

SENATE ECONOMICS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – 2015-16 SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET ESTIMATES – 22 OCTOBER 2015
INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND SCIENCE PORTFOLIO

Q No.	Senator	Division/ Agency	Broad topic	Question	Hansard page & date or Written question	Date received by Secretariat	Date tabled
SI-1	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Synchrotron funding	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I will come back to the point: are other departmental agencies required to contribute, or is that \$20.5 million entirely through the department of industry?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The \$20.5 million is through the bottom line from the government. The source of funds for that \$20.5 million was considered through the budget development process.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Why can't you tell me who is paying what?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I just said that the government is providing \$20.5 as a budget measure.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, but which agencies within government?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That gets very confusing in terms of the budget development process.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is very confusing to me if you cannot tell me. Where is the money coming from?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The government.</p> <p>CHAIR: I am interested as well, Senator Carr, but \$20.5 million is made up of a number of different contributions from different agencies. That is your proposition. What you are after is the break-up of that between the agencies.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I cannot see what is unreasonable about that.</p> <p>CHAIR: We will try and get it. It looks like we might have some information.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Do you have some information, Madam Secretary?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The \$20.5 million was made up of contributions from other agencies, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Can you tell me what those contributions are?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I have not got that information in front of me. Could I take that on notice, please?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course you can. I am surprised you have not got that in front of you.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I think from the bottom line—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, it is not just a question of the bottom line.</p> <p>CHAIR: We do not want to have an argument, Senator Carr.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I cannot understand why there is this obstruction.</p> <p>CHAIR: Madam Secretary has taken it on notice. She has not got it, so</p>	Page 36		

				there is no point in verballing.			
SI-2	Carr	ANSTO	Capital cost for new beamlines	<p>Senator KIM CARR: You mentioned a figure in terms of the capital cost for new beamlines. So if it is eight to 15 for each new beamline, how many are you building a case for? How many are you seeking to actually secure?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: The next round of the science case has seven beamlines in it. That science case is what I would call a background document to allow us to engage in a conversation with the stakeholder community. It is also put through our science advisory committee, which meets annually, and they also give us guidance on what international best practice is in terms of current developments in beamlines. It therefore is an indicative case. But once capital funding envelopes become available there is a requirement to further engage stakeholders to stratify the resources against the requests and find the most optimal use of the resources to maximise the productivity of our academic and industrial science and engineering users. So there is a conversation with users. There is a series of user groups. As an operator of the facility, we take our user views very, very seriously.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So if you have a science case for seven extra beamlines, what is the aggregate cost for that?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I do not have the full figure in my mind at the moment because they are indicative costs, but I can provide that on notice.</p>	Page 37-38		
SI-3	Carr	ANSTO	Percentage of revenues and comparisons to international standards	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, thank you. You have said that the centre is world-class. I concur with that, from all I have seen. But can you refresh my memory: what is the rate of commercial return for commercial users? Is that world-class as well?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: We have been concentrating on that very intensively. Just as background for the senators, we have essentially two modes of access. On published scientific proposals we have merit based access; this is a universal standard internationally, so that the excellence of the science rather than access to resources wins the debate. For commercial users, and even for academic users who want to protect their intellectual property, we have a fee-for-service approach, and that fee-for-service approach allows them to maintain the confidentiality of the work, whereas, in the merit based access scheme, there is a requirement to publish in the open literature. We have a very strong and growing number of industrial users. The New South Wales government, seeing the virtue of this, has funded an access program for New South Wales companies to the level of \$1.4 million. This has been very successful and has significantly increased the industrial engagement by New South Wales companies who receive benefits from that scheme. In some cases the Victorian voucher scheme has allowed people to access from the Victorian industrial base, and there are a number of other commercial users who pay on that fee-for-service basis.</p> <p>Since we took over operation of the synchrotron, the industrial utilisation of the fee-for-service basis has increased by some 300 per cent, and we</p>	Page 38		

				<p>continue to pursue industrial engagement actively.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the aggregate then, in terms of the percentage of revenues?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I will take on notice the percentage of revenues now from our industrial use for the last financial year—I do not have that number immediately to hand. But it—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How does it compare with the internationals? That is the bit I am interested in.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: In terms of international comparisons, there are slightly different models. I would say that at present, from the information we have, we benchmark well with the most commercially available fee-for-service arrangements. The Canadian model is slightly different. They have a specialised extension service that they use. Just about every dollar that they eventually get from industry is actually used to expand that extension service. I think that is a model that works quite well. They have specifically-identified staff who are trained in industrial engagement. That is a feature of the New South Wales scheme with us as well.</p> <p>I do believe that we have some data. We try to improve this data over time to find out in the merit-based access scheme the extent to which universities and publicly funded research institutions and other users are working with industrial and business collaborators. An indicative number, based on assessments that we have received, indicates that about one in five merit-based access programs support an eventual industrial application or business application of sorts.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you take that on notice for me then? I would like to know what the comparisons are and how you think ANSTO fares by international standards.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: We will certainly do that, Senator.</p>			
SI-4	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Philip Clark Review	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Okay. Madam Secretary, you mentioned this in the last estimates, and my colleague was good enough to pursue these issues at the last estimates back in June—was it June? Yes, that is right. You said that the government was looking in response to the Philip Clark review, and I think you have said similar things today. So where are we up to with the review? That is now some months ago.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That review is being managed through the Department of Education and Training.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: It is looking at a strategy around the funding of science research infrastructure. The government has not yet responded to that report. From our point of view, future ownership and funding arrangements will be considered in the context of the government's response to that review.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How long has the government had that review now?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take on notice when it was provided to the</p>	Page 39		

				<p>Minister for Education and Training.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It has been some while, though, hasn't it?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: As I said, I do not have an exact date on when that was provided to the minister.</p>			
SI-5	Carr	ANSTO	Philip Clark Review	<p>Ms Beauchamp: As I understand it, Phil Clarke has provided a report to the Minister for Education and Training. In terms of developing the government's response, we are of course working with the Department of Education and Training on that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Dr Paterson, you have made a submission to that review?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: ANSTO made a submission and the publicly funded research agencies also collaborated to put in a submission.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I assume you met with Mr Clarke.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I had the opportunity of meeting with Mr Clarke and two members of the committee that he convened.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The Chief Scientist?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: The Chief Scientist was not at that meeting but I understand he was a member of the committee.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So who were the two that you met with?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: It was with Susan Pond and—I would have to take it on notice to find out who the other one was. In fact, it might only have been Susan Pond and Mr Clarke.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I take it you got a good response from them.</p>	Page 39		
SI-6	Carr	ANSTO	Stawell underground physics lab	<p>Dr Paterson: ANSTO on behalf of government maintains the relationship with CERN in Geneva, and this has a second order link to the type of work that CERN does, because some of the neutrino experiments that take place in that facility in Italy use neutrinos that come from CERN. We also have relationships with Japanese partners, for instance the J-PARC facility in Japan, where they have some neutrino experiments. I was recently there and met an Australian researcher, who is associated with the team that looking at that very interesting neutrino experiment. I think that keeping a capacity as a nation to be involved at the cutting edge of particle physics is a useful thing. It is something that ANSTO can support as a national organisation that is involved in nuclear science and technology. It does make sense for us to add some convening power to these types of arrangements over time.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What are the time lines for all these? This is the first stage of the project. When do you expect that to be completed?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I think really we are at the stage where we are securing a quantum of funding to allow the facility to be constructed and go into its commissioning phase. That is really where we are. I think the thinking is there, the early design works are being completed with the current tranche of funding, and there is the qualification of the facility and the development of the stakeholder relationships. These are things for which ANSTO is not</p>	Pages 41-42		

				<p>directly responsible, but I am briefed on them from time to time.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Who is going to manage this project?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: It is going to be managed probably from the consortium that is assembled around the University of Melbourne. It is well within the reach of a modern university to operate a facility of this scale. That would be one logical landing place for the facility in its early period. It will probably be ring-fenced in some way, so that everybody can see their contributions clearly, but that as a model would work.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When do you anticipate the project will be up and running?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: It is dependent on the funding.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much money is required there?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I do not know the full budget envelope. As indicated, we are a partner giving in-kind contributions to support it, but we are not the lead agency.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you able to advise us further on that matter?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I am happy to take it on notice and provide more information. It is certainly an exciting project. People get excited about neutrinos. I hope everybody is a bit more excited about the fact that they are experiencing neutrinos all the time with no effect.</p>			
SI-7	Carr	ANSTO	ANSTO FTE	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What is your current staffing at ANSTO—headcount and full-time equivalent?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I can give it to you as headcount. It is 1,240. I do not have an accurate FTE figure, but I will secure one.</p>	Page 42		
SI-8	Carr	CSIRO	Data61 Organisation chart	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How many people will be employed at Data61?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: At the current time we have a total of 589 staff in NICTA and DP who work for Data61. We have 124 contributed staff from universities, which equates to about 32 FTEs, and we have 391 students. So it is almost 1,000 people in total.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you able to provide us with a corporate structure or an organisational chart for the new entity?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: I can provide on notice a chart of the new senior management structure, yes.</p>	Page 47		
SI-9	Carr	CSIRO	Funding provided to start-ups	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The same story quotes you, Dr Marshall, as saying: ... we want to increase the rate of start-ups and will be investing at least \$100 million over the five-year strategy in increased support for early stage start-ups and hi-tech SMEs ...</p> <p>Is that the figure that has doubled? Are you intending to double that? Where do you get that figure from?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: I do not know that that statement is accurate.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: There are quotes around those words. Have they misquoted you?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: Or perhaps quoted out of context or perhaps quoted in</p>	Page 50		

