government's contention that area alone equals effective conservation?	Written	SQ15-321
61.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	What elements, other than area, are required to effectively conserve terrestrial bioregions? How much of that area is ecologically representative?	Written	SQ15-322
62.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	Australia's strategy for the NRS sets a number of specific targets. Two of these on page 4 are to protect 'examples of at least 80% of all regional ecosystems in each bioregion by 2015' and 'each subregion' by 2015. What is the Department's method for identifying regional ecosystems and measuring targets has been developed, and if so, what is the progress on those targets?	Written	SQ15-323
63.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	Can you please provide information on how the strategy priorities of protecting core areas for the long term survival of threatened ecosystems and species in each of Australia's bioregions by 2030 and identifying and protecting critical areas for climate change resilience and landscape protection are being identified, and what steps are being taken to ensure this part of the NRS Strategy is met? I just want to get some clarification because it seems to me that this assertion doesn't meet CAR principles (Comprehensive, Adequate and Representative – like WWF's "Building Nature's Safety Net report). We still have under-represented bioregions, we still have poorly connected landscapes, which are essential elements of Aichi Target 11 – yet the Department asserts that we have met this target? If the government doesn't accept WWF's analysis, how does the Government measure the ecological representativeness of the national reserve system and what threshold has it set for the system to be considered ecologically representative?	Written	SQ15-324
64.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	Does the Government accept that a reserve system in which so many ecosystems and species remain unprotected cannot be considered ecologically representative no matter if its 17% of land area? If the Government has no funding for acquisition of land for new protected areas, how will it be possible for the government to ensure that the reserve system is	Written	SQ15-325

				ecologically representative as committed to by Australia under the Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi target 11?		
65.	1.1 BCD	Urquhart	National Reserve System	Can the Department outline any reviews that are being planned or undertaken of the National Reserve System or the National Reserve System Strategy? If yes, can you outline the details of this review process - what is the scope, timelines and so on? Do you anticipate this review being made public? Or seeking public input into the review?	Written	SQ15-326
66.	1.2 Science	Waters	Funding and Staffing – environmental information	Senator WATERS: I was going to ask how much funding and staff time is allocated to consolidating environmental information on a continental scale particularly about biodiversity. Would you consider that you could describe the work that you have outlined as consolidating that information? Ms Olsson: I would probably have to take that on notice. We have a number of staff involved in all of the databases that were referred to before We have staff involved in the essential measures program and in SoE, but it would be not possible for me, off the top of my head, to come up with a figure for you.	12 26 May	SQ15-207
67.	1.2 Science	Waters	Review by Morton and Tinney in 2012	Senator WATERS: I will think on that and come back to you with some more specific questions. There was an external review of our environmental information gathering in 2012 by Morton and Tinney. Can you tell me whether any actions were taken as a result of that review? Dr Wright: I would need to take that question on notice.	13 26 May	SQ15-208
68.	1.2 Science	Urquhart	Research priorities	Senator URQUHART: You do not have the fully established work programs for those yet? Ms Olsson: No. We literally have them in the department assessing them, but they have not been agreed or finalised yet. Senator URQUHART: Are you able to say what the research priorities are? Ms Olsson: The priorities for each area that were discussed comprise quite a long list. They are not publicly available at the moment, but we could provide information on them on notice.	21 26 May	SQ15-209
69.	1.2 Science	Urquhart	Research priorities	Ms Olsson: We have a set of research priorities which have been formalised, which I do not have in front of me, but the research plan that goes to those is still under consideration. Dr Wright: All the hubs are operating on the same schedule for the initial plans and	21 26 May	SQ15-210

				<p>then the substantive plans in October; so each hub is operating on the same time frame. There is a high level description of the expected nature of research for each hub in the guidelines which are in the public domain. We would be happy to provide them to you.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay—if you could provide them and maybe the priorities. Are you saying that it is October before they are finalised?</p>		
70.	1.2 Science	Urquhart	Funding variation for program support	<p>Senator URQUHART: Right, but that does not explain the figure under here for the program support through the forward estimates. Can you explain that to me?</p> <p>Dr Wright: Not the program support. We were referring to the NRM for climate change line, which is 1.2—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The top one.</p> <p>Dr Wright: We have a component of that, and a component is with another program.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: It seems that we cannot answer the question.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you can take it on notice, that is fine.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We will take it on notice. I will add, though, that with the climate change adaptation there are lots of other areas of activity in the department that cover adaptation. You already have the National Environmental Science Program material. Earth sciences is one of the core areas, but certainly the marine, air and tropical water is also clearly climate change adaptation. Also, in the Antarctic program there are some very core bits of research being done on the impact of acidification on krill or other exoskeletal creatures and ecosystems that are important for understanding the environment and fisheries in the longer term. So there is a variety of work being done in the department around adaptation beyond these.</p>	94 26 May	SQ15-239
71.	1.2 Science	Urquhart	CSIRO and BoM information	<p>Dr Wright: There are two components to this initiative. The first one was the one my colleague referred to earlier—the development of regional reports on climate change for NRM regions that were published in January and then followed with a website that was released on 8 April. The website provides very sophisticated modelling and planning tools. The website is provided by CSIRO. It was a \$5.1 million project. The NRM regions were all engaged in the development and delivery of the tools so that they were fit for their specific purposes. They facilitated the testing of the website before it went live. They now have at their fingertips the capability to look, on a regional basis and for different scenarios they can choose, at</p>	97 26 May	SQ15-242

				<p>what the impacts will be—to help them make their own decisions. There is a second component which is not yet completed. It is nine individual projects to assist NRM regions with the actual planning. That is still ongoing. But the biggest part was the development of this modelling tool and the individual reports which are all available on the CSIRO website. We can provide the link to that.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That is fantastic. The modelling and planning—is there a time frame on that?</p> <p>Dr Wright: I do not have that information with me.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to find that out?</p> <p>Dr Wright: Yes, I will take it on notice.</p>		
72.	1.4 WHM	Singh	International whale science initiative research programs and outcomes	<p>Senator SINGH: Could I ask on notice for a list of those research programs out of that grants program? If no decision has been made, and obviously 30 June is only a month away, does the department have any idea about when a decision might be imminent about the future of a replacement program? (page 16)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator Singh, as officials have advised, there are core operations within the Antarctic Division that are funded on an ongoing basis and they are the people providing that international presence and undertaking research. With the National Environmental Science Program, one of its hubs is a marine hub. You would expect scientists may seek to access funding for whale-related research under that marine hub, and of course there are other competitive research grants that are widely accessed by scientists across its sphere of activities.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: You have partly answered my next question, but just to go back: I do not think I asked you, Ms Schweizer, whether you can take on notice a list of the international whale science initiative research programs and outcomes. Finally, I was going to ask what other research projects the department has in an ongoing respect to do with cetaceans?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: The Australian Antarctic Division, which is part of the department, has ongoing research programs which are relevant to the Southern Ocean and whales and cetaceans in that context. That will continue as part of its research program. (page 17)</p>	16 and 17 26 May	SQ15-396

73.	1.4 EACD	Waters	Melville Island	<p>Senator WATERS: The Northern Territory government had not informed you that that was now a new activity being undertaken on the site?</p> <p>Mr Gaddes: I would have to take that one on notice. It starts to get quite detailed.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank is why we are in estimates.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The question is taken on notice.</p>	30 26 May	SQ15-211
74.	1.4 EACD	Waters	Risk associated with compliance matters	<p>Mr Knudson: I assume you are talking about the system that we have developed for assessing risk associated with compliance matters. We are in the process of taking a look at how do we use, again as guidance, our analytical tools to better indicate what sort of level of effort we need to put behind various assessments. Because that work is not finished that is not in the public domain at this point. That being said, Mr Gaddes can talk a little bit about some of the work that CSIRO have done in this space. They have done a research paper on this system, and that is in the public domain.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: In the interests of time and everybody's patience, I am interested in that, but if you could give me that on notice, I will read it when it comes through. Before we leave this area, if you have gone down that pathway of not attaching additional conditions, as the policy recommends but does not oblige, what level of involvement does the Commonwealth then have in the enforcement of those conditions? I would think none; is that correct?</p>	32 26 May	SQ15-212
75.	1.4 EACD	Siewert	Western Australian sharks	<p>Dr Banks: Around the time that the exemption was issued in October, in relation to an incident in Esperance, we had subsequent discussions with Western Australian government officials after that. I do not have the precise dates in front of me.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Could you take it on notice and provide me with the dates of those discussions?</p> <p>Dr Banks: Sure.</p>	35 26 May	SQ15-213
76.	1.4 EACD	Ludlam	Development approvals	<p>Senator LUDLAM: We are in perfect agreement with that. Under section 136(1)(b) of the act the minister has to consider economic and social matters. Do you have access to the business case? Nobody else does. Has that been made available to you in the course of your assessment process thus far?</p> <p>Dr Banks: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you check for us?</p> <p>Dr Banks: Sure.</p>	37 26 May	SQ15-214
77.	1.4 EACD	Urquhart	Water trigger	<p>ACTING CHAIR: So 1.4. Okay. I have a few questions on that, so I will move them to 1.4. The next one I have is on coal seam gas, the regulatory assessment matters and the water trigger. I know it is linked to 4.1, but I think it fits here. Can you update</p>	41 26 May	SQ15-215

				<p>us on how many approvals under the water trigger are currently in train?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We do not have the statistics on the current number of projects. I assume what you are asking is: which projects that had the water trigger applied have been approved, and which projects that have had the water trigger applied are currently under assessment? We can get that for you in answer to a question on notice.</p>		
78.	1.4 EACD	Waters	Coal seam gas condition that the Commonwealth has imposed	<p>Dr de Brouwer: The third part is where we would like to do more, especially in the future. The general approach to this in Australia—and globally—is to take a principles-based adaptive management approach to economic development that maintains and protects environment. It is principles-based. For us that is the ecologically sustainable development principles and the precautionary principle, from our legislation. But it is adaptive management. What does 'adaptive management' mean? It means that based on an assessment of risk there is a sequential conditioning in approvals as required. That draws on knowledge or on further work that is required to satisfy various conditions in the development. So it is a progressive conditioning that is monitored and adapted and changed as new information comes to light. But it is again through a risk-based framework: you don't take unacceptable risks, but you take risks that you judge to be acceptable along various stages. You condition along that frame.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: On that, with your progressive conditioning has there been a change to any coal seam gas condition that the Commonwealth has imposed?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: That one I will have to come back to, or take on notice. I am just trying to explain what is on the website.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I understand.</p>	42 26 May	SQ15-
79.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	National Trusts Partnership and Community Heritage and Icons Grants program	<p>Senator URQUHART: Based on that active process, what would be your best guess about the timeframe? You have obviously ticked a lot of the boxes, and the questions have now been asked. It is back in the final sort of version, if I can use that term. What would be your expectations as to the length of time from here on?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: As Mr Oxley indicated, there has not been a completion as yet of the whole-of-government clearance process. We cannot be definitive about that.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Would we be looking at weeks or months?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I cannot be drawn on it, sorry, because I cannot be any more specific than that. As you know, ultimately it is a matter for the minister about when he wants to release it.</p>	50 26 May	SQ15-217