				<p>relation to the idea of 'if we had a fund'. I do not know if I mentioned the last time we were here that the whole fund story came out because I was asked by Tony Boyd: what was one of the most unusual ideas that came out from the crowd sourcing on the platform? That was it—the idea that CSIRO could stand up a fund to focus on translation. So it is an idea.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can the CFO tell me exactly how much you are spending on start-ups?</p> <p>Ms Bennett: I would not be able to tell you.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can I just finish this line of inquiry.</p> <p>Ms Bennett: I am sorry, Senator, I do not have a figure in front of me as to how much we spend on start-ups. The start-ups, essentially, that CSIRO has historically supported are the investments in the financial statements. They are sitting at a value of about \$14 million. If I took an average figure—because, as you can imagine, each year it does vary according to what is at an appropriate stage to move from science to technology into a start-up—my best estimate would be in the order of \$5 million a year. But I am happy to take that on notice and provide further information.</p>			
SI-10	Rice	CSIRO	Forest and forest product research	<p>Senator RICE: I want to talk about your forest and forest products research. Late last year, three respected and senior former CSIRO researchers published a paper that identified:</p> <p>... a dramatic and damaging reduction in the level of research and development in the forest industry in Australia over the last 5 to 7 years ...</p> <p>Dr Glen Kile and Alan Brown, the former CSIRO forestry chief, were two of the scientists involved. They state:</p> <p>The fragmentation and serious decline of R&D capacity in Australia is a major weakness and a risk to business compared to other timber producing countries such Canada, New Zealand, Finland, Chile and Brazil.</p> <p>I want to get your response to that and what you feel the current state of forest and forest products research is.</p> <p>Dr Marshall: I would have to take that on notice. That is the first I have heard of it.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you do not have any comments about the current state of forest or forest product research?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: No.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay, if you could take on notice your response to that and particularly what the current number of forest scientists and researchers employed by CSIRO is and how that compares to staffing levels 10 years ago and 20 years ago?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: Will do. Sorry that we did not have the information for you.</p>	Page 51		
SI-11	Whish-Wilson	CSIRO	RV Investigator –	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I have some questions on RV <i>Investigator</i> and the use of that boat by Chevron. Could you tell the committee what price</p>	Pages 51-52		

			<p>Chevron contract</p> <p>Chevron is paying for the use of RV <i>Investigator</i> and how that is worked out?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: I would have to refer details on the price to Dr David Williams, who is responsible for the Marine National Facility.</p> <p>Dr D Williams: Can I just clarify: you asked for details on the process of allocation?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could tell us what they are paying for the use of the boat; is it a lease fee of some sort?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: Which work are you talking about in particular?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Chevron going to the Great Australian Bight.</p> <p>Dr D Williams: The Chevron work is a package of research that Chevron and CSIRO have agreed to undertake in the Great Bight. That work is around the deep ocean, the lower ocean and substrata, and to do that work they are required to use the <i>Investigator</i>. So the <i>Investigator</i> is part of the scientific package.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I understand that, but are they leasing it on commercial terms?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: No, they are not leasing it. They have placed a contract with CSIRO to undertake the research work, and, within CSIRO, we are using the vessel and paying for the vessel to be used, in terms of its running costs.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you tell us what those costs are? How long the project is going to go for? I only have the media release from the minister here. It provides some detail.</p> <p>Dr D Williams: The Chevron work is 39 days at sea. We cost the running cost of the vessel, per day, at \$68,000, and that is just the actual consumable cost of being at sea.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: So Chevron are not financially contributing to that cost?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: They are through the contract for the research. There is a contract with CSIRO to undertake research, and part of that research is to use the vessel. There is not a separate contract for the vessel.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you tell us the dimensions around that contract?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: Can I take that on notice? We will have to talk to Chevron about releasing commercial data about the value of that contract.</p>			
SI-12	Whish-Wilson	CSIRO	<p>RV <i>Investigator</i> – Chevron contract</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: The minister acknowledges that in his release. He also says: It will also improve understanding of the ecology and provide baseline data to inform environmental assessments. And, of course, the release talks about looking at prospectivity for oil and gas exploration in the Great Australian Bight. I would have thought a big company like Chevron is interested in the prospectivity of drilling for oil</p>	Page 52		

				<p>and gas and exploration to look at the risks and dimensions around that. If, as the minister refers to, this collaboration is informing environmental assessments, are they environmental assessments for Chevron so they can go oil and gas drilling?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: No, we are on a mission where CSIRO will crew the vessel. The data will be collected against a plan. All that data in the time scale of 12 months will be made publicly available. Chevron will be able to do their own analysis on the data, CSIRO will be available to do the analysis and any group in the country—or, indeed, in the world—will be able to access those data and do their own analysis.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: What is the importance of that data? I can see why Chevron would want it, but what about the taxpayer who is paying for the boat?</p> <p>Dr D Williams: It is about understanding the marine environment around Australia and having a better understanding of the ecology of the Great Australian Bight.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: My understanding—and congratulations to Senator Carr and his government for delivering it on time and on budget—is that the boat was significantly oversubscribed—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, that is not right.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: in terms of science time, mostly with long-term collaborative projects. Could you give us an idea of the kinds of projects that CSIRO are conducting and whether they are parts of long-term projects.</p> <p>Dr D Williams: On this particular mission?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: On this particular 39 days with Chevron.</p> <p>Dr D Williams: Yes, we can take it on notice and send you a descriptor of the science involved. My colleague, who is also involved in this work, can give a bit of information today.</p>			
SI-13	Waters	CSIRO	CSG Study – phase 1 wells	<p>Senator WATERS: In relation to sample size, phase 1 was 43 wells and the authors described that as a very small sample—which indeed it was, considering how many wells there are. Why, then, are there only six wells being looked at in phase 2?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: The 43 wells are around one per cent of the wells in the production region. The sampling methodology that was engaged to determine which wells were looked at was done with the aim of trying to get a representative sample of wells so that the results that come out of that work are not biased—they are indicative of what is actually going on in the field. Because of the nature of the more detailed work associated with well completion, the sample number is lower. So far we have undertaken measurements around four well completions and measurements around one work-over. So these are measurements that are made over a number of days, while that process is going on in each case.</p>	Page 63		

				<p>Senator WATERS: Did you confine the selection of the six to those that have been in the 43?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I do not know the answer to that question. I could take that on notice.</p>			
SI-14	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	CSIRO Board	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Minister, what is the process to fill three vacancies on the CSIRO board?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: The recommendations come through from the minister, from memory, and they will go to cabinet.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: They are cabinet appointments?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: Yes, that is right.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You are the Cabinet Secretary. What is the process for filling the vacancies?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: We will await recommendations from the minister.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So they have not come in yet?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: I would have to go back and check. There is a long list the Cabinet Secretary has to go through. It could be on that list.</p>	Page 64		
SI-15	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Quadrennium agreement	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The quadrennium agreement is non-binding? The strategy agreement or the quadrennium agreement?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The quadrennium agreement.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is non-binding?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: We are waiting for finalisation of that plan.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The budget is non-binding?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The budget is binding, of course, through the budget process.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The funding agreement you are saying is non-binding?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: It is a non-legally-binding document.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So it is not worth a dob of glue?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Sorry, Senator: the budget itself is binding and we are in the process of considering further agreements based on the outcomes of the strategic planning exercise that CSIRO has just been through.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Madam Secretary, that does not sound like a very specific line of inquiry. It is like trying to grab smoke with this government, is it not?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I think the budget provides a certainty in funding for CSIRO over the forward estimates and we are in the process of providing advice to the government and to the minister on the next quadrennium funding agreement.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So when will it be concluded?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 65		
SI-16	Carr	CSIRO	CSIRO staffing numbers	<p>Senator KIM CARR: On notice, can I have a breakdown of staffing numbers across CSIRO, by headcount and FTE, broken down by location?</p> <p>Mr Roy: You can.</p>	Page 67		

SI-17	Carr	CSIRO	NICTA	<p>Dr Marshall: The combination of NICTA and CSIRO—NICTA also has capability in this area—has really supercharged our capacity in this predictive analytics area. I think you will see even more valuable things in the future as a result of that combination.</p> <p>Dr Wonhas: You are correct; we are expanding the transit model from, originally, cattle transport to now 50 commodities in the north of Australia. We certainly hope that the results from this model will help to direct the \$700 million investment that the government wants to make into northern roads to the most beneficial use for this country.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: I know the model has been used to some extent for the beef industry already, but how long is it going to take to start getting useful information for those 50 commodities?</p> <p>Dr Wonhas: This is off the top of my head, but I will correct that. I think the full 50 commodities will be available in 2017.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Okay.</p>	Page 68		
SI-18	Carr	IP Australia	Gene patents – High Court Decision	<p>Ms Beattie: The amendments that were made under raising-the-bar bill included increasing the bar for inventive step. It included examination for utility, which was not examined previously. It introduced, as you might appreciate, the broad research exemption. It increased the requirement for the description requirements in the claims of the specification of the patent.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That refreshes my memory. That is what I understood it to mean, but this patent was brought before those amendments to the IP regime here.</p> <p>Ms Beattie: It was granted before those amendments, yes. In fact the patent was granted over 20 years ago and has now expired.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. Would a patent of that type have been issuable under raising-the-bar amendments?</p> <p>Ms Beattie: It would be more difficult to be issued. It goes back to the time at which it was applied for. If the patent were applied for before the human genome was published and the raising-the-bar legislative provisions were in place then it would possibly have been more difficult to satisfy the inventive step requirement, because it was higher.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, I am trying to get to another point. Could you have a patent of the type that the High Court has now struck down registered given our current legal framework?</p> <p>Ms Beattie: It is difficult to make a general analysis without a specific claim before you in terms of understanding.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: All I am saying is that was the subject of the High Court ruling. Could that be registered in today's legal framework?</p> <p>Ms Beattie: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you take it on notice? When I watched the media reports I thought that these matters had already been attended to with the package of measures that have been described as raising the bar. Can</p>	Pages 69-70		

				<p>you confirm that that is the case or otherwise? Ms Beattie: The High Court considered what was patent-eligible— Senator KIM CARR: at that time. Ms Beattie: Even today. The raising-the-bar bill did not change the provisions of the manner of the manufacture test—the patent eligibility component. There was nothing in the raising-the-bar bill that addressed that, and the High Court was focused on that particular element of the legislation. Senator KIM CARR: I presume there is no proposal to change the legislation to strike down or neutralise the High Court decision. Mr Kelly: The High Court decision is fairly recent. At the moment, we have sought no authority for legislative change. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I understand that. My point is: is there intention to amend IP legislation to take into account the High Court decision one way or the other? Mr Kelly: At present there is no intention.</p>			
SI-19	Carr	IP Australia	Gene patents – High Court Decision	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How will it be administered from now on? Mr Kelly: As I said, our proposed administration post the Myriad decision has been embodied in a draft practice note that we have released for consultation. Senator KIM CARR: How many submissions have you received for that practice note? Mr Kelly: The practice note is open for submissions until 30 October. I am not sure how many submissions we have received to date. Senator KIM CARR: All right. What is the date of return of questions here? CHAIR: The fourth of December. Senator KIM CARR: So, as of the 30th, can you indicate to me how many submissions you received? Mr Kelly: Certainly we can take that on notice.</p>	Page 70		
SI-20	Carr	Corporate	Date of notification of meeting at University of Western University	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the role of the department in last week's meeting the Prime Minister had at the University of Western Sydney? Ms Beauchamp: I attended that meeting last Friday at the University of Western Sydney. Is that the one you are talking about? Senator KIM CARR: Yes. It was the one on 15 October. Ms Beauchamp: My role there was to support my ministers. So it is primarily a listening role in terms of hearing from both academia and business about what works and what does not work—just some of the ideas, whether there were any barriers or constraints around innovation and addressing some of the areas around skills and capability. So it was primarily a listening role for me. Senator KIM CARR: Is the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet the lead agency for this meeting? Ms Beauchamp: Yes, in supporting the Prime Minister they would be the</p>	Page 71		

				<p>lead agency in terms of organising it, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When did you become aware of the meeting?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: We were told that CSIRO were made aware on 10 October, which would have been the Saturday before. When did you become aware of it?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: It was about that time that I knew it was going to occur. My role, rather than receiving a formal invitation as such, was there to support my ministers.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But it was developed on a Saturday.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: You would have to ask the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I am just asking if you were told about it on a Saturday?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: As I said earlier, I would have to take it on notice, specifically. It was around that time.</p>			
SI-21	Carr	Corporate	Breakdown of ministerial responsibilities	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I would be interested to know if I could get a clear statement as to what assistant ministers are responsible for.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: Can I take that on notice on behalf of the minister, because those issues are usually dealt with at a portfolio level between minister and parliamentary secretary or assistant minister and junior minister.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That might be the case, Senator Ryan, but certainly in my time, parliamentary secretaries were allocated responsibilities which the department knew about so that they could actually deal in an administrative sense with particular divisions or programs. Is that the case under this minister?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Both Minister Frydenberg and Minister Pyne have given us some clear guidance in terms of responsibility of the assistant ministers, but until that is absolutely formalised through the political process it is probably unwise for me to go into detail about that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. So we are still working that out.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: We just need to confirm it.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you want to take it on notice?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Indeed.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Would you provide then a breakdown of all the policy areas—program areas—listed in the department's organisational chart, outlining how they report to Ministers Pyne and Frydenberg and Assistant Ministers Andrews and Roy? Can you provide that information?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Taking the previous question on notice until it is confirmed, I can certainly provide that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I need that level of detail, if you would not mind.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Yes.</p>	Pages 75-76		
SI-22	Carr	Corporate	FTE of the	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the FTE of the department now—the</p>	Page 77		

			department	<p>establishment of the department?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The FTE would be—in terms of headcount we probably have 2,679. But in terms of our ASL staffing, which is indicated in the budget papers it probably has not changed much since the budget. I think we are looking at a 25,388 ASL number.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Could you provide the FTE by division on notice?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: FTE by division? Yes I could provide that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many of the staff are employed on fixed term contracts? We have about 2,470 ongoing staff and probably 209 non-ongoing staff.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p>			
SI-23	Carr	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Digital Economy programmes	<p>Senator KIM CARR: With regard to the digital economy, under the administrative orders there is reference to, 'the national policy issues relating to the digital economy'. Where does that program sit within the department now?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That program will probably sit within our strategic policy area. There are two elements related to the coalition commitments around the digital economy. There was a stream of work related to what is now being managed through the Digital Transformation Office, and there is also the work that has been transferred to us in terms of policy work around the digital economy and what that means for industry policy.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I think you said 28 had been transferred from communications?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: 28 positions, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Will all 28 be working in the same areas in the department of industry and innovation?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That is the proposal—to keep the team together—yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I have been led to believe that the Department of Communications, when asked some questions on the digital economy matters on Tuesday, specified that the status of 34 digital productivity initiatives at appendix C of the Advancing Australia as a Digital Economy. I am just wondering, are you undertaking all of those programs now in the department of industry?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: These, I understand, were programs that were initiated by the previous government and continued under the current government. Are you planning to cancel any of those initiatives?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 77		
SI-24	Carr	Corporate	Ministerial staff entitlements	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Of the ministerial staff previously employed by Mr Macfarlane, how many of them have transferred over to the new minister and assistant ministers?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I am aware that two officers have transferred to Minister</p>	Pages 78-79		