				<p>Senator URQUHART: Can I ask you to take that on notice and see if you can get an answer for us?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Yes.</p>		
80.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	National Heritage List	<p>Senator URQUHART: He did not refer to buildings; it was Budj Bim, another name. How many properties or areas have been entered on the National Heritage List since the last budget?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Since the last budget? I will try and get the answer to that before we wrap up. Certainly Broken Hill; there may have been one other. I am just not quite sure.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: There was nothing since Broken Hill.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Moree Baths?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Moree Baths was just before Broken Hill.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: There was the Murtoa No. 1 Grain Shed, but I am just struggling to remember whether that was since the last budget.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you could clarify that it would be good.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, I will.</p>	53 26 May	SQ15-219
81.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	World Heritage Committee meetings	<p>Mr Oxley: I am just trying to find it now so that we can provide that answer immediately. Minister Hunt has met with his ministerial counterparts or alternatives from 15 countries—Croatia, Serbia, Germany, the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Portugal, Finland, Poland, Jamaica, Columbia, Peru, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and India.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How many times has he met with them?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I cannot definitively answer that for you now. I believe only once. If I am wrong on that, we will come back on notice and provide that additional information.</p>	54 26 May	SQ15-220
82.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Australian Heritage Council	<p>Senator URQUHART: I have one final question in this group. What was the total funding and extent of resources allocated to the Australian Heritage Council for the 2014-15 financial year?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: If I may, I will take that one on notice. I do not think we will have it covered in any of our briefing notes. There are probably two components that I will identify. The first component is actually the salaries/wages or however one might describe it, the remuneration, for the Heritage Council members themselves and then the second component is the resources of Heritage branch that are used to support the work of the Heritage Council. For example, all the substantive work around the assessment of proposals that have been included on the final priority assessment list for national heritage assessment, and in the same list the Commonwealth heritage basis, is undertaken by the staff of the department working</p>	55 26 May	SQ15-398

				<p>to the members of the council. We do a lot of the grunt work and then they add the value and test the veracity of our assessment and together they polish it up, finalise it and then it is presented to the Heritage Council. A large part of the resources of Heritage branch, in one way or another, is directed towards supporting the activities of the council. It may be difficult for us to specifically quantify it for that reason.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: The Heritage Council receives \$50,000 per year over three years and the program is used for research into potential listings and nominations of places such as thematic studies.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you can search for further information that would be great.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Just for completeness, Mr Oxley went through a very long list of different organisations and bodies that were part of the consultation engagement. Fishers and the natural resource management regional bodies were also part of that list. As Mr Oxley said, a lot of the work now is actually designing the governance around some of those stakeholder engagements as follow-up to the 2050 long-term sustainability plan. We will be doing that very closely with Queensland.</p>		
83.	1.4 WHM	McGrath	Pandas at Adelaide Zoo	<p>Senator Birmingham: I can say that the Adelaide Zoo has ambitions, as yet unrealised ambitions, in relation to the breeding program with Wang Wang and Funi. My information is largely from media reports in Adelaide. I understand that they have received assistance from Chinese experts in that regard but the engagements between Wang Wang and Funi have as yet not realised a baby panda, sadly. We shall all hope.</p> <p>Senator McGRATH: I shall wait for reports at further estimates.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am sure that now that fertility has been raised in Senate estimates it will provide greater impetus for the arrival of a said baby panda. I am not sure of the arrangements in terms of whether it returns to China. I do not imagine that it would be returned to the wild, which would be my guess. I know that the two adult pandas are here for a fixed term originally. And what would happen with any offspring as to whether it stayed in Australia or was repatriated when they were repatriated we might have to take on notice.</p>	62 26 May	SQ15-399
84.	1.4 WHM	Siewert	Sharks MoU	<p>Mr Oxley: I think it would be fair to say that we had a very good appreciation of the views of all of the stakeholder interests and, when considering the ramification of listing these species on the EPBC Act, when essentially the consequence of listing is a level of protection that goes beyond what is actually required under the Convention on Migratory Species, Appendix 2, which is where they were listed, and bearing in mind the difficulties that were had a few years earlier in relation to the listing of mako sharks, the decision was taken to enter a reservation. It was a</p>	67 26 May	SQ15-224

				<p>decision taken on the advice of the department.</p> <p>That reservation, however, does not in any way diminish the commitment to the conservation of the species. It recognises that the way that the EPBC Act operates, there is a very significant penalty on anybody who interacts with those species, even though their conservation status is arguably not at question when Appendix 2 requires states to cooperate together through the conservation of those species. So while reservations have been taken out, Australia will continue to actively engage in activities to support the conservation of those species, including through our support for the memorandum of understanding on conservation of sharks under the convention itself.</p> <p>We are actively involved, we have been a contributor of funding in the past and we will monitor the proponents of the sharks' MOU. We will stay actively engaged and we are seeking to have these species incorporated under the MOU so that there is a focused conservation effort put in place in relation to those species.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I have been told I have run out of time. Could I just ask if you could send that?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, we will.</p>		
85.	1.4 WHM	Rhiannon	World Heritage Listing for Royal National Park	<p>Mr Oxley: Yes, it must be on the tentative list for 12 months before it can be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List. Obviously, the process that is being run by New South Wales did not result in all of the evidence necessary to support a nomination being collated in the time frame that would have allowed submission for the tentative list this year. I am very confident New South Wales is working hard to bring forward a tentative listing proposal for consideration in the next cycle.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: So, when you said it has been 'very active', we are talking over 18 months. What were you basing the words 'very active' on? What has happened?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Perhaps it has been a bit generous with language. I do know that they have been undertaking analysis assessment to look at the values of the place, and one of the things that needs to be done is a comparative assessment to identify the value of the place relative to equivalent places throughout the world. That is the sort of work that is being undertaken by New South Wales.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Could you take it on notice to provide details of what the analysis and what the comparative assessment are? Do you have information on that?</p>	67 26 May	SQ15-225

				Mr Oxley: Yes.		
86.	1.4 WHM	Rhiannon	Dolphins	<p>Senator RHIANNON: So, are you saying that all of those dolphins that have come to Australia—and we have had more than those two oceanariums or marine mammal parks since, I think you said, the 1970s. Are you confident that all of those mammals have been sourced locally?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: I have not checked that. I have just checked the imports from Japan. I will have to take it on notice and we would have to do some inquiries in the database to see if there has been any other imports of dolphins from other countries.</p>	69 26 May	SQ15-400
87.	1.4 WHM	Rhiannon	Dolphins	<p>Mr Oxley: Just in terms of the question about how the system works, whether we are able to track the provenance, so to speak, of the animal that comes into Australia, to the extent that we have an answer to that question we will come back to you on notice with an explanation of how that system works.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: How the system works?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: It was also specifically about your database. If you have marine mammals coming from China or any other country, do you know where it was imported from before it went into that country? Surely, that is what we need to be clear on.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, we will come back and answer that question.</p>	69 26 May	SQ15-226
88.	1.4 WHM	Rhiannon	Mammals	<p>Senator RHIANNON: I understand rescued terrestrial wildlife must generally be returned back to the wild under soft release conditions if they have been in quite long-term care. Are rescued dolphins at Sea World protected by the requirement that they will be rehabilitated back into their natural environment?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: You are in a line of inquiry that I do not think we are able to answer at the table. If we may, we will take that on notice.</p>	69 26 May	SQ15-227
89.	1.4 WHM	Ludlam	Representatives at meetings re heritage listings	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Is the state government ever present at those? Do they have a representative?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: The state government does come to those meetings. They are actually held up at the Burrup. There are other meetings held in Canberra and by teleconference which, generally, the state government does not attend. They do attend the annual planning meetings.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Time is a little short; I think I have only got 10 minutes or so. Could you provide for us on notice the make-up of those meetings? What is their</p>	70 26 May	SQ15-229

				<p>standing? Who is the secretary? How they are convened? What is the membership of those meetings and how frequent are they?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I would really appreciate that. I am particularly interested to know in what capacity the state government participates. Is it your understanding that the Burrup—we are talking of the entire precinct, the Dampier Archipelago and the area under National Heritage Listing—has never had a full heritage survey?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: It was certainly assessed for National Heritage Listing back before its inscription.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand that.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: I am not aware of what other assessment has been done.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you check for us?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Sure.</p>		
90.	1.4 WHM	Ludlam	Burrup – National Heritage listing	<p>Mr Johnston: We have been in touch with Western Australian officials to get some background information. This is principally because the chair of our Heritage Council sought some information from us. Acting as secretariat to the Heritage Council, we were in discussions with them the week before last.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you please provide us with that correspondence on notice?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Are you undertaking to provide it or are you undertaking to check to see if you will be able to provide it? I just want to be clear.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Both. So, we will check that we can provide it and if we can provide it we will provide it.</p>	71 26 May	SQ15-230
91.	1.4 WHM	Ludlam	Emergency heritage listing	<p>Senator LUDLAM: That is very useful. Can you just identify for us whether any single action by anybody at all was undertaken as a result of that emergency assessment report completed nearly four years ago, Commonwealth or state? Can you identify a single person who lifted a single finger in consequence of those recommendations in that report? You have identified that you do not have that at the table.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, so we will take that one on notice.</p>	71 26 May	SQ15-231

92.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Leadbeater's possum draft recovery plan	<p>Senator RICE: Moving on to the Leadbeater's possum draft recovery plan, given the results of those reports and the Bayesian network model saying that the creation of the Great Forest National Park was the most effective action, what plan does the department have to restore the Leadbeater's possum recovery plan's activity, effectiveness and credibility?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: That is not actually my responsibility; it is the Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division's responsibility. So I feel like I should let them answer that question.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: That program area is 1.4, and the officers appeared earlier today. In relation to recovery planning, that is, as Mr Andrews indicated, the responsibility of the Wildlife, Heritage and Marine division. We would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay, take that on notice.</p>	119 26 May	SQ15-251
93.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Spot tailed quoll – recovery plan	<p>Senator RICE: I also note that they no longer log their native forests—but that is another point. Moving on to another species but still staying in Far East Gippsland, can you please tell us what stage the recovery plan is at for the spot tailed quoll?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: I will need to take that on notice. It would be the wildlife and marine division that would respond to that.</p>	122 26 May	SQ15-252
94.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Swift Parrots	<p>Senator RICE: Also, what resources has the federal government committed for its recovery? Moving on to swift parrots, these questions may be more for the department rather than the Threatened Species Commissioner but I am not sure—I am still confused about where the roles overlap. We have an issue of sugar glider predation of swift parrots. Has consideration been given to incorporating the recent body of scientific work demonstrating the impacts of sugar glider predation and the direct and indirect impacts of logging on the swift parrot into the swift parrot national recovery plan?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: It can because it is a recovery planning question. Program 1.4 is the right program to ask those questions because that is the part of the department that does the recovery planning activity. There are no officers at the table who I think can answer that, so I think we will have to take that on notice.</p>	122 26 May	SQ15-253
95.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List	How many threatened species lists are there in Australia at the moment?	Written	SQ15-274

96.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – common assessment method	How will a common assessment method for threatened species, and a single operational list of threatened species in each jurisdiction, improve outcomes for Australian threatened species?	Written	SQ15-275
97.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – agreements for common assessment methods	What obstacles exist, if any, to putting agreements in place for a common assessment method for threatened species, and a single operational list of threatened species in each jurisdiction? What is the Department's hopeful timeframe for those agreements and ultimately, lists?	Written	SQ15-276
98.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – lists maintained by the Department	How current and comprehensive are the lists of threatened species maintained by the Department at the moment? Does each threatened species listed have a recovery plan or similar at the moment?	Written	SQ15-277
99.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – statutory deadlines	What is the statutory deadline to assess species and ecological communities for inclusion or removal from national threatened lists?	Written	SQ15-278
100.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – time for assessments	What is the Department's current average time for assessment? What resources does the Department need to improve this result?	Written	SQ15-279
101.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species List – removal of species from national threatened lists	How many species have been removed from the national threatened lists during the term of this Government? How many species have been included on the lists?	Written	SQ15-280

102.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened species management plans – (review)	In a best-practice sense, how often does a threatened species management plan need to be reviewed to gauge its effectiveness? How much does the average review cost?	Written	SQ15-281
103.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened species management plans – average time to undertaken review	What is the current average length of time for the Department to undertake such reviews? Without timely reviews what is the utility of such plans?	Written	SQ15-282
104.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	International obligations – Japanese whaling program	1. I want to talk about our international obligations briefly, noting that the IWC Scientific Committee meeting is currently underway in the US [as of late-May]. How many ministerial representations have been made by the Government to Japan about its plan to resume Southern Ocean whaling? 2. How many Ministerial meetings have there been? 3. Which Ministers have met with the Japanese Government and have raised this issue, on how many occasions and at what forums?	Written	SQ15-286
105.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Species Profile and Threats (SPRAT) Database	1. What is the current average monthly unique page views of the Species Profile and Threats database (SPRAT)? Why does the Department consider this number a key deliverable? 2. What is the monthly page views trend? How can the Department increase this number?	Written	SQ15-296
106.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Christmas Island Biodiversity Plan – rejection of draft plan	According to QON48 from Additional Estimates, the community of Christmas Island essentially rejected the draft Christmas Island Biodiversity plan en masse due to concerns about the economic and social impacts of the plan. Does the Department feel those concerns are valid and reasonable? What are the expected economic and social impacts in question? Did the Department take those concerns into account when preparing a revised draft plan for the Threatened Species Scientific Committee?	Written	SQ15-283
107.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Christmas Island Biodiversity Plan – stakeholder	How has the Government engaged with key stakeholders to discuss these areas of concerns and review the draft plan? Which stakeholders has it met, and when?	Written	SQ15-284

			engagement			
108.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Christmas Island Biodiversity Plan – amendments to draft plan	Was the Department able to identify any possible amendments to the draft plan that could be made? Have those amendments been made, and if so, what effect will they have on the effectiveness and ambitious scale of the draft plan?	Written	SQ15-287
109.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Christmas Island Biodiversity Plan – consideration of draft plan by TSSC	Did the Threatened Species Scientific Committee consider the new plan in early-2015, as expected? If not, what has been the delay? What were the recommendations of the Committee?	Written	SQ15-288
110.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Christmas Island Biodiversity Plan – delay	The plan was intended to be finalised for consideration for the Minister by mid-2015. Will that deadline be met by the Department? What will a delay mean for the 17 endangered species on Christmas Island, particularly the 5 critically endangered species?	Written	SQ15-289
111.	1.4 WHM	Urquhart	Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Could you please provide information on the Threatened Species Scientific Committee? What I am seeking is membership, budget and expenditure broken down into sitting fees, travel, administrative costs etc. Please provide this for the current financial year and the 2016-17 financial year (budgeted).	Written	SQ15-314
112.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Menindee Lakes project	What is the current status of the Menindee Lakes project? Of the 600 GL you forecast to be achieved through infrastructure, how much did the Menindee Lakes project contribute? When is any water expected to be recovered under this project?	Written	SQ15-337
113.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism by 30 June 2016	Is the Government on track to deliver an agreement with other Basin Governments on the Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism by 30 June 2016? What are the current and emerging risks to that process at the moment?	Written	SQ15-338

114.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative	Has the Department been exploring any mechanism for increasing private investment in the Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative, as was intimated by the Deputy Prime Minister last year? If so, has there been any success or interest from potential private investors? Who has shown interest and to what extent?	Written	SQ15-339
115.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Domestic water saving	What methodology will the Department be using to measure its success at achieving a domestic water saving of at least 100,000 megalitres through national water efficiency labelling next financial year?	Written	SQ15-340
116.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Government Response to the Water Act	Can you give us an idea of when the full government response to Water Act will be released yet?	Written	SQ15-342
117.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	National Urban Water and Desalination Plan	Referring to page 88 of the Budget Measures, how is the Government going to achieve the \$1.2 million in savings for the National Urban Water and Desalination Plan? The Forward Estimate spend in last year's budget for the Plan in 2015-16 was \$13,860,000. On page 75 of the PBS that spend has been reduced to \$8,248,000. What is the reason for this significant reduction and why is this seeming cut of around \$5.3million represented as \$1.2million in savings?	Written	SQ15-343
118.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	National Urban Water and Desalination Plan	How was the Plan tracking, and how will the cut affect the delivery of the plan?	Written	SQ15-344
119.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	National Urban Water and Desalination Plan	Can you provide details of the nine projects that have been allocated funding, and how much funding they have each been allocated in total? Why were these projects selected? Were any other projects considered? What were they and how much funding did each need? Why were these projects selected? Were any other projects considered? What were they and how much funding did each need? Will all of those projects be completed with the cessation of funding forecast for the Plan after this year's budget?	Written	SQ15-345

120.	1.4 Water	Urquhart	Increased water reform commitment	With an El Nino cycle on the way and ongoing drought in some areas, the Government is reducing its spending on both the Sustainable Rural Water Use and Infrastructure Program and the National Urban Water and Desalination Plan. Is there any aspect of water reform where the Government has increased its commitment?	Written	SQ15-346
121.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Spot-tailed Quolls – recovery plan	Can you please tell the Committee what stage the Recovery Plan is at for the 'Thylacine of the mainland', the Spot-tailed Quoll?	Written	SQ15-357
122.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Spot-tailed Quolls – resources	What resources are the Federal Government committing to for its recovery?	Written	SQ15-358
123.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Spot-tailed Quolls – delay in recovery plan	Given the extraordinary delay in producing a recovery plan, resulting in at least a decade of inaction on addressing the causal factors responsible for the species ongoing decline, can you tell the committee what immediate funding will be made available to start implementing the 'priority actions' listed in the recovery plan?	Written	SQ15-359
124.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Swift Parrot – National Recovery Plan	1. Has consideration been given to incorporating the recent body of scientific work demonstrating the impacts of Glider predation, and the direct and indirect impacts of logging on the Swift Parrot into the Swift Parrot National Recovery Plan?	Written	SQ15-360
125.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Swift Parrot - reclassifying	Has there been consideration given to reclassifying the Swift parrot to critically endangered due to the new predation threat and lack of progress in responding the threat posed by habitat loss and fragmentation due to logging?	Written	SQ15-361
126.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Swift Parrot – Tasmanian Government	Is the Government in communication with the Tasmanian Government over putting in place measures to address these threats?	Written	SQ15-362
127.	1.4 WHM	Rice	Swift Parrot – Tasmanian RFA framework	Given the likelihood of reclassifying the species as critically endangered and the limitations imposed by the current Regional Forest Agreement and EPBC Act s.38 exemption on the Commonwealth's ability to ensure nationally endangered species are actually protected, is the Minister seeking changes to the Tasmanian RFA framework through the current RFA review process to ensure this species and	Written	SQ15-363

				others can be protected from extinction?		
128.	1.4 WHM	Waters	UNESCO / WHC engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide an update on the total number, duration and destination of all trips taken by Departmental staff, and the Minister which were concerned with the GBR World Heritage listing in 2014 and 2015. 2. Please provide the costs of each trip to the Department. 	Written	SQ15-370
129.	1.4 EACD	Waters	Hand over of approval powers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In estimates in May, an officer asserted that mine site rehabilitation could in some circumstances be consistent with the Department's EPBC Offsets Policy. Please clarify whether this is the case. 2. The Department's own review of the EIS for the Shenhua Watermark project in July 2013, said "rehabilitation of disturbance footprints does not qualify as an offset" – at page 6 of that review Can you please confirm that the Department's interpretation of the EPBC offsets policy remains the same as it was in 2013? 3. How is the above statement from the Department consistent with the position asserted by the officer in Estimates? 4. Did the Department ever prepare and adequacy assessment of NSW's Major Projects Offset Policy? 5. Was that assessment ever given to the Minister? 6. Did the assessment identify any defects in the policy which would prevent it from meeting the federal standards? 7. What was the general conclusion of the assessment? 	Written	SQ15-377
130.	1.4 WHM	Waters	CITES nominations	<p>What species is the Government considering for nomination on the CITES Appendices at the next CITES meeting (COP17) in 2016?</p> <p>Specifically, is the Government considering nominating the following species at the next CITES meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nautilids (Allonautilus spp. and Nautilus spp.) • Southern bluefin tuna, Thunnus maccoyii • Long- and short-fin mako shark: Isurus spp. • Mobula rays (Mobula spp.) • Tope, school or soupfin shark: Galeorhinus galeus • Gulper sharks: Family Centrophoridae • Freshwater Stingrays: Family Potamotrygonidae • Guitarfishes / Shovelnose rays: Family Rhinobatidae 	Written	SQ15-384

131.	1.5 EACD	Ludlam	Approval of decisions under the EPBC Act	<p>Senator LUDLAM: You do not have to approve everything.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: No; that is correct. There is a provision, as you know, in the EPBC Act for us to advise and for a minister to make a decision that a project has unacceptable impacts. As you probably know as well, there are very few projects that have fallen into that category. Nevertheless, I will have to take that on notice or answer that in 1.5. I am not aware of the number.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you take that on notice for us?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Sure.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: In the entire history of the act since when, 1999—</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: when it was first legislated, how many projects have actually been refused? If other Commonwealth ministers, or state ministers for that matter, have already announced that the project is going ahead, does that have any bearing on your assessment process?</p>	16 25 May	SQ15-172
132.	1.5 EACD	Ludlam	Proposed decision approvals	<p>Senator LUDLAM: I will ask you more tomorrow, although I understand the schedule is a bit more congested. Finally from me, on notice, could you identify whether under your act you have ever knocked back a proposal of which a state or federal government was the proponent, even one single time.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Sure. Just to clarify: whether we have ever found a project sponsored by a state or federal government—or where a state or federal government was the proponent—to be clearly unacceptable under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Yes. I appreciate that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Or was refused approval at the end of the process.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Okay.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Either.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: If there is a distinction—</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Yes, there is.</p>	17 25 May	SQ15-173
133.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Efficiency Dividends	<p>Senator WATERS: If you could provide a list of the total funding and the full-time equivalents allocated to the relevant departmental section responsible for assessments, approvals and compliance monitoring under the EPBC Act—obviously the names will have changed—again, since 2008-09. Thank you.</p>	17 25 May	SQ15-395