			<p>Pyne's office and one officer to Minister Frydenberg's office.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are there any ministerial staff vacancies within the minister's office?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will have to take that on notice and just check with each of the ministers. My understanding is that I think they have the full complement.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The reason I ask that is because the convention was that the department would provide ministerial staff for a limited period. Is that still in play?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: According to the guidelines, we do assist with the transition period until permanent officers and advisers are found.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is up to three months; is that right?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Indeed, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Do you have any officers currently serving in ministerial offices other than the DLOs?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: There are two officers in Assistant Minister Andrew's office and one officer in Assistant Minister Roy's office.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: In what capacity are they serving?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: They are only there in a transitional basis, as we have said, just to make sure that they can support and keep the office—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So are they extra numeri at the moment?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I am not sure what you mean.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are they in addition to ministerial entitlements?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: No, they are not.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So are they filling vacancies?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Whilst the permanent staffing is being filled, we are trying to provide some continuity of business with—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I am not arguing about the legitimacy of their practice; I just want to know: are they in addition? I thought you said before that the ministerial positions have been filled. Have you got additional officers in the ministerial offices—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Do you mean over and above the compliment?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, over the top of the established ones.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice because sometimes, if there is a person sick for example, they might come off and head up the office.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But that is not in addition; that is a temporary vacancy.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: No, it could be in addition, to be fair. If there was an announcement or some work was being undertaken and someone was off work for a week, that would, I think, fit the criteria you outlined before of being in addition.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, they are not in addition; they are filling a</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>temporary vacancy.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: Not if a person is on sick leave. They would not be filling under the way that ministerial entitlements work. I understand, from my other committee I did for many years, if somebody came up to supplement an office while someone was on sick leave, they are still actually employed. I would not want to mislead you and say they were there for—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I want to know if these three additional officers in the executive wing are filling unfilled vacancies or are an addition to the establishment within the executive officers.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will take that on notice.</p>			
SI-25	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	R&D Tax Incentive	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The first one is an R&D tax incentive—a very simple proposition. Is it still the government's intention to pursue the measures contained in Tax Superannuation Laws Amendment (2015 Measures No. 3) Bill. That is the one that cuts the incentive for the R&D tax by 1.5 percentage points.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: Senator Carr, given you asked is it the government's intention, I will take that on notice and see if I can get an answer—not being as familiar with the—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is a straightforward policy—I want to know if the policy has changed with regard to the bill.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: I appreciate and you appreciate that it is also not in my portfolio. I do not want to mislead you but I will take it on notice and seek confirmation.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you, and I would like to also ask: can you confirm that the effective date for that measure is 1 July 2014.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: I will take that on notice as well—I am sure you understand.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I presume that does not have to go through the full rigmarole.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: No, I will seek advice from the minister's office.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p> <hr/> <p>Ms Schofield: Senator Carr, you put a question on notice about the starting date for the R&D tax measure that is currently sitting before parliament. The starting date, as you mentioned, was 1 July 2014.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And it is the intention to proceed with that legislation?</p> <p>Ms Schofield: I thought that the minister had answered that question.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: No, I said I have taken it on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You have got the answer to the second half; it is the first half we are still waiting on.</p> <p>Ms Schofield: The answer to this one was to double-check the legislation that is currently sitting before parliament.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, I am not arguing the toss about this.</p> <p>Senator Ryan: To be fair to the officials, it is predicated on the answer to</p>	Pages 84 and 86		

				the first question.			
SI-26	Carr	Minister Pyne	18 th round of CRCs	<p>Senator KIM CARR: When can we expect the 18th round for the CRCs?</p> <p>Ms Schofield: That would be a decision for government about when any future round would take place.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Minister, when will we get an announcement on the 18th round?</p> <p>Senator Ryan: I will take that on notice</p>	Page 85		
SI-27	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	AIG employee numbers	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. Under the Enterprise Connect program, business advisers were drawn from industry but they were employed by the department.</p> <p>Ms Mulder: There was a combination of arrangements in terms of employment arrangements. Some were definitely non-ongoing employees with the department, but a number were also employed through partner organisations.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many of the non-ongoing employees are still with the department?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: Seventy-two positions have been filled by existing personnel.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are they still employed directly by the department?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: No. A tender took place late last year, early this year to engage industry partners. Specified personnel who undertake those services for research connections and business management are engaged through industry partners.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Who are those industry partners?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: There are 10 industry partners in total. Would you like me to read them out?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, please.</p> <p>Ms Mulder: Austmine Ltd, Australian Industry Group, Australian Manufacturing Technology Institute Limited, Business Foundations Inc., Business South Australia, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia Inc., CSIRO, Deloitte Private Pty Ltd, Geelong Manufacturing Council and New South Wales Business Chamber.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many are employed by AiG?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: Twenty-three.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you give me a breakdown, please, of each of those providers and how many people they employ?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: Starting from the start: at Austmine Ltd there are a total of seven—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You could take it on notice if you like if it is a pretty straightforward—</p> <p>Ms Mulder: You would like me to repeat the name and the total of employees?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If you can, but if you have just got a table there—we are running short of time—can you table the table?</p>	Page 87		

				Ms Mulder: Certainly.			
SI-28	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	EIP Partners	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Have you had any complaints from anybody about the employment of these advisers and facilitators by the industry associations?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: No.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: None at all?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: Not to our knowledge.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Your website still refers to the program as the Entrepreneurs' Infrastructure Program. You are saying it is not three partners; it is 10 partners. That is the point? I think your website refers to three.</p> <p>Ms Mulder: I would have to check that, but there are three elements to the Entrepreneurs' Program and definitely 10 industry partners. I can confirm that they are on our website.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the AusTender reference for these arrangements?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: I might need to take that on notice.</p>	Page 88		
SI-29	Carr	Corporate	EIP Partners	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I take it it was a tender—</p> <p>Ms Mulder: It was an open tender, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is it the case that the department still has a role in picking the advisers?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: The industry partners are responsible for the engagement of specified personnel.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you do not have any role at all?</p> <p>Ms Mulder: The industry partners do provide names of specified personnel for the department for consideration.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: On notice, can I have a list of all industry department contracts and programs that are contracted out to Ai Group? Can you give me a list of all of those?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Is that just in relation to the Entrepreneurs' Program?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No; all industry programs.</p> <p>Mr Schwager: We would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course. I would expect you would. I would like to know, if you could, please, the number of contracts and a summary against each contract outlining the value of the contract and the type of services that are delivered.</p> <p>Mr Schwager: Can I just clarify: is that a request for all AiG contracts, not contracts within the Entrepreneurs' Program?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No; all—right across the whole department with AiG.</p> <p>Mr Schwager: We will take that on notice.</p>	Page 88		
SI-30	Carr	AusIndustry – Business	Status of AusIndustry	Senator KIM CARR: Are all of the AusIndustry programs still run as they were two years ago?	Page 88		

		Services	programmes	<p>Ms Schofield: I would have to get the relevant AusIndustry officials in the room.</p> <p>Mr Hazlehurst: Ms Butler will probably join us in the room in a moment and can expand. Yes, to the extent that there are other AusIndustry programs continuing that are not part of the Entrepreneurs' Program, those are still managed through the rest of AusIndustry, and AusIndustry itself then has a direct engagement with the business community.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you take on notice what AusIndustry programs have ceased in the last two years? I will not waste your time. I would like to know all AusIndustry programs that have ceased in the last two years.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I do not wish to labour the point, but in terms of AusIndustry programs, AusIndustry deliver programs on behalf of other organisations as well.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Well, programs that have ceased and therefore AusIndustry is not delivering</p>			
SI-31	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Commercialisation assistance	<p>Senator McKIM: I have only been in the Senate a short time, but on my preliminary look at this issue, I would like to submit that there are gaps for internet-based start-ups. Senator Ryan might wish to refute that. My question goes back to priority sectors. I am struggling a little to know why you would badge five areas as priority sectors if you are trying to argue that they do not get priority assistance. What is the priority here?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: There has been a fair bit of work done in this area looking at Australia's competitive and comparative advantage. These areas have been identified through various means, but that does not mean that other sectors are not important outside this portfolio. I think what you are raising is certainly what has been raised under the new PM and our new ministers, in terms of an area that we might need to look at about jobs and productivity, and that is the ICT sector and start-ups. There are certainly some views and comments coming forward in these round tables and through the innovation task force that is being run by PM&C.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: But you have not been asked to review the structures of the program as yet?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Not formally, but of course we are looking at what can be done within existing programs.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: I do not want to belabour the point, but I am struggling to understand the program in the context that you have identified five priority sectors. Do they receive priority assistance if they qualify under those five sectors?</p> <p>CHAIR: You just asked that question.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: With respect, I do not fully understand the answer, because if they are priority sectors, surely they would receive some priority assistance.</p> <p>CHAIR: I am keen for you to be heard and get your answers, but if you</p>	Page 90		

				<p>could just ask your question—if you do not like the answer, I am sorry, but you cannot keep re-asking it.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Just so that there is no perceived insult, it is not a question of me not liking the answer, it is a question of me not understanding the answer, so I am seeking some clarification. If you fall within those five sectors, do you receive priority assistance?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: For some programs, and perhaps we might be able to take on notice the programs that are provided across government in relation to tech start-ups, in particular.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: I would be happy for you to do that. I thank you for the offer and I accept that.</p>			
SI-32	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	ATS – company contracts	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How much is left in the ATS over the life of the program?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: I beg your pardon?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much money is left in the ATS over the life of the program?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: The expected spend at the moment is \$1.7 billion from the \$2.5 billion available.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: There is \$0.8 billion left?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: In expected underspend.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The underspend is \$0.8 billion, is it?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: Yes. That is for the capped aspect of the program. For the uncapped aspect, there is an expected spend of \$337 million.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That is out to 2020-2021?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: Correct.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Do the current forward estimates take into consideration the figures from funds that are committed to the ATS for firms that are not directly contracted to companies operating in Australia—that is, firms that have contracts with international suppliers at the moment?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: We will need to clarify that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much is your expectation?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: Sorry, could we clarify the question?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It has been presumed that the only companies that are eligible for assistance are the ones who have direct contracts with Holden, Ford and Toyota for production in Australia. That is not true, is it?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: There are other export customers as well.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That is right. They are entitled to support under the scheme. I want to know, in your expectation, the number of firms that have direct contracts with companies, and does that affect your projections on the forward estimates?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: I might need to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course you will. I appreciate that. Will you be able to tell me how many firms are likely to be in that category?</p>	Page 94		

				Dr B Williams: I would need to take that on notice.			
SI-33	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	ATS – national interest provisions	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course. How many firms have applied for national interest provisions?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: To date, there are 12 that have been allowed on national interest provisions and there are currently three requests in train.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is it the case that the national interest provisions apply for only one year? Or is it two?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: I believe it is up to two years.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Of the 12 that have been allowed, how many of them have already passed two years or are in their second year?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: I need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many have been unsuccessful?</p> <p>Dr B Williams: Again, I need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Page 94		
SI-34	Carr	Corporate	ICT Sustainability Plan	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The ICT sustainability plan, which was implemented in 2010, sets a target of 100 per cent government owned and purchased general use office paper to be from recycled content from 1 July 2015. How well has that plan gone?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: The Department of the Environment is responsible for that plan. We understand the plan has lapsed and is no longer active.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you tell me why that is? Have you had any advice on that?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: It is something the Department of the Environment would have to respond to.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you had no input into that?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Not that I recall.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I just find it odd. The Commonwealth puts \$9.5 million into the development of a de-inking facility for recycled paper, has a policy of 100 per cent recycled paper, and then we go off and close the program down. You did not have any say over that whatsoever? You were not consulted? You were not asked in any way?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I do not know if the program was closed; I think it lapsed.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. Was there any consultation about maintaining the program?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I am not sure. I would have to take that on notice.</p>	Pages 95-96		
SI-35	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Enhanced Project By-law Scheme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: So there has been no change to the Commonwealth costs associated with this? The officer before provided me with a list of projects. The Enhanced Project By-law Scheme amendments are said to save \$1.9 billion. How does that come about?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: It is a deregulation saving.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How is that? You just do not implement them—is that how you deregulate it?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I am not sure of the document that you are reading from.</p>	Page 96		

				<p>Senator KIM CARR: This is the list of measures in the Industry and Science portfolio deregulation report, quarter 3: 'Enhanced Project By-law Scheme'. Is the way in which you are saving money from it by not implementing the program?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: It relates to the savings to industry.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, that is what I mean. Does industry save money by not having to do these things anymore?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How does that fit with the requirement to encourage the development of Australian industry capacity?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: As I mentioned in my previous comments, when a proponent came forward with a major project—and we had received some fairly direct stakeholder feedback on this—they had to comply with the AIP requirements. They also had to comply with largely similar enhanced project by-laws requirements. The work that was done within the department related to alignment of those two processes so that they did not have to go through the process twice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How do we find a saving of \$79,000 in regard to the continuation of funding for the Australian industry participation policies? How do you reduce costs there, since there seems to have been no change in the policy from what you said to me before?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: It relates to administrative processes. I could get you a more detailed response to that on notice.</p>			
SI-36	Ludlam	Resources	<p>National Radioactive Waste Management Project</p>	<p>Senator LUDLAM: I have a couple of questions that go to the National Radioactive Waste Management Project that was initiated by Minister Macfarlane. He no longer holds the relevant portfolio, so I am just checking on the big picture before I go to a couple of detailed questions. Are there any major changes of direction to be expected under the new minister, or is it steady as she goes?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: If I can characterise your question: it is 'steady as she goes'. There is no change in direction.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: In relation to the detailed business case for the National Radioactive Waste Management Project, what is the current status of the DBC?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: The DBC has not yet commenced. We are currently working through and about to finalise a tender for a consultant to come on board. When the minister moves ahead with proposed nominations for comment the detailed business case planning process will begin at the same time.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: So it has not been awarded yet. I have a couple of questions that go to slippage in the time line. But before I do I want to preface them by saying that I would much rather this was done right than rapidly, so I am certainly not here to give you a hard time about timing. I think Minister Macfarlane did the right thing in slowing the clock down a</p>	Page 97-99 and written 11 November 2015		

			<p>little bit to allow the process to unfold. Do you know who your consultant is going to be to aid you in preparing the DBC for tender?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: You are asking about the consultancy for the detailed business case?</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: We are just finalising that now. I am not in a position to be able to identify the consultancy.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Not even who it is? Is that because you do not know who it is yet?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: We know, but we have not finalised the process to do that. It is very, very near, but we have not done that yet.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I will take 'very, very near'.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: If you would like to put that on notice, we will be able to advise you of who it is very shortly.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Okay, if it is that close. It does sound imminent. That is fine. And that will be to take that case to the market looking for a tenderer, or a set of tenderers, presumably? Is that where that goes, or what happens then?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: We have run a request for tender for that consultancy.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I see.</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: The consultancy will help us compile a detailed business case and a few other factors. That is why I cannot answer at the moment. We have worked through to the point where we are just finalising the tender.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: In that case I might just formally ask you to take that on notice. When you are in a position to update us, I would appreciate that.</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: Yes.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: There is a bit of a news that I found a bit curious. Tony McGrady, the mayor of Mount Isa, has made what I guess you could call an 11th-hour expression of interest to host the facility. I have not spoken to the mayor about it, but there was a little bit of media about that proposition. Could you clarify if that proposal has been or will be accepted and considered as a formal nomination. I preface that by pointing out that the nomination process is well and truly closed and has been for a while, which you would all be well aware of.</p> <p>Mr Wilson: There are several layers to that. Firstly, we are aware of the comments by the mayor. We have not received in the department a nomination from Mount Isa. At this point there is nothing to consider. In terms of your point about the process being formally closed: that is true. The former minister did have a process inviting nominations, and that nomination process has closed. However, under the act a person may make</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>a valid nomination at any point up to the point, as I understand it, that the minister has made a final decision on a preferred site. It is up to the minister then as to whether they want to consider that nomination.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I will take your word for the black-and-white reading of the act. One thing that you folks have set in motion which the previous government did not, for whatever reasons, was you have stood up a number of panels of people with various expertise to assist in making the decision on the kind of criteria that should be applied on shortlisting and then on the shortlists themselves. I do not understand how you could then accept somebody parachuting a late nomination into the process without needing to restart that short-list process. How does this work in terms of not just the ministerial decision and his discretion, but these reference groups that you have stood up that have spent months of their time doing these assessments? How does that work, if somebody can just turn up at the last minute with a brand-new idea?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: You are asking me to speculate on a situation that has not occurred yet. There has not been a nomination, so we do not have a process in place for it.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: But just to be clear: there is nothing in the act that would prevent the minister from accepting a late nomination either to be shortlisted, or to find itself back in the process at some stage?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: In a technical, black-and-white reading of the act, that is correct, as far as I understand.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Okay.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: If I could give you some confidence around the process: both the former minister and the current minister are well aware of the many steps that we are going through in this process. They would, of course, be mindful of the integrity of the process that is in front of them, and we would provide advice around it. Just to provide some context around this general proposition: all parties, including the ministers that we are working with—former and current—are well aware of the importance of a very thorough process with independent advice.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: It is good to be reminded of that and to hear that again on the record. But you can see where I am coming from: that process did not envisage late, completely random proposals for radioactive waste dumps to be parachuted into your process months after the formal nomination process has closed.</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Ludlam, your point has been made. You have been answered.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Maybe it has been made twice, Chair. I will move on. Could you please walk us through the broad terms and scope of the detailed business case. As somebody who is outside this formal process, could you tell me what it incorporates. I did have briefings from the former minister,</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>so I have a very rough idea of why you are doing it this way—and I think it is better than what we were served up with under the previous government. But I am not in the room, so just walk us through the broad scope of what the detailed business case is after.</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: There is very clear guidance on the Department of Finance's website. What we are going through is a two-stage capital works process, and the detailed business case is one element of that two-stage capital works process.</p> <p>The detailed business case, in a broad sense, will be looking at the design. You would recall that the initial business case—the first part of a two-stage process—identified a number of design options. The purpose of a detailed business case is to, now, further consider those design options and come up with a recommended—not sure if that is the correct word, in the DBC context—option that can be put to government for consideration. That will include activities such as the design, the costings and all of those things that go into being able to put a proposition to government for consideration. External to that but partly related to it would be the process of going through the regulatory requirements that would need to be met, the site-licensing requirements and the environmental requirements that we have talked about. There are those two parallel streams of the environment and nuclear regulatory processes.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: From my recollection, the initial business case documents were released at the end of last year or maybe earlier. They have been in the public domain for a while, anyway. They kept live a fairly broad range of management options, including co-locating long-lived intermediate-level waste—that is, the reprocessing waste and spent fuel—with the shorter half-life low-level waste and a couple of other categories of material, either co-locating them in a remote location or splitting them up and applying different management solutions to the different categories of waste. Does the DBC keep those—there were more, actually; there were two or three, from my recollection—</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: Four.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Are all four of those options still live or have you started narrowing those down?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: No, those options will be taken through the detailed business case. There is one option that is always the case of 'do nothing' or 'business as usual'.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: That was one of the four, was it?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: Yes. Then, there was an option around co-location, as you said. One of the options was also not to co-locate. There was a fairly broad range of options that were still available for assessment.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Have any of those four options been set aside for the purpose of the detailed business case?</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Mr Sheldrick: Not at this point.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Is that DBC examining the issues of ownership and operation of any future national facility, no matter what category of material it ends up hosting?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: The operational processes and ownership will be part of the broader—whether it is entirely in the DBC. I am just a little bit hesitant in that there are a number of processes that will be run at the same time, some of these other regulatory ones. In that overall process, we will need to look at operational arrangements as well for the facility.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: The DBC, I guess, is where I would expect to find answers to these sorts of things; thanks for that. Is it envisaged, in the case that you are putting together, that the federal government or its various agencies would be responsible for ownership and operation, or are you contemplating some form of a public-private model or even a fully privatised model?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: We have not ruled any of those in or out. We will be looking at the range of options, there.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: In terms of final custodianship, under the proposed Muckaty dump that was live until a year or so ago, the idea was that a lease would be signed over for 300 years and that property would, then, pass—from recollection—back to the traditional owners of the area. Is that what we are still considering or is it too early to be trying to pin down some of those kinds of arrangements?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: Issues around traditional ownership and native title, it is too early to be considering—</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Because you do not have a block yet.</p> <p>Mr Wilson: because we do not yet have a serious set of options, a broad suite of options. As I understand it—Mr Sheldrick can correct me—under the act, the Commonwealth acquires the land as freehold title. That may involve, depending on the various ownership structures, other forms of compensation and negotiation.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: It is probably unfair to try to pin you down now; I get that it is probably a little bit early to tell. In relation to the National Repository Capital Contribution Fund, there are two administrative models outlined. Do you have any further insight you can give us as to whether you have landed on one of the two?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: No, we have not landed on either of them.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: With any of these that you are not able to tell us, at the moment—where clarity will be provided when the detailed business case comes into the public domain—I ask that you take those questions on notice. ...</p> <p>.....</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Clarification of question:</p> <p>Part one should be - basically - <i>will the Department or Minister accept late nominations?</i></p> <p>Specifically if we can ask on notice:</p> <p>Is there a process for accepting late nominations for potential sites for a national radioactive waste management facility? If yes, what is that process If no, does that mean the Department / Minister will not accept any late nominations</p> <p>(Part two seems like a set of questions on potential sites - that Senator Ludlam was asking in reference to the short listed sites to be announced)</p> <p>Specifically if the Senator can ask on notice:</p> <p>What land tenure arrangements would be developed for these sites (eg. 300 year lease returned back to traditional owners as was proposed at Muckaty?) Which administrative model is preferred for the National Repository Capital Contribution Fund - and why is it preferred? Have any of the four options for storage (being co-location of LLW and ILW, reprocessing, do nothing, and splitting the storage of ILW and disposal of LLW) been set aside for the purpose of a detailed business case?</p>			
SI-37	Carr	Anti-dumping Commission	Application processing times	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How long does it take to get a determination? What is the shortest time and what is the longest time to get a determination?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: Under the legislation, there are 155 calendar days. As some senators around the table will probably be aware from previous hearings, that is the shortest time possible under the WTO antidumping agreement. Australia adopted that position in legislation in the late 1990s.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the shortest time you have been able to process an application?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: Currently, we are averaging around 270 days for complex matters. This is not, in my view, an unreasonable performance outcome given the complexity and the increasing complexity of the matters that we are investigating.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How does it compare to international practice—for example, with the United States and Canada?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: The US is a bifurcated system and the bifurcated system, when you combine the two sides of the investigation, takes a minimum of 365 days. The Canadians are a little shorter than that. However, even with</p>	Page 102		