134.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Land Clearing	<p>Senator WATERS: I think that is fairly clear. You listed the agencies and that was good. Can I ask when you first became aware of that land clearing and who it was that alerted you to it?</p> <p>Mr Gaddes: I will give you an answer, but I may need to come back on notice if I do not have it correct. I think it was the Australian Conservation Foundation that alerted us to this one in March. If we have not got that correct I will come back to you on notice.</p>	56 26 May	SQ15-221
135.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Whitehaven	<p>Mr Knudson: I would just add that on March 17 Whitehaven submitted a revised offset management plan in accordance with condition No. 32 and we are currently assessing that plan for potential approval or otherwise.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: A revised offset plan. Was that to include those additional areas that they had been required to obtain after the independent review or are there other features that I should be aware of?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Fundamentally, it was addressing the issues associated with the—</p> <p>Mr Gaddes: I will have to take that one on notice, because I do not have the available information in front of me. I would be able to characterise it as significant progress in securing the majority of offsets that they need to.</p>	59 26 May	SQ15-222
136.	1.5 EACD	Singh	Offset Payments	<p>Senator Birmingham: You have asked, 'Is there anyone else?'. I am suggesting that if there are specifics that I think we can provide those on notice.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: We just found out that there was the Great Barrier Reef Foundation, so it was worth asking the question. I will move on then, just to make it clear. The governance arrangements for the management of offset funding through the Reef Trust is not quite finalised?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: That is right.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: But there seems to be some kind of framework for that finalisation—is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: And finalisation will be some time in the second half of the year?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: That is right.</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: I should add that the fact that that bit of the framework is not completely finalised yet has not stopped us funding some excellent projects informed by science in phase one and phase two.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: The details about how the offset payments will be calculated—has that been worked out yet or is that still part of this finalisation?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Clearly we would be working off the existing offsets calculator with</p>	107 26 May	SQ15-244

				<p>the new EPBC Act. But it is a good question you asked, because one of the things we are giving consideration to is whether that needs to be modified. It is very heavily a terrestrial focused calculator, in terrestrial impacts. What we are talking about with the reef is the interaction between terrestrial and marine. How might the calculator need to be made more contemporary for that is one of the things we are working through.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Okay. And what is the finalisation date for that?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I would have to take that on notice, Senator.</p>		
137.	1.5 EACD	Urquhart	Reef Trust – terrestrial offsets	Are offsets in the marine environment assessed differently to terrestrial offsets? Will they be?	Written	SQ15-304
138.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Lobbying the big 4 banks – Galilee Basin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have any of your officers met with or spoken to any staff from the Big 4 Australian banks about the Galilee Basin mega-coal mines or the Abbot Point coal port? 2. Can you take on notice to provide the dates, locations and positions of the officers present at those meetings or on those phone calls? 3. Please detail what those officers discussed with the banks? 4. Have any officers ever asked an Australian bank to make or not make any public statements about financing the Galilee Basin mega-mines or the Abbot Point coal port? 5. To your knowledge, has the Minister contacted any of the Big 4 banks to ask them to refrain from commenting publically on whether they'll finance the Galilee Basin mega-mines? 	Written	SQ15-368
139.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Sea Dumping in the GBRWHA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide an update on the amount of dredge spoil dumping the GBRWHA in 2013, 2014 and so far in 2015, disaggregated by maintenance and capital dredging. 2. Please provide similar figures for dredging. 	Written	SQ15-369
140.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Victorian Western Highway Duplication – Stage 2	<p>In relation to EPBC 2010/5741 (Stage 2 of the duplication):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to the ecological communities known as GEVVP and NTGVVP, does the Department have good evidence to support the offset sites chosen for the project? 2. Does the Dept know of any other similar habitat which might be preserved as an offset for Stage 3 3. Is there any evidence to suggest that the proponent is not meeting their obligations to secure offsets under Stage 2? 4. Are there any plans beneath the main approval which have been approved by 	Written	SQ15-378

				<p>the Minister or a delegate since the Minister gave approval for this project? Have they all been published?</p> <p>5. Has the Department visited the offset sites? Please detail which sites were visited, and when.</p>		
141.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Victorian Western Highway Duplication – Stage 3	<p>In relation to EPBC 2010/5744 (Stage 3 of the duplication)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Department completed any assessment of the availability of offsets for the impacted ecological communities? 2. When were those assessments done? 3. Has the Department visited the offset sites (if any) proposed by the proponent? Please detail which sites were visited, and when. 	Written	SQ15-379
142.	1.5 EACD	Waters	Maules Creek	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been any change approved to the biodiversity corridor which was the subject of media reporting early in 2015? 2. When was that decision made? 3. Has Whitehaven asked for any variation? 4. Have Whitehaven secured the proposed offsets areas , including those extra properties identified in the Independent Review of Offsets by Greenloaning Biostudies? 5. Have the offsets sites Cattle Plains and Blue Range been secured by the proponent? 6. Is the Department aware of when negotiations commenced to secure the above two sites? 7. Has Whitehaven submitted a revised Offsets Management Plan? When was it submitted? 	Written	SQ15-380
143.	1.6 EQD	Singh	Evidentiary Certificates under the Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Export and Imports) Act 1989	<p>Senator SINGH: Has the minister issued any evidentiary certificates under the Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Export and Imports) Act 1989?</p> <p>Mr McNeer: Mr Edwards is probably best placed to answer that question.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: And if so, obviously I would like some details regarding how many and what kind of materials.</p> <p>Mr Edwards: I do not have information about evidentiary certificates but we do issue decision statements when we make different decisions. I would have to take both of those things on notice if you are interested in numbers or if there are any other parameters that you wanted to give to us.</p>	87	SQ15-405

144.	1.6 EQD	Singh	Hazardous Waste Technical Group	<p>Senator SINGH: For how long, on average, do individuals serve on that technical group?</p> <p>Mr McNee: I do not have the exact details but, due to the nature of the group and the particular expertise, there have been individuals who have served on that committee and provided advice over a considerable period of time.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Are you able to provide the committee with the expertise of those on the group and their expertise?</p> <p>Mr McNee: Yes. We could provide that detail on notice.</p>	89 26 May	SQ15-236
145.	1.6 EQD	Singh	Hazardous Waste	<p>Mr McNee: There is a range of situations where other Commonwealth departments may, in fact, be involved in either the repatriation of some form of waste to Australia or, in fact, the export for final disposal. In that context we will work with those departments to ensure that the obligations of the legislation are met.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: It would be useful to take on notice a list of the various government agencies that you connect with.</p> <p>Mr McNee: Yes. We will do that. I am not sure that there is a consolidated list but we can certainly look at who we have dealt with.</p> <p>Mr Edwards: Yes. We will do our best. I should add that we have quite a bit to do with state government agencies, because part of the process of determining assessments is obviously understanding local capacity and their happiness or concerns about certain movement of waste. We can certainly give you a list and we would include those agencies on that list for you.</p>	89 26 May	SQ15-237
146.	1.6 EQD	Urquhart	National Water Efficiency Labelling	Is the Department on track to implement national water efficiency labelling? What are the risks to that process?	Written	SQ15-341
147.	1.6 EQD	Waters	National Assessment of CSG Chemicals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you illuminate your involvement in the National Assessment of CSG chemicals? 2. How many FTE are devoted to the Assessment? 	Written	SQ15-381
148.	1.6 EQD	Waters	Waste and advisory bodies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the Product Stewardship Advisory Group, the Oil Stewardship Advisory Council and the Fuel Standards Consultative Committee still functioning? 2. Are you currently working on any reform proposals regarding hazardous waste, oil stewardship, or product stewardship more generally? 3. Can you give an estimate of the FTE devoted to those reforms? 	Written	SQ15-382

149.	1.6 EQD	Waters	Waste Oil recycling levy	<p>1. Subsequent the Independent Review of the Product Stewardship [PS](Oil) Act in 2013, is the government working on a response?</p> <p>2. What is the timeframe?</p>	Written	SQ15-383
150.	Outcome 2 ERF	Urquhart	Methods in operation	<p>Dr Kennedy: There are 41 methods in operation at the moment. We would be happy to provide to you the list of those methods and what they are. We can provide that quickly—and then a list of these 15 methods that you mentioned, Hilton, that are under development. I think that information is available to the public. If not, we are happy to provide it in a table.</p>	119 25 May	SQ15-199
151.	Outcome 2 ERF	Singh	Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee	<p>Senator SINGH: Are you able to provide the committee with a list of the attendees for all of these meetings?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: Yes.</p>	123 25 May	SQ15-200
152.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Singh	Post 2020 Roundtable Taskforce	<p>Senator SINGH: So you did receive the submissions via the taskforce? You are kind of part of the taskforce, but the department itself received the submissions through the taskforce. What can you tell us about the submissions? There were 430 written submissions. Is that still the correct number?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: I think the number is higher than that. There were some late submissions. We can get the most accurate figure for you from the taskforce.</p>	123 25 May	SQ15-201
153.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Singh	Post 2020 Roundtable Taskforce	<p>Ms Brunoro: At a very high level, it was a broad range and there was quite a significant number of submissions that did not nominate what the target would be. They focused on the kinds of things the government should consider when setting a target. The range extended from above the Climate Change Authority's suggestions. The Climate Change Authority put out their recommendations recently. There were submissions that went beyond those targets to 2020 and 2030, and there were submissions which suggested that the government should not take any action on climate change. So it was fair to say it was quite broad. Those who did nominate a specific target did focus on the Climate Change Authority's recommendations.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Thank you. Could I also ask that that question be taken on notice?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We will pass that question on to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. They really are the authoritative answer on what that range is. I think they will be preparing material summarising the submissions. That is their</p>	124 25 May	SQ15-202

				responsibility and properly given to them.		
154.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Emissions Reduction figures	<p>Senator URQUHART: Sorry; can I just step back? The figures were arrived at by the calculation of the emissions reductions versus what?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Versus the revenue from the carbon tax.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That is how you arrived at the figure?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Yes, indeed. Emissions reduction divided by carbon tax revenue is the pretty simple analysis. There might be a little more to it which I can provide on notice if need be, but the short version there is that is the approach. Equally, we have outlined that the Emissions Reduction Fund, which is directly contracting abatement, is a \$13.95 per tonne average—as Dr Kennedy explained before. Some are more; some are less. That is about achieving the 47 megatonnes of abatement, if my memory is correct, out of the \$600 million-odd of contracts related there. In both cases, it is abatement divided by the cost.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You offered to provide some more detail on notice. Can I take you up on that offer, because I know that Senator Rice has some questions, and I do not want to take her time.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am sure the minister will be happy to provide the analysis of the costs of abatement under the carbon tax versus the costs of abatement under the Emissions Reduction Fund.</p>	125 25 May	SQ15-203
155.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Rice	Native forest wood	<p>Senator RICE: Could you take that on notice and see if there have been any other submissions to government actively requesting native forest wood to be included?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes, I can do that.</p>	126 25 May	SQ15-204
156.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Rice	Native forest wood	<p>Senator RICE: Again, if you can take on notice whether there has been correspondence or advice either way from energy retailers about the inclusion of energy from native forest wood.</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes, I can certainly take that on notice.</p>	126 25 May	SQ15-205