				<p>an average of 275 days, the Australian jurisdiction is still in the top two or three when it comes to efficient outcomes from dumping and countervailing systems.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Would you say that the applicants are more successful in the United States and in Canada than in Australia or less successful?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: I do not have the information in front of me about the performance outcomes of the US system. It is a highly institutionalised and litigious system in the US, and I do not have any analysis that suggests what the success rates might be.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you take it on notice? Would you have the resources to give us an indication?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: Yes.</p>			
SI-38	Carr	Senator Sinodinos	Safeguards Senate Resolution	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you aware of the resolution passed in the Senate on 10 September as a joint notice of motion, urging much more rapid action before Australia loses its steelmaking capacity, comparing us to the global steel industry crisis, and urging a range of procurement safeguard measures? Are you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: Yes, I am aware of the motion.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The notice of motion called for the government to immediately refer matters to the dumping of sub-cost steel in Australia to the Anti-Dumping Commission for a preliminary report within three weeks, including an assessment of the possible harm to the local industry and options for action, including duties and WTO emergency safeguards.</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: Safeguards are not a matter for the commission.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That was the nature of the resolution carried by the Senate. Was that matter referred to you?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: No, Senator.</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: The safeguards are not a matter for the commission, as I understand it.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, but the other matters are. That matter was not referred to you?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: No.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That is obviously a matter we will have to take up elsewhere. Senator, were you aware that the matter was not referred?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: I have not been briefed on that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Would you undertake to find out why that was not referred?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: Yes.</p>	Page 103		
SI-39	Carr	Anti-dumping Commission	Safeguards – Productivity Commission	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Commissioner, in terms of your understanding of emergency safeguard matters under the WTO, is there an applicable case for Australian steel in that regard?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: As the senator correctly answered a moment ago, the</p>	Page 104		

				<p>proscribed authority for safeguard actions is the Productivity Commission. The Anti-Dumping Commission has no jurisdiction in that regard. My understanding is that it is a matter for the Treasurer on advice from agencies, and we have no jurisdictional coverage.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So because you have no jurisdiction you have no opinion of that?</p> <p>CHAIR: You are not asking the commissioner—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Do you have any capability to assess that matter?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: In a framework sense there are three World Trade Organisation agreements that form the trade remedy offer. One is the anti-dumping agreement, the second is the subsidies and countervailing measures agreement and the third is the safeguards agreement. For many years in the Australian model, the first two have been allocated to the agency looking after anti-dumping and countervailing, which is customs in our industry. More recently, through the government's model of the Anti-Dumping Commission, the third—as far as I am aware—has been referred to the Productivity Commission for some years as a proscribed authority under the act.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: We will have to take that up with them. While I do understand that the Productivity Commission is the Australian agency for the safeguard provisions, has the Productivity Commission had any conversations with you in recent years about these matters?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: The Productivity Commission and the Anti-Dumping Commission have met recently on a number of matters, but the safeguards issue was not raised as part of those conversations. It was to do with a review of the Productivity Commission's 2009 report into anti-dumping in Australia and an update on that review.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand that there were some conversations about pig meat industries and tomatoes in 2013. I also understand that there has been no action taken with regard to safeguard measures.</p> <p>Mr Seymour: I might have to take on notice whether anybody from the Anti-Dumping Commission discussed safeguard matters with the Productivity Commission in 2013.</p>			
SI-40	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Steel used in Australia	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Mr Chesworth, are you aware of what percentage of Australian-made steel is used in Commonwealth procurement projects?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: No I am not. I am not sure if those figures are available, but we could always go and have a check.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If you could, please? I would be interested to know what the level is or what the volume is of Australian steel used, or the steel used, in Commonwealth funded procurement for projects and what the source of that steel is. And are you able to tell us what the level of state government procurement is involving the use of steel, and what the source</p>	Pages 104-105		

				<p>of that steel is?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Again, we will go and have a look. It will depend on the extent to which the states collect the data. Are there any particular states that you would be interested in?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Each state will do. The Victorian government has recently introduced a position with regard to the purchase of Australian steel for level crossings and other rail infrastructure. Are you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Yes, I am.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you aware of whether any other state government has followed a similar course of action with regard to the procurement and use of Australian steel?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: At the Commonwealth level, as you know, we have Australian industry participation.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: We dealt with that little earlier, didn't we?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I recall it very well. The Victorian government has, I guess, what you might call a 'complementary' scheme as well. My recollection is that there are two other states—Western Australia and, I think, New South Wales—that have similar schemes too, but if I have to correct the record on that I will do so.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the usage of steel like in Australia? Do you have any figures on the total amount of steel that is actually used in Australia?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: There are figures around. I do not have them with me.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Yes. Obviously, being an issue that is front of mind for us we would—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you would have those figures available?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I am not sure. If we have them I will provide advice.</p>			
SI-41	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Steel exports	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the level of exports for Australian steel? And what is the level of imports of steel?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We will get that for you quickly, Senator.</p>	Page 105		
SI-42	Carr	Minister Pyne	Steelworkers delegation	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Can I come back to the issue of the delegation of steelworkers that has been visiting Canberra? I am wondering if the minister has agreed to see them. Senator Sinodinos, has Minister Pyne agreed to see the delegation?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: I am not aware of that. I can check with his office.</p>	Page 105		
SI-43	Rhiannon	Anti-dumping Commission	Safeguards	<p>Senator Sinodinos: All I was going to say is that we have already had one tranche of reforms, which, with the opposition's support, went through. We are looking at what further changes might be required. If you have some ideas around that, put them in. But obviously you cannot do everything and, frankly, I do not think the workers will have the information that we are talking about here. The impression I get is that the sort of information is very confidential, detailed financial information that the company itself will</p>	Page 111		