157.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Rice	Power generators	<p>Senator RICE: All right. In terms of the pre-2011 regulations, are there any power generators that are operating under the transitional arrangements in the 2011 legislation—operating under the regs that existed?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes. I would actually have to take that question on notice. I am not aware that there are, but to be certain I need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could—and how many, what they are, how much power they are generating. In particular, do you know whether there are any processes of auditing them for whether they complied with the conditions under those regulations?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I guess that sort of relates to the question of whether there are any. I will take that on notice.</p>	126 25 May	SQ15-206
158.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Waters	Member of the Board of the CCA	<p>Senator WATERS: Apology for my lateness; I have just had another engagement that I actually ran here from, so I appreciate your patience. Again, pardon me if I go over some of the ground that the other senators have asked. I will try not to from the notes that I have been given. Was a part of the arrangement with Clive Palmer and the government to allow him to appoint a member to the board of CCA?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: I think there were some discussions about that. We are not a party to the details of that or to the progress or lack of progress that might have been made in relation to that undertaking.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Does the minister have anything to add on that one?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am not aware of that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you take that on notice, because I suspect perhaps the actual minister may well be quite aware of that.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I can seek any information from the minister.</p>	78 26 May	SQ15-234
159.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Waters	Qualifications of Board members	<p>Senator WATERS: Okay, I think that is code for something that I do not understand, but it sounds very important. Are you aware of whether the suggestions that have been made by particularly Mr Palmer are credible, science based folk?</p> <p>Mr Parker: No, I am not aware. I do not have anything to add to the answer by the assistant minister.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps the minister can take on notice that part of the question of the respective qualifications?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I can take it on notice, but I do not know that we will want to be providing a commentary on the characteristics of any suggestions that have been made to us as to whether they are credible or otherwise. The government will make its decision on appointments.</p>	79 26 May	SQ15-235

				Senator WATERS: Simply their qualifications would suffice. They will probably answer that question. Thanks, minister. The authority has previously described the five per cent emissions reduction target as totally inadequate and as leaving an unfair burden on future governments, who will have to achieve deeper and more disruptive cuts, a view that I share. Is there any consultation between the authority and the government of the day in setting targets?		
160.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Budget for program 2.2	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you run us through the budget for program 2.2 please.</p> <p>Mr Parker: We can give you some staffing numbers, but we would be struggling at this point to break the budget down to that level of detail.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you break it down on notice and give us the details of the staff as of now?</p> <p>Mr Parker: Yes, beyond the stuff that is actually in the PBS.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Let me approach your question in a different way, and we will go through the climate change adaptation. There are probably four direct areas where the department is actively involved in climate change adaptation.</p>	92 26 May	SQ15-401
161.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Funding variation	<p>Mr Archer: The funding profile, I think, really relates to the agreement that we have reached with NCCARF around the delivery of their milestones. So the timing of payments is related to the delivery of particular milestones. I think we can probably provide a bit more information on the different milestones and the timing of those, if you would like.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you do that now?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We can certainly make a start, and then we might have to provide further detail on notice.</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: With respect to the \$2.805 million, there were five key deliverables for this financial year, In October 2014, a project plan was provided. On 28 November, there was a monitoring and evaluation plan. At the end of the last calendar year, there were a range of proposed arrangements for the hosting of four research networks associated with the research facility. In January this year, there was the delivery of a stakeholder engagement plan. On 1 April, there was a coastal user needs analysis report and state of play report that both went to the development of the coastal tool, which is a major output of the three-year work. I can provide a bit of a high-level overview of those milestones, if that would be useful.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you can provide that on notice, that may be adequate.</p>	93 26 May	SQ15-238

162.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Staffing in adaptation team – CCRE Division	<p>Mr Archer: In the adaptation team in the Climate Change and Renewable Energy Division we have a staffing level of basically eight full-time equivalent staff. This is the team that does really only one portion of the work across the department that the secretary was referring to and in particular manages our engagement with NCCAF. We are not anticipating that level of staffing changing in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. That has been eight for how long?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Certainly since the start of this financial year. It would have reduced from the previous financial year.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you know by how many?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I think I will have to take that one on notice.</p>	94 26 May	SQ15-240
163.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Staffing NCCARF	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell us anything about staffing at the research facility—how many and what functions?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: I will have to take that one on notice.</p>	95 26 May	SQ15-241
164.	Outcome 2 EFR	Rice	Abatement from halting highlands logging	<p>Senator RICE: In January The Age newspaper published an article entitled 'Highlands logging halt would earn Victoria \$30m a year in emissions reductions: report'. The article referred to a methodology that would need to be approved to calculate the CO2 emissions saved from ceasing logging of native forests. What can you tell me about this report?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I think the issues around methodology were really discussed in 2.1, in the climate change discussion. We have experts on land sector methods, and those officers are not here now. We can take that question on notice for them.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. I wanted to know whether that report was publicly available. I have written to the minister to seek a copy but have not had a response yet.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: There is no-one here who can answer that.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Sorry, Senator Rice; what is the report you were quoting from?</p> <p>Senator RICE: It is a report that I understand is with the minister, which has got information saying that, if logging ceased in the Central Highlands, it would be of \$30 million a year value in emissions reductions. It would mean that there would be 3.2 megatonnes of carbon sequestered if we ceased logging.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I am just not aware of that report, and the team who work in detail on that are not here at the moment. We can only take that question on notice.</p>	122-123 26 May	SQ15-254
165.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Meetings with fossil fuel-related	How many meetings has the Minister or his Office had in the past year with representatives from fossil fuel-related companies?	Written	SQ15-301

			companies			
166.	Outcome 2 ERF	Urquhart	The 41 methods for the ERF	At the hearing, the Department noted that of the 41 methods for the ERF in operation, 15 have been made under the new legislation. Which methodologies are these? How many projects were contracted in the first ERF auction under these 15 methodologies? Were these methodologies being driven by proponents prior to the new legislation taking effect, or were they fully developed by the Department?	Written	SQ15-353
167.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	National Greenhouse Gas Inventory	The latest National Greenhouse Gas Inventory data from September 2014 shows Australia's carbon emissions rose by 0.3% in the quarter. Can you please outline some reasons for this increase?	Written	SQ15-354
168.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	National Greenhouse Gas Inventory – increase emissions from electricity	The NNGI data showed that emissions from electricity rose by 6 per cent unadjusted, or 1.3 per cent trend. Can you explain why this may be the case, and how it differs from previous quarters?	Written	SQ15-355
169.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Urquhart	Solar Towns	I'd like to ask about the Solar Towns program, that was promised prior to the election and is now being delivered on a much smaller scale. Applications for the 2014-15 competitive round for the Surf Coast Shire in Victoria closed on 20 February. Can you update us on the assessment process for this round? Your website also states that a number of preselected community sites in Tasmania and Victoria would receive funding from the 2014-15 round. When will these be announced? Will the grants be to value of what is expected by these community groups?	Written	SQ15-356
170.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Waters	SLATS vs NNGI landclearing data	SLATS vs NNGI landclearing data <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is considerable inconsistency between Queensland's SLATS data and the Department's NNGI data for landclearing – can you please explain the differences in methodology which might have led to that discrepancy? 2. What are the other factors which the Department attributes this discrepancy to? 	Written	SQ15-376
171.	Outcome 2 CCRE	Waters	NGER - Flawed methane equipment	In a news article that surfaced on early May this year (http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/flawed-methane-monitor-underestimates-leaks-at-us-oil-and-gas-sites-20150506-ggvuj5.html) about a US study which found potentially very serious flaws in a very commonly used piece of equipment used to measure the level of methane gas emissions from gas wells in	Written	SQ15-385

				<p>the CSG and shale gas industries. The equipment is called a “Bacharach”. Are you aware of that study?</p> <p>Quote from the SMH article in May 2015: “In one instance, the authors found that two separate Bacharach samplers recorded natural gas concentrations in the air of 1 to 6 per cent, when the actual concentrations were between 7 and 73 per cent” – do you know whether that equipment is widely used in Australia?</p> <p>Does this have any implications for the way methane is measured under the NGER methodologies applicable to oil and gas in Australia?</p> <p>Please give an estimate of how many tonnes of methane emissions are determined by direct measurements which could be ascertained using a device such as this.</p>		
172.	2.1 CCRE	Urquhart	Budget – Outcome 2.1	I note on page 58 of the Portfolio Budget Statements that total program expenses for 2.1 are nearly \$10 million less in 2016-17 than in 2015-16. Could you please run us through why this is the case?	Written	SQ15-351
173.	2.1 CCRE	Urquhart	Staffing level	The Average Staffing Level for Outcome 2 will reduce by 6 next financial year, from 187 to 181. Could you tell us where these reductions will come from, and how they fit into the general reductions across the Department?	Written	SQ15-352
174.	Outcome 3 AAD	Whish- Wilson	Operating Budget	<p>Mr Sutton: The depreciation gets reassessed annually, and the finance costs represent future make-good costs, and they have been in the budget now for several years.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay, maybe the subtotal. I wanted to strip out the maintaining Australia's presence before we go into depreciation and approved operating loss. I am just trying to get an idea of your operating budget. You can take that on notice.</p> <p>Dr Wooding: I can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I just want to know how that has fluctuated over the last 10 years rather than a short-term view, because you are talking about a long-term plan now. You mentioned that after August you will be looking at formulating it. My guess, Senator Birmingham, is that it will be before the next election that you might release your new budget and your 20-year plan. I would be interested to know how that would reflect the previous 10 years, not just a short time period.</p>	81 25 May	SQ15-187
175.	Outcome 3 AAD	Whish- Wilson	Budget 2015-16	<p>1. If and where in the Portfolio Budget Statement expenditure related to the following is contained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o \$45.3 million over four years from 2014-15 for the Australia-Antarctic Airlink; and 	Written	SQ15-270

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o \$13.4 million over four years from 2014-15 for logistics support for the Australian Antarctic Programme? <p>If and where in the Portfolio Budget Statement expenditure related to the following is contained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o \$24million for the Antarctic Gateway Partnership? 		
176.	Outcome 3 AAD	Whish-Wilson	Budget 2015-16	1. What the major capital items (greater than \$500,000) are?	Written	SQ15-271
177.	Outcome 3 AAD	Whish-Wilson	Budget 2015-16	1. What impact the budgeted reduction in expenses from \$104,285 in 2015-16 to \$89,038 in 2016-17 will have on programme delivery?	Written	SQ15-272
178.	Outcome 3 AAD	Whish-Wilson	Wilkins Runway	<p>Could you please detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The make and model of cargo planes that are known to be able to land fully laden at Wilkins Runway? - The make and model of cargo planes, and their country of origin, that are expected to land fully laden at Wilkins Runway? - The make and model of cargo planes that are known not to be able to land fully laden at Wilkins Runway? 	Written	SQ15-273
179.	Outcome 4 CEWO	Rhiannon	Water resources that Australia is signatory to	<p>Senator RHIANNON: I was after which international agreements are relevant to the Murray-Darling Basin and relevant water resource issues that Australia is a signatory to?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Principally, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; I think desertification might be sited in—</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Conventional biological diversity.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We can take on notice to provide any further details.</p>	70 26 May	SQ15-228
180.	Outcome 4 CEWO	Singh	Water received by the CEWH	<p>Senator SINGH: The 790? How much water has been received by CEWH in each calendar year since the announcement of the National Plan for Water Security in early 2007?</p> <p>Mr Papps: I do not know that I have the detail, but let me tell you what I do know. Since the CEWH was established—that is, since 2008-09—it has received in allocations, 5,054 gegalitres. That of course is not its holding; the holding changes each year. It has grown each year. That is the allocations against the holding cumulative over those seven years. In terms of what it has received, I would have to take that on notice and give you those figures year by year. At the moment, our holdings are 2,275 gegalitres, but keep in mind that the holding is the entitlement total and the numbers that my colleagues are talking about in terms of 2,750, for</p>	102 26 May	SQ15-195

			<p>example, are long-term average annual yields. So the currency of the plan is long-term average annual yields.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Could you take that on notice as far as the breakdown of the years?</p> <p>Mr Papps: So you want the entitlements accrued each year?</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Papps: Okay. We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: I also wanted to know how much water has been delivered by the CEWH since the coalition government came into office.</p> <p>Mr Papps: Again, you would have to give me a little time to do the calculation. I can tell you, for example, without doing any calculations, that since the CEWH was established in 2008-09 we have used—that is, delivered—4,332 gigalitres. That is the 'use' figure that relates to the total allocation figure I gave you earlier. When you look at it, roughly 86 per cent has been used so far over that seven-year journey. I would have to get a calculator and do the numbers for you.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Maybe we could take that on notice and you could have a look at that.</p> <p>Mr Papps: Yes.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: That will provide how much has been delivered. It is how much has been received and delivered, I suppose, that is what I am trying to get a snapshot—not a snapshot, trying to get the whole picture of. If that could be provided on notice, both—</p> <p>Mr Papps: That will not be a problem; we keep those statistics. I just do not have the detailed breakdown, in terms of the years, you are asking for. I would just make the comment—and we will provide extra context for you when we provide you with the figures—that the amount of water used each year is essentially dependent on two things. It is slightly more complicated than this, but at its heart it is essentially dependent on two things. Firstly, it is dependent on how much water we get—that is, the level of our locations across all of those entitlements. Secondly, it is dependent on the ecological demand—that is, where we are in the ecological cycle of all the wetland assets that we are involved in, in watering, and there are many of them. What is the demand? What level of watering do we need to undertake to meet the ecological objectives associated with that particular asset? Across the basin,</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				that total gives us the equation that we have to deal with, each and every year, around how much water we use.		
181.	Outcome 4.1 Science	Urquhart	IESC timelines for advice	<p>Senator Birmingham: And you asked about the Shenhua Watermark, which we can happily use as an example—I am not entirely sure that is where we are up to in the program. As I understand it, both on 26 February and 23 March the minister sought further advice from the IESC in relation to that project and requested further additional advice from the IESC in relation to specific concerns raised by the community when he met with farmers and Indigenous leaders on 27 February. On 7 May the IESC advice was published. So that advice is publicly available and on the department website. The minister has extended the time frame to make a decision under the EPBC application, and that has been extended to 9 July. The minister's decision will be a public decision as well, with the relevant statements that accompany that. So it is all quite transparent and it will be there for all to see; whether or not the decision accords with the advice provided at the different iterative steps by the IESC.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The document you are reading from—are you able to provide that time line to us?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: These are just briefing notes, but if you want detail on the process—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I would love to have the minister's briefing notes.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: at what stage the IESC can step in and out of a process like that; I am sure there is probably a nice fact sheet ready that the department can provide.</p> <p>Dr Wright: We certainly have the dates we can provide to you.</p>	96 25 May	SQ15-193
182.	Outcome 4.1 Water	Urquhart	Tasmanian Irrigation Project	<p>Mr Robertson: All five of them were subject to the work that Infrastructure Australia did.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What is their advice in relation to those five projects?</p> <p>Mr Robertson: I do not have the detailed advice with me at the moment. Essentially, with the work that Infrastructure Australia was doing, I think they concluded that the information available to them showed that there were potentially positive cost-benefit analyses. I cannot think of the exact words that Infrastructure Australia used.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Given that you do not have that with you, are you happy to take that on notice?</p>	99 25 May	SQ15-194

				Mr Robertson: Yes, we can do that.		
183.	Outcome 4.1 Water	Singh	Cost per gigalitre under buyback	<p>Mr Slatyer: 581.4 gigalitres in long-term average annual yield terms. By recovered I include there, as I said before, water that is under contract for recovery. So not all that water has yet been formally conveyed and transferred to the environmental water holder.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: That is good to know. When I get the other figures, I will not be—</p> <p>Mr Slatyer: These numbers are not reconciled with the numbers that Mr Papps will give you.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Yes. Thank you for clarifying that. Of water contracted to date, what is the average cost per gigalitre under buyback?</p> <p>Mr Slatyer: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Okay, and the follow-on question I was going to ask is: what is the average cost per gigalitre under contracted environmental water recovery infrastructure?</p> <p>Mr Slatyer: It will not be difficult to do those calculations. If we can provide you that information during the hearings we will.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: On and off farm.</p> <p>Mr Slatyer: Otherwise we will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: All right. Thank you.</p>	106 25 May	SQ15-196
184.	Outcome 4.1 Science	Waters	Office of Water Science research funding	<p>Ms Milnes: For this research that is being undertaken, it is commissioned by the Office of Water Science and the funding is provided to whoever is commissioned to undertake the work by the Office of Water Science.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: How much money do you have to dole out for that purpose?</p> <p>Ms Milnes: Our budget there has been more than a few million dollars each year.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can you be any more specific?</p> <p>Ms Milnes: Yes. I can, perhaps, take that question on notice and provide you with some further details.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: More than a few. Less than 10, though?</p> <p>Ms Milnes: Less than 10, generally. And it varies from year to year.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I will accept these on notice, but it is good to have a ballpark—</p>	110 25 May	SQ15-197
185.	Outcome 4.1 Science	Waters	National Partnership Agreement funding	<p>Dr de Brouwer: You mentioned at the start, or during, the conversation that the majority of the money went to the states. With the national partnership arrangements, \$50 million out of that 200 went to the states. So it was not the majority. It was a sizeable proportion, but the majority did not go to the states directly through the national partnership arrangement.</p>	110-111 25 May	SQ15-198

				<p>Senator WATERS: It was not 50 per state. It was 50 all up?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Total of 50—or 49-point-something. Roughly 50.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Where did the rest of the 150 go?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Where Ms Milnes has gone through—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: 150 and 10 are quite different.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: It is also over a number of years.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Four years now, yes.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Some of what Ms Milnes was talking about was expenditure per year as opposed to over—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. Perhaps you could also take on notice, just to clarify, where that 150 got spent. I have asked this before, but I just cannot remember what the answer was. If you have got that to hand, that would be helpful.</p> <p>Ms Milnes: Yes, I can take that on notice.</p>		
186.	Outcome 4.1 Science and Water	Waters	Long term drawdown of groundwater	<p>Lestar's concern was 1) seepage into the Condamine River, 2) draining of the Condamine River due to disruption of water flows 3) long term impact on South Australia (in 100 or 200 years) Below are some questions on 3).</p> <p>1. There's a lot of concern about the long term (i.e. 20 years) drawdown in groundwater systems from the CSG industry. Can you tell me who if anyone in government is doing that work?</p> <p>2. Can you tell me what the level of funding is for that work?</p> <p>3. Have you got any staff looking at the long-term impacts "downstream" in the Great Artesian Basin, since the GAB drains partially into South Australia? We understand that it takes over 100 years, or up to 200 years for the water under Roma and western in Queensland to reach South Australia . Is anyone investigating whether long term consequences on water flow in South Australia may occur in 100 or 200 years?</p> <p>Please detail the funding and FTE associated with this work.</p>	Written	SQ15-372
187.	BoM	Singh	Efficiency Dividends	<p>Ms Middleton: It is not explicit in this PBS because there are no new efficiency dividends this year. These are the efficiency dividends that were introduced in the 2011-12 MYEFO adjustments and then have continued on since then. Those are roughly an efficiency dividend of about 2.5 per cent that carry forward over the forward estimates.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: So a package of \$58.5 million. Could you tell me now what it is over the forward estimates in total, the package?</p>	25 25 May	SQ15-175

				<p>Ms Middleton: We would have to re-do those calculations because that is just part of our entire appropriation. I do not have a breakdown here of that.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Will you take that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Middleton: Yes.</p>		
188.	BoM	Waters	El Nino	<p>Senator WATERS: It is modelled that super El Ninos will become twice as frequent; namely once every 10 years, as climate change intensifies.</p> <p>Dr Vertessy: We don't use the term 'super El Ninos'. We would say that strong El Ninos are likely to be more frequent. I cannot remember the exact figure of frequency increase, but I do know that they are increasing.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps you could take it on notice. My understanding is that it is one every 10 years, which is a doubling.</p> <p>Dr Vertessy: We would be happy to provide a more detailed answer to that.</p>	28 25 May	SQ15-176
189.	BoM	Waters	Offshore oil and gas work	<p>Senator WATERS: Can you tell me about your offshore oil and gas work? How many staff do you have through that capital program working on offshore oil and gas?</p> <p>Dr Vertessy: I might go to Dr Canterford on that.</p> <p>Dr Canterford: We do have some figures here. I have an approximate number of about 30, but I would need to check our table.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So it is about the same amount of people doing climate change work as doing offshore oil and gas?</p> <p>Dr Canterford: Let me confirm the number first.</p> <p>Ms Middleton: In terms of our external revenue, in the last financial year, 2013-14, we generated about \$74 million worth of revenue. In terms of headcount that equated to roughly 300 staff at one time or another during the course of that financial year that were actively engaged in delivering services that were funded from the private sector. We provide about \$6 million worth of commercial weather services to the offshore oil and gas industry. Those are bespoke services, where the oil and gas industry is looking for additional services beyond what we traditionally provide to the public—beyond what we are appropriated to provide. Specifically, it is around early warnings regarding tropical cyclones and other events that affect their production. So they are quite specific services where the industry actually defines the parameters and the nature of the service that they want and they pay to have dedicated forecasters available to provide that service to them.</p>	33 25 May	SQ15-397

190.	BoM	Waters	Funding and staff numbers allocated to consolidating environmental information	<p>Dr Vertessy: Yes, I think it is running at about \$3 million to \$4 million per year. There is a little bit of extra money in the original measure to do some capital builds of some data infrastructure. We can give you the precise figure on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. Can you tell me how much funding and staff time are currently allocated to consolidating environmental information on a continental scale, especially as regards biodiversity?</p> <p>Dr Vertessy: It is pretty small. Again, I would have to look into that and we could give you a detailed answer.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you; I would appreciate that. Specifically, whether there is anyone dedicated to that or whether it is just a responsibility shared amongst a few folk, and what resourcing they have available to them.</p> <p>Dr Vertessy: I can certainly clarify one thing: we are not in the process of gathering and collating environmental information for the continent. Really, we are focused more on the standards and the technologies for doing it, such that other people can work together in what you might call a federated system whereby we are all doing our own bit and are able to share one another's data.</p>	34 25 May	SQ15-177
191. 1	Clean Energy Regulator	Urquhart	ERF Contract breakdown	<p>Ms Swirepik: I can give you the breakdown by the length of the contract, not by the delivery of abatement which I do not have at estimates with me today.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have that?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I have the breakdown for the contract duration.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And the other one you just spoke about?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: We would need to go back and get that.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you provide that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: Yes. There are 62 contracts that are 10 years in duration; 42 contracts which are seven years in duration; one contract of five years and two contracts of three years duration.</p>	67 25 May	SQ15-185
192.	Clean Energy Regulator	Waters	Sequestration	<p>Senator WATERS: In going to the sequestration, do you have a breakdown of how much was avoided deforestation as opposed to the soil carbon and the forestry?</p> <p>Ms Munro: I do not have a simple summary of that in front of me. I think we might need to take that one on notice. We certainly can break that down but I do not think we have the projects sorted in a way that I can give that to you.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I would like the detail on notice.</p> <p>Ms Munro: Certainly.</p>	73 25 May	SQ15-186
193.	Clean Energy	Xenopho	ERF safeguard mechanism	Did the government consult with the Regulator during the formation of the ERF	Written	SQ15-258