				<p>have. As a bystander, I can have a suspicion that this looks like it could be dumping, but, unless the company itself has the capacity to bring detailed stuff forward, it will not go anywhere.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Why would the US give the standing to workers and other organisations? Why do other countries give them that standing?</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: As I say, if there is information that is relevant, feed it in.</p> <p>Mr Seymour: It comes down to a definitional issue, I think. I can happily research that for senators and come back.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Thank you. It would be good to come back to it. Is the designation of two public bodies, the Productivity Commission and the Anti-Dumping Commission, the most effective and efficient way to administer the Australian antidumping regime?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: The safeguards agreement is not an antidumping mechanism; it is a separate and different mechanism. It is not surprising, on that basis, that government has, for a long period of time, had a different model for how those matters are investigated.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: As you are taking on notice to look at how regimes work in other countries, could you also consider if there are other jurisdictions around the world that have employed this model that we are relying on—which seems to be at variance with how it has been handled overseas? I understand that South Africa and Britain can respond more quickly.</p> <p>Mr Seymour: I am more than happy to provide some further information about that matter.</p>			
SI-44	Rhiannon	Anti-dumping Commission	Steel imports	<p>Senator RHIANNON: What is the highest duty you have imposed on steel imports?</p> <p>Mr Seymour: That is a good question.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: I was interested in how that compares with overseas—for example, with the US, Canada and the EU.</p> <p>Mr Seymour: I would have to take the second part of the question on notice. There are many steel duties being imposed by many countries.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: This is such a global crisis, this comparison could be of assistance to work our way through this.</p> <p>Mr Seymour: I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 112		
SI-45	Ketter	Geoscience Australia	Redundancies	<p>Senator KETTER: I just have a few questions to ask. The first is in relation to the impact of the budget cuts from 2014. Since the last estimates, I understand that you have advised that there has been a total of 99 redundancies up until the end of April. I want to get an update on whether or not the 2014 cuts have led to any further redundancies.</p> <p>Dr Pigram: The numbers that you had up to April are correct. Since that time, there have been a further 20 separations of which 17 were redundancies. Three employees were transferred to other government</p>	Page 114		

				<p>entities and were not paid a redundancy.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What did the 17 redundancies relate to?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Across a range of areas in the agency. I am not sure I have a breakdown of where precisely the last 17 occurred. They were all voluntary so they came from various areas and various projects within the agency.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Could I get a breakdown of the 17?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: We will take that on notice and provide it to you. Do you want levels? What particular details would you like in that breakdown?</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Just the particular part of the agency where the redundancy occurred.</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Okay.</p>			
SI-46	Ketter	Geoscience Australia	Redundancies	<p>Senator KETTER: What effect have those redundancies had on the delivery of Geoscience Australia's programs?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Inevitably, they require us to wind back the program. But, in terms of the specifics of which areas have been slowed down, I cannot provide you with that information, I am sorry, but we have certainly scaled the work program to fit the available resources.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Are you able to provide that information on notice?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Certainly. I will have a look at where those people came from.</p>	Pages 114-115		
SI-47	Ketter	Geoscience Australia	Graduates	<p>Senator KETTER: Thank you. Moving on to the number of graduates who have been made, or will be made, offers for 2060. Are you able to provide that information?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: My understanding is that next year's intake will be 13 and it will comprise two components: 10 in the science area and three in the ICT area.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: That is for the whole of 2016.</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Yes. We only take a small quantum each year. That is bigger than we normally take. Not everyone will accept, but I understand the offers have been made at that level.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: How does that compare with previous years?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Last year was eight and two, I think. But I will check that and I can advise that on notice if you would prefer.</p>	Page 115		
BI-48	Edwards	NOPSEMA	Offshore oil and gas jobs	<p>CHAIR: Okay. I better send a memo! Did ministers impose any special conditions on BP's exploration permits in the Great Australian Bight?</p> <p>Mr Guyan: Yes, indeed, they did. There were a number of conditions added to the title which go to technical matters related to the design and construction of the wells and, indeed, their final abandonment.</p> <p>CHAIR: I am not sure whether this is within your remit—and tell me if I am going off the page. Are there any figures available on how many jobs the offshore oil and gas industry supports in Australia?</p> <p>Mr Guyan: Sorry, I cannot answer that.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy: There are those figures. I do not have them to hand but I certainly could provide them for you on notice.</p>	Page 119		

				<p>CHAIR: Would you mind? Dr Kennedy: No problem. The chief economist would have them. Unfortunately, we let him go. But we will— CHAIR: No worries.</p>			
SI-49	Edwards	NOPSEMA	BP's environmental plan	<p>CHAIR: No worries. There are claims that you will be forced to make the final decision on BP's environmental plan within 30 days; is that right? Mr Guyan: No. That is not correct at all. The regulations provide for NOPSEMA to request further information essentially without constraint, so, indeed, NOPSEMA can take as long as it needs in relation to the complexity of the submission and the impact and consequences addressed therein. There is no absolute 30-day guideline. There is a point at which we have to make a decision, but that decision may be to request further information or to request that the proponent revise and resubmit the plan, and so on. There are a number of possibilities. I could certainly provide more detail, and Mr Heidan can supplement. CHAIR: That would be great, if you would not mind. This is going to be an ongoing issue. You have spoken about who has reviewed you, and we have discussed that, and the eminent scientists and governance people around your process and what you do. So we do not need to revisit that.....</p>	Page 119		
SI-50	Canavan	AusIndustry – Business Services	Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Programme	<p>I note the progress with the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Programme — a \$61.8 million competitive grants programme established to support businesses that are investing in high value manufacturing operations in South Australia and Victoria, ie: regions affected by the closure of Australia's car manufacturing industry. Applications closed on 9 January and the South Australian successful applicants were announced on 3rd August. Question: Given this was almost three months ago, can you please advise how you are progressing with the Victorian applications?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-51	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>In the Budget Estimates hearings this year I asked the Commission about procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers, in particular in the context of Case No. 271 - Olex Australia's allegations of the dumping of certain PVC flat electric cables exported from China. I put questions on notice regarding the number of preliminary affirmative determinations published within 60 days from the date of initiation of an investigation and the average number of days taken to publish PADS. I was told that Australia's Anti-Dumping legislation allows for a PAD to be made at any time during an investigation however I was told that a PAD cannot be made earlier than day 60 after the initiation of an investigation. Why are PADs not able to be made earlier than day 60? Is this time period legislated? Could a PAD be made earlier than this day if the Commissioner is satisfied that there appears to be sufficient grounds that dumping and/or subsidisation has occurred and is causing injury to the Australian industry?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		

SI-52	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>I note as at 30 April 2015, PADs were made during the course of 7 investigations at an average of 228 days from the initiation of the investigations.</p> <p>Can the Commission provide a more current figure on average times of PADs being published? Can you provide a breakdown of the time taken for a PAD by each of these seven investigations?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-53	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>I also asked about the number of times that the Commissioner has accepted data from interested parties without conducting on-site verification of the data received, regardless of the nature of an investigation or inquiry – that is, a dumping investigation, review inquiry or a duty assessment. I was told that it is not possible for the Commission to undertake on-site verification exercises in relation to all cooperative exporters in all types of investigations, reviews and other inquiries.</p> <p>Can you elaborate on the risk management approach taken to verification activities? What are the key risks assessed by the Commission when making decisions about how many countries and which exporters should be subject to on-site or other types of verification?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-54	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>I note the Commission will “generally aim” to visit the largest exporters of the product under investigation from a particular country. The Commission has sufficient resources to cover up to three exporters for a country or less if the investigation involves multiple countries.</p> <p>Does the Commission consider on-site verification as the ideal/preferred way to gain satisfaction as to the reliability and completeness of exporter data? Can you advise how much funding the Commission allocates for these on-site verifications?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-55	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>In response to my questions on notice, I was informed the Commission does not keep comparison data on the number of on-site verifications versus other types of verifications. Why not? Does it keep figures of the number of on-site verifications? If so, can you provide.</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-56	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	<p>I also asked about the average number of days for completion of exporter questionnaires and was informed that the Commission does not formally report on this figure however this is monitored by case managers individually who also encourage compliance with the 37 day deadline for submissions. Does the Commission monitor numbers of exporters who are compliant and non-compliant with the deadline?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		