	Regulator	n	consultation paper	<p>safeguard mechanism consultation paper?</p> <p>Given that the regulator has administrative responsibilities under the National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Scheme, which forms the backbone of the safeguard mechanism, such consultation would have been vitally important, wouldn't it?</p>		
194.	Clean Energy Regulator	Xenophon	Safeguard mechanism	<p>Is the regulator playing an active role in the consultation process that is now underway in relation to the safeguard mechanism?</p> <p>- Has the Regulator provided any feedback to government? What feedback has been provided?</p>	Written	SQ15-259
195.	Clean Energy Regulator	Xenophon	Safeguard mechanism	<p>Has the regulator provided any advice about the effectiveness of the ERF and whether the proposed safeguard mechanism will be strong enough to reach Australia's international targets?</p>	Written	SQ15-262
196.	Clean Energy Regulator	Xenophon	International trading of units	<p>Does the regulator have a position on the need for or benefits of international trading of units, provided the units are of suitable quality and robustness?</p>	Written	SQ15-263
197.	Clean Energy Regulator	Xenophon	International targets	<p>Does the regulator have a position on the need for a 'strategic reserve' of international emissions units to assist the government in achieving our international targets at least cost?</p>	Written	SQ15-264
198.	Clean Energy Regulator	Urquhart	Registered power stations	<p>How many registered power stations are there currently under the previous RET rules that utilise native wood waste biomass as an eligible renewable resource? How many certificates have been generated by these participant(s)? How many certificates in total have been generated for native wood waste biomass?</p>	Written	SQ15-349
199.	Clean Energy Regulator	Urquhart	Registered power stations	<p>How many registered power stations are there under current RET rules that utilise non-native wood waste biomass as an eligible renewable resource? How many certificates have been generated by this participant(s)? How many certificates in total have been generated for non-native wood waste biomass?</p>	Written	SQ15-350
200.	Climate Change Authority	Urquhart	Members of the CCA Board - qualifications	<p>Ms Thompson: I do not have details of the qualifications of the board with me. I can run through the names and give you a broad indication of their areas of expertise.</p>	77 26 May	SQ15-233

				<p>Senator URQUHART: If you could do that, and maybe take the other on notice if you are able to?</p> <p>Ms Thompson: Yes, very happy to do that.</p>		
201.	Director of National Parks	Siewert	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review	<p>1. What is the expenditure to date on the Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review (CMRR)?</p> <p>2. What is the projected expenditure, both of the Review itself, and then the process of redrafting the management plans including undertaking 2 required rounds of consultation under the EPBC Act.</p>	Written	SQ15-265
202.	Director of National Parks	Siewert	Managing the Marine Parks reserves	<p>1. What is the current expenditure for managing the pre-existing marine parks (not including the GBRMPA and those Commonwealth marine reserves declared prior to 2012)?</p> <p>2. What are the forward estimates for ongoing management of all the Commonwealth Marine Reserves</p>	Written	SQ15-266
203.	Director of National Parks	Siewert	When will parks become operational	<p>1. When does the Government plan to make the Commonwealth Marine Reserves which have had their zoning set aside pending the Review, operational on the water?</p> <p>2. Has the Department received any instructions as to when the marine parks should become operational?</p>	Written	SQ15-267
204.	Director of National Parks	Siewert	Review consultation outcomes.	<p>1. How many submissions were received to the CMR Review? (of any type)</p> <p>2. How many were pro marine parks and in particular sanctuary/marine national park zones?</p> <p>3. How many asked for more marine sanctuary/marine national park zones and opposed reductions?</p>	Written	SQ15-268
205.	Director of National Parks	Siewert	Oil and gas expanding into parks	<p>1. On 15 April 2015 it was revealed in nationwide media that a number of the new Commonwealth Marine Reserves (CMRs) had become subject to new oil and gas permissions (eg: new acreage, seismic permits, new exploration leases etc).</p> <p>a. Was the Environment Department consulted by the Resources portfolio on this?</p> <p>b. How many of the new CMRs have either new acreage opened up for bidding, or new oil and gas operating rights of any type approved in them post their declaration in December 2012?</p> <p>c. How many of these are in (set-aside) zoning within the CMRs that prohibit mining?</p> <p>d. Does the Environment Department consider that this undermines and pre-empts the Review by allowing allocation of new uses in parks whilst they are being</p>	Written	SQ15-269

				reviewed? If so, what is being done to rectify it?		
206.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves – EPBC Act	Referring to QON 380 from Supplementary Estimates, it says that prior to management plans being in place, Commonwealth Marine Reserves are managed in accordance with the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 and IUCN principles. In the absence of a management plan are the reserves afforded specific protections when they are being managed in accordance with the Act and principles?	Written	SQ15-327
207.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	External revenue	On page 184 of the PBS, it states that the Director will look to increase external revenue. Why then does page 195 of the PBS show revenue from the sale of goods and rendering of services is expected to decline by nearly \$3 million over the forward estimates? What are the implications for the DNP if this significant decrease in external revenue is borne out? What is the reason for the projected decline in external revenue?	Written	SQ15-328
208.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Visitor numbers to Commonwealth National Parks	Can you tell me what are the current trends in visitor numbers to the Commonwealth National Parks, with specific reference to Kakadu and Uluru-Kata Tjuta? What are the reasons for these trends? What are the remedies for these trends? Does the Kakadu National Park Management Plan address these trends? How?	Written	SQ15-329
209.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	biological control agent for the Yellow Crazy Ant	Was the application to the Department of Agriculture to import a biological control agent for the Yellow Crazy Ant (a wasp) that was submitted on 28 November 2014 approved? The current phase of funding for the crazy ant control program will finish at the end of this financial year, is that correct? What is the budget for the next phase, and will you receive that funding? Where are you to in the implementation process of the Yellow Crazy Ants biocontrol programme? How much has it cost so far? What is the final cost expected to be? What are your expectations of success for the program? Why? Will it be possible for the biocontrol programme to be used in the Queensland Wet Tropics, where there is a burgeoning Yellow Crazy Ant problem?	Written	SQ15-330

210.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Marine ecosystem health indicators	What specific marine ecosystem health indicators are you planning to establish a baseline for by 30 June 2017? Why those indicators in particular? What will be the utility of these indicators? Can you foresee any potential delays in achieving this timeframe?	Written	SQ15-331
211.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	feral animal and weed control efforts	What are the feral animal and weed species the DNP has prioritised in its control efforts? What are its indicators of success in these control efforts? How much does the DNP spend annually on feral species control efforts?	Written	SQ15-332
212.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Value of the DNP's land and buildings	Referring to page 196 of the PBS, which notes a decrease in the value of the DNP's land and buildings over the forward estimates. What are the reasons for this somewhat counter-intuitive outcome? Is there anyway it can be arrested?	Written	SQ15-333
213.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	World Parks Congress	What were the main, positive outcomes from Australia's hosting of the World parks Congress last year? What was the direct economic benefit to NSW, compared to the pre-event estimate of \$24 million? What are the next steps to carry on from the Congress?	Written	SQ15-334
214.	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Norfolk Island threatened species plan	Have you started working with the community on Norfolk Island on a broader threatened species plan yet? How is that going?	Written	SQ15-335
215.	GBRMPA	Canavan	Tourism figures	Senator CANAVAN: All statistics and all measurements—I am an economist; I certainly do not believe figures very often because I have been involved in having to create them many times—are rubbery, but these in particular seem to be a problem because it is not just the inland areas that are included. My reading of it is that tourism captures not just holiday leisure time but also visiting friends and relatives and business. Is that your understanding in the tourism costings for this report? It is a little bit opaque, I must say; it is hard to work out. Dr Reichelt: I am sorry; I would need to check that on notice. Senator CANAVAN: Perhaps you could check that on notice, because it seems that one section of this report calculates tourism and they get to a figure of \$6.4	45-46 25 May	SQ15-178

				<p>billion, which is then translated into value added to \$5.1 billion, and the \$6.4 billion would seem to include visiting friends and relatives. I have often done that, as my mum is from Ayr. But I do not go to Ayr to see the reef; I go for my nonna's spaghetti. This figure is being used to say that fishing does not matter because of all this tourism, but a lot of the tourism has nothing to do with coral, if you are visiting friends and family.</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: I did not read the relatives things as the importance of those individual activities, but in dollar terms—</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: It is simple.</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: It is, yes. Can I just say too that we estimate from our environmental management charge figures that just under two million paying customers go out on day trips to the reef per year, but in the outlook report there were estimates of between 13 million and 16 million day visits from people not connected to tourist operations.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Sure. Anyway, please take that final question on notice. It also includes business travel as well which, I believe, is about the same as the visiting of friends and relatives impact.</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes. There are also types of fishing. Charter fishing, is that a recreational activity or—</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Or is it a tourism activity?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes. I will check the details.</p>		
216.	GBRMPA	Waters	Indigenous Rangers	<p>Senator WATERS: How many of those are Indigenous rangers?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: I do not have the exact figure. If I could give that to you on notice? I just need to check that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Is that the same pool of folk from whence the turtle and dugong Indigenous rangers will be sourced or is that a separate category?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: We have Indigenous people employed within the group as well as the additional funding program. I would need to check the number of Indigenous people doing that part.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: For both of those aspects of their role.</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes.</p>	51 25 May	SQ15-179
217.	GBRMPA	Waters	World Heritage	<p>Senator WATERS: On the lobbying trips, I understand that GBRMPA staff have gone along with various ministerial and departmental representatives to do their reef</p>	56 25 May	SQ15-182

			meetings	<p>lobbying. Have any of the GBRMPA officers been allowed to speak with World Heritage country/nations without the minister or the department present?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes, we have. I am just looking for the exact figures here. I have met with my counterparts in 11 member countries. I was on my own. I had no colleagues with me other than a Foreign Affairs person who helped facilitate the travel and took notes at the meeting.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: You were meeting with whom?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: The natural expert advisers to the governments who were taking an interest in understanding the Great Barrier Reef and committee members.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can you provide a bit more detail on notice about that? In those meetings, did you bring to the attention of the folk with whom you were conversing that statement in the outlook report which says that the overall outlook for the Great Barrier Reef is poor, has worsened since 2009 and is expected to further deteriorate in the future?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes. Some of the meetings were short, an hour or so. In some cases the longest was nine hours, where I was quizzed in great detail about that report.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: You drew that statement to their attention in every meeting?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes, very much so. I was able to explain that it operates at different scales. It is the climate change effects, it is the long run changes in catchments, it is the fact that at the time that report was written there were five new ports proposed, and extensions. It was actually written in advance of the changes that have occurred in the past 12 months in ports policies. I was given unfettered access to those, to the extent that they wanted to meet with me.</p>		
218.	GBRMPA	Waters	Dumping of maintenance dredge spoil	<p>Senator WATERS: Moving quickly to the proposed dumping ban, which has not yet taken effect, it obviously does not apply to dumping of maintenance dredge spoil. I am interested in whether the department has provided any advice to government on the impacts of dumping maintenance dredge spoil in the marine park?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I do not know that we have officers at the table to answer that. I will take that on notice, if I can.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That is a shame because I think I am asking it in the right section. It is 1.4, is it not?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: The dredging itself was dealt with primarily under the GBRMPA evidence yesterday and then your question is rightly to the department. I do not think it is in this program area. I will have to check on that at some stage.</p>	72 26 May	SQ15-232

				<p>Senator WATERS: Do I have a chance to ask it later or is the chance gone? I am keen to get an answer as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I can seek to try and find an answer for you and come back this evening.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, thank you. I would appreciate that.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: What was your question again?</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It is whether you have provided advice on the impact of dumping of maintenance dredge spoil in the marine park? Perhaps in a similar vein, the dredge synthesis panel looked at maintenance dredge spoil and actually found that it could be potentially more damaging because it is finer and therefore is more easily able to resuspend. Has the department either done, or have you asked GBRMPA to undertake, any work to examine that impact or to examine how to mitigate that impact? Could you get back to me on that as well? That would be lovely.</p> <p>Mr Thompson: Yes. By way of a holding response, one of the commitments under the long-term sustainability plan is to develop a dredge management framework with the Queensland government. We would expect that sort of work to be part of that task.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It is whether you have provided advice on the impact of dumping of maintenance dredge spoil in the marine park? Perhaps in a similar vein, the dredge synthesis panel looked at maintenance dredge spoil and actually found that it could be potentially more damaging because it is finer and therefore is more easily able to resuspend. Has the department either done, or have you asked GBRMPA to undertake, any work to examine that impact or to examine how to mitigate that impact? Could you get back to me on that as well? That would be lovely.</p>		
219.	GBRMPA	Urquhart	Reef 2050	Is the Reef currently maintaining its diversity of species and ecological habitats with a stable or improving trend? What is the overall trend for these indicators?	Written	SQ15-300
220.	GBRMPA	Waters	Sharks / drum lines / finning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand the Queensland Fisheries are currently using drumlines in the GBRMP – 184 in total, but they've only got a permit for 148. Can you give us an update on whether you're taking any compliance action on that? 2. Have you examined the evidence about the efficacy of drumlines versus other more shark protection measures like barriers, sonar technology or shark spotting programs? 3. Have you done your own assessment, or relied on assessments done by 	Written	SQ15-371

				<p>others?</p> <p>4. Please detail those assessments.</p> <p>5. Do you have an estimate for the number of sharks from protected species have been caught on drumlines in the GBR Region?</p> <p>6. Do you have any plans to review the use of drum lines impacting on sharks in the GBR or elsewhere?</p> <p>7. Have you detected any illegal shark finning in the GBR in the last few years?</p>		
221.	GBRMPA	Waters	Shen Neng ground	<p>Shen Neng grounding</p> <p>1. Please provide the most accurate possible cost assessment for a cleanup of the TBT contamination on Douglas Shoal.</p> <p>2. Please detail any trips to Douglas Shoal since 2011 taken by GBRMPA staff and their timing and purpose.</p> <p>3. Have you done any long term impact assessment if the contamination is not cleaned up?</p>	Written	SQ15-386
222.	GBRMPA	Waters	Coal Spill	<p>Coal Spill</p> <p>We're very lucky that when the Shen Neng ran aground in 2010 the cargo of 68,000 tonnes of coal didn't end up on the sea floor, given what we know about coal's toxicity. I understand that one recommendation of the North East Shipping Management Plan (NESMP) was that ---</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMSA to maintain a pollution response reserve of \$10 million and line of credit of \$40 million to ensure immediate access to funds in the event of a marine pollution incident. • GBRMPA and AMSA to investigate means of securing funding for restitution of non-pollution damage to coral reefs following a ship incident <p>1. To clarify – would non-pollution damage to coral reefs would include remediation of the Shen Neng contamination?</p> <p>2. Would it include a coal spill?</p>	Written	SQ15-387

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. What's the progress on the above actions? 4. Can you explain what you've done so far? 5. How many FTE have you got working on the second of those two actions? 6. What would the procedure be in the event of a coal spill? 7. How much research have we got to draw on about the consequences of a big coal spill? 8. What is GBRMPA's understanding of the risks of a large coal spill on the Reef? 		
223.	GBRMPA	Waters	National Ship Strike Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide an update on GBRMPA's work on the NSSS since last estimates. 2. How many FTE are devoted to the NSSS? 	Written	SQ15-388
224.	GBRMPA	Waters	Underwater Noise	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide an update on GBRMPA's work on creating a guideline on underwater noise which includes mitigation measures, since last estimates. 2. How many FTE are devoted to this task in GBRMPA? 	Written	SQ15-389
225.	MDBA	Singh	MDB Special Account	<p>Senator SINGH: It includes revenue drawn from the Murray-Darling Basin Special Account?</p> <p>Ms Schumann: It does.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Can you provide us with a breakdown of that revenue, whether it is for the measures that you have just spoken about?</p> <p>Ms Schumann: I can. It would probably be best if I gave that to you in writing.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: I just wanted to know how much came from basin states, for which projects and programs, and how much was drawn from the special account and for what purpose.</p> <p>Ms Schumann: Essentially the increase in the cash contributions for jurisdictions was \$13.6 million. That was a negotiated outcome and the cash. An increase in the comparative revenues is a result—\$10 million—primarily of some accounting treatment as a result of the introduction of the PGPA, the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act.</p>	87 25 May	SQ15-188
226. 2	MDBA	Singh	Staffing profile	<p>Senator SINGH: Perhaps you could tell the committee about the general staffing profile as in the basic number of staff in different roles and where they are based.</p> <p>Ms Schumann: They are all based in Canberra, aside from one staff member in Toowoomba.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: And the rest of the profiles and different roles?</p> <p>Ms Schumann: Yes. We could break that down into quite broad levels, but again we do not have that detail with us now.</p>	88 25 May	SQ15-189

				<p>Senator SINGH: If you could take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Schumann: We can provide that on notice, but we would have to do it in fairly broad categories.</p>		
227.	MDBA	Singh	Staffing – changes to duties	<p>Senator SINGH: Have there been any changes of note to staff duties since the last estimates? Has there been any change to the work that the staff are doing?</p> <p>Dr Dickson: The role of the staff varies, for a start, as the Basin Plan is rolled out, so some tasks are completed and new tasks come on. For example, in environmental watering, one of the key tasks of our environmental watering staff on the Basin Plan side was to develop the basin watering strategy over the last couple of years, which is a very detailed piece of work. In these next coming years they will be focusing very much on the water resource planning supporting the development of environmental watering planning under those water resource plans with the states, so things change as the Basin Plan is being rolled out. In the joint programs the decisions on the activities that the governments want are the decisions of those governments, so as those tasks change our staff need to adapt and do different roles. There has not been a huge amount of change in that, but there has been some change.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Are you able to take on notice more specifics in relation to those kinds of changes? I know you are going to provide me, on notice, with the profiles and some of the roles, so perhaps it could be formulated in response to that since last estimates.</p> <p>Ms Schumann: Yes.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: I have some questions about funding.</p> <p>Dr Dickson: Just before you continue, I do not think that there has been a lot of change since last estimates, which was back in February, so there would not have been anything to report on there. We could certainly do the—</p> <p>Senator SINGH: No, since the last budget estimates. Obviously this is about the budget in the last 12 months.</p> <p>Dr Dickson: Since the last budget estimates?</p>	88 25 May	SQ15-190
228.	MDBA	Singh	Suite of programs	<p>ACTING CHAIR: I am interested in the revised suit of programs agreed by the basin sates, how they have changed based on the revised contributions and where you are up to with that.</p> <p>Dr Dickson: The programs for 2015-16 are very similar to the programs for this current year. Since 2011-12, when New South Wales unilaterally reduced funding, there have been significant changes across the programs, but this current year the</p>	89 25 May	SQ15-191

				<p>core programs which are managing the River Murray, the salinity program, the Living Murray program and the supporting science programs are pretty much as they were for this current year and they are very similar for next year, so there has been little change from last year to this in terms of the nature and the scope of the programs.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Are you able to provide us with a bit more detail of that because you said 'very similar'? Could you provide on notice some more detail around what that revised suite of programs that has been agreed to by the basin states looks like.</p> <p>Dr Dickson: Certainly. The basin ministers are due to formally sign off on their corporate plan for next year, so once that is done it could be quite a straightforward job and we can point out what was done this year and what the program is for next year.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Also, could you take on notice a little bit more detail around your work program?</p> <p>Dr Dickson: What sort of detail would you be after in relation to the joint funded programs?</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Just any other detail that you have. I am mindful of time. I do not want to take all my colleagues' time and the chair has returned, so she is probably going to stop me now anyway. We will put it in further questions on notice to you in terms of the detail.</p> <p>Dr Dickson: We could very simply do just a summary of what is involved in each program. We have that information up on our web, so we could probably do a simple assessment like that.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Yes, if you could send that to us. We will have a look and then if we need any further information we can put it on notice. Thank you.</p>		
229.	MDBA	Urquhart	Basin Salinity Management Program	<p>Senator Urquhart: When is the next 15-year program due to start on the Basin Salinity Management program, and how is work progressing on its development?</p> <p>Dr Dickson: I will get someone to report on where we are up to at this stage.</p> <p>Mr McLeod: The next 15-year program for salinity management is being styled as BSM2030, which reflects the period out to 2030. We are currently in a development phase of that program and over the course of the coming year we hope to kick that off and set up arrangements for the period through to 2030.</p> <p>This is the third iteration of the salinity management. The first ones were the Salinity and Drainage Strategy 1998-2001 and the Basin Salinity Management Strategy</p>	94 25 May	SQ15-192

				<p>2001-2015. In moving into this new phase a general review of salinity arrangements was initiated about two years ago in relation to the changes that occurred associated with the basin plan coming about, which was not envisaged at the time that the BSMS was set up in 2001, and we are looking at moderating the efforts associated with implementing the salinity management to actually take account of those new things and also look at the new risk, which is both the benefits of the dilution effect of the environmental water and also any salt metallisation that might occur as a result of those environmental watering events. All of that will be coordinated in an overall comprehensive framework.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You mentioned that you were kicking it off. Did you say later this year?</p> <p>Mr McLeod: Yes. I would have to take on notice the exact timing.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Could you get back to me with the time frames.</p> <p>Mr McLeod: Yes.</p>		
230.	MDBA	Urquhart	International obligations – Murray-Darling Basin Plan	<p>1. The Commonwealth Water Act 2007 makes provision for the management of the water resources of the Murray-Darling Basin. One of its objects (s3(b)) is 'to give effect to the relevant international agreements.... and in particular, to provide for special measures, in accordance with these agreements, to address the threats to the Basin water resources'. What special measures does the Basin Plan provide to address threats to basin water resources and give effect to international agreements?</p> <p>2. Are the measures in the Basin Plan adequate to maintain the ecological character of the Ramsar sites, in particular those characteristics which are dependent on an adequate flow regime?</p>	Written	SQ15-290
231.	MDBA	Urquhart	Sustainable Diversion Limit (SDL) Adjustment Mechanism	<p>Have the trials referenced in Supplementary Estimates QON178 to test and validate the ecological elements methodology and the modelling framework that will underpin the operation of the Sustainable Diversion Limit (SDL) Adjustment Mechanism in 2016 been completed? What were the findings?</p>	Written	SQ15-336