			rs	Can you advise of how many extensions requests have been granted and on what grounds?			
SI-57	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Procedures afforded to overseas versus Australian manufacturers	Does the Commission need more resources to be able to accurately track and monitor the types of data mentioned above?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-58	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Solar panel dumping	<p>I refer to Anti-Dumping Notice No. 2015/118 - Termination of an Investigation into the alleged dumping of certain crystalline silicon photovoltaic modules or panels (the goods) exported to Australia from China, following an application lodged by Tindo Manufacturing Pty Ltd. I note in the Termination Report the Commissioner “found that the injury, if any, to Tindo, or the hindrance, if any, to the establishment of an Australian industry, caused by the dumping of goods exported from China is negligible”.</p> <p>I note the applicant may request a review of the decision to terminate the investigation by lodging an application with the Anti-Dumping Review Panel. I understand Tindo will be appealing this decision.</p> <p>Can the Commissioner advise of how long this process generally takes? If an appeal is granted, what action is then taken by the Anti-Dumping Commission?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-59	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Solar panel dumping	<p>I refer in particular to Chapter 8 of the Termination Report ‘Has dumping caused material injury or hindrance to the establishment of an industry?’ in which the Commission reports that the injury or hindrance are ‘negligible’. I note the weighted average dumping margin of 21.1 per cent – how did the Commission conclude that this margin in particular would have a negligible effect of Tindo?</p> <p>Did the Commission consider the effects that countervailing duties would have on Tindo/the Australian industry?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-60	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Solar panel dumping	<p>I refer to the Canadian International Trade Tribunal judgement that found Chinese solar panels are being dumped into Canada and are threatening to cause injury to the domestic industry. Several other countries – including the United States – have also found that Chinese solar panels were dumped into their markets, and have put in place punitive tariffs.</p> <p>Has the Commission kept abreast of the Canadian findings and those of other countries in relation to solar panel dumping?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-61	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Solar panel	How is it that US and European authorities found evidence of dumping	Written		

		Commission	dumping	causing harm but the Australian Anti-Dumping Commission has not?	question – 30 October 2015		
SI-62	Xenophon	Sectoral Growth Policy	Automotive Transformation Scheme	<p>I refer to the recent article in the SMH ‘Australia’s car industry one year from closing its doors’. I note University of Adelaide researchers estimate the closures will trigger a net loss of just under 200,000 jobs and \$29 billion off Australia’s GDP.</p> <p>As you would be aware the Government is planning to wind up the ATS when car making finishes in 2017. However, industry experts and academics believe the funding should run until 2020/21 and be broadened to give businesses within the supply chain a chance to diversify.</p> <p>Has the Department conducted any modelling on potential job losses with the ATS winding up the ATS earlier than legislated?</p> <p>Has the Department considered the cost of keeping the scheme versus the potential bill from job losses and publicly-funded redundancies?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-63	Xenophon	Sectoral Growth Policy	Automotive Transformation Scheme	<p>In the SMH article, German multinational engineering and Electronics Company Bosch which used the ATS to help fund expansion plans, advises that Bosch’s head office decision to consolidate diode production in Australia was approved on the basis that the ATS legislation would continue until 2020/21.</p> <p>Is the Department aware of other cases in which investments and expansions have been made on the basis of the ATS continuing until 2020/21?</p>	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-64	Xenophon	Sectoral Growth Policy	Automotive Transformation Scheme	I touched on this in Additional Estimates, but has the Department since done any modelling or analysis or provided any advice about potential amendments of the ATS such as changing the ATS to allow businesses to produce parts for purposes other than domestic vehicle manufacturing?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-65	Xenophon	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Boron Content of Steel	Is Standards Australia aware that the failure in their process, which allowed the Australian Steel Association to override technical advice from the Steel Industry and veto the inclusion of a clause in the Steel and Welding standards to limit boron, has created a potential threat to public safety?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-66	Xenophon	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Boron Content of Steel	The Welding Technology Institute of Australia states that: <i>By virtue of Standards Australia granting the ASA significant stakeholder “major interest” status, the ASA have been given a veto on the progress of important technical Standards. This cannot be justified either by their contribution to the steel value chain, where they simply buy and sell steel products, or the merit of their technical argument which lacks rigour from an engineering and material science perspective.</i>	Written question – 30 October 2015		

				What is Standards Australia's response to this statement?			
SI-67	Xenophon	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Boron Content of Steel	The Welding Technology Institute of Australia states that: <i>"Not having the 8 ppm limits on boron significantly impacts the safety of steel structures"</i> Is Standards Australia aware of this issue?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-68	Xenophon	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Boron Content of Steel	What is Standards Australia's responsibility to ensure that Australian Steel Standards do not jeopardise the safety of steel structures?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-69	Xenophon	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Boron Content of Steel	Furthermore, is Standards Australia aware that by forcing fabricators to verify the chemical composition of all the steel they use they have placed an unreasonable duty of care, liability and cost on an industry already struggling with competition from cheap, poor quality imported products?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-70	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	Please outline exactly how NOPSEMA's assessment process differs from that which would have happened under the EPBC process?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-71	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	In the event NOPSEMA decides that BP's proposal for exploration drilling in the Great Australian Bight has "unacceptable risks", what then happens with the assessment process?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-72	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	How does NOPSEMA determine whether a proponent has undertaken appropriate consultation and whether relevant persons have been provided with sufficient information to allow the relevant person to make an informed assessment of the possible consequences of the activity on the functions, interests or activities of the relevant person?	Written question – 30 October 2015		
SI-73	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	How often does NOPSEMA require extra time to seriously assess the potential impacts of a proposal?	Written question – 30 October		
SI-74	Xenophon	Resources	Assessment process	On what basis were BP awarded leases in the pristine Great Australian Bight within a year of the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico and prior to damage and compensation in the GOM being assessed?	Written question – 30 October		
SI-75	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	Amendments to section 571(2) of the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act (OPGGs Act) became effective on 29 November 2013. These amendments require titleholders to maintain sufficient financial assurance to meet the costs, expenses and liabilities that may arise in connection with carrying out petroleum activities among other things. As of 1 January 2015, titleholders are required to demonstrate to NOPSEMA that they meet the financial assurance requirements of section 571(2) of the OPGGS Act as a prior condition of acceptance of an environment plan (EP). Have NOPSEMA been satisfied of financial assurance requirements from BP and how are these estimated?	Written question – 30 October		

SI-76	Xenophon	NOPSEMA	Assessment process	Under the OPGGS Act, it appears that consultations on environment plans are the responsibility of the proponent. While in cases where an Offshore Project Proposal is required (in addition to an environment plan), NOPSEMA manages a more structured consultation period process (Section 5C). Exploration drilling does not however require an Offshore Project Proposal. Q. On what basis is this distinction, as to the robustness and management of public consultation processes, made between exploration and production drilling?	Written question – 30 October		
SI-77	Xenophon	Resources	Assessment process	How is the NOPSEMA Board appointed and by whom?	Written question – 30 October		
SI-78	Carr	IP Australia	Economic impact of innovation patents	1. Please provide an update on IP Australia’s report on the economic impact of innovation patents, including (but not limited to): a. Is it IP Australia’s recommendation that the innovation patent system be abolished? b. Does the available data suggest there is a link between manufacturing R&D investment and innovation patents?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-79	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	R&D Tax Incentive	In relation to the R&D Tax Incentive, please provide a breakdown based on registrations for the most recent income year, covering: c. The top ten sectors by R&D performing companies (based on registrations), including the number of R&D performing companies in each sector and their proportion as a percentage of total registrations. d. The top ten sectors by R&D expenditure (based on eligible R&D expenditure), including the value of R&D expenditure in each sector and the proportion of expenditure as a percentage of total registered expenditure. e. A breakdown of R&D performing companies based on their turnover (>\$20 million and <\$20 million), the total R&D expenditure for each of these two categories of R&D performing companies and the proportion of expenditure as a percentage of total registered expenditure.	Written question – 2 November		

SI-80	Carr	Digital Transformation	National policy issues relating to the digital economy	In relation to “National policy issues relating to the digital economy” – last year the Department of Communications provided an update the status of the 34 digital productivity initiatives at Appendix C of Advancing Australia as a Digital Economy and the status of the 24 actions at Appendix B of the same document (see Answers to Questions on Notice 201 and 203 from Additional Estimates in February 2014 and Answers to Question on Notice 564 from Budget Estimates May 2014). Please provide a similar update on the status of these 58 initiatives, including an update on their funding, whether they have been terminated, and what outcomes have arisen out of each initiative.	Written question – 2 November		
SI-81	Carr	Corporate	Appointments	Please provide a list of all appointments due to be filled in the next 12 months, including a summary of what appointments to Boards and advisory bodies are required at this point in time and whether there are any appointments which are overdue.	Written question – 2 November		
SI-82	Carr	Corporate	Industry and Science Programmes	<p>Please update the attached table and provide it in excel format, responding to the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the National Measurement Institute please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the Australia-China Science and Research Fund please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the International Education and Training (Australia-India Strategic Research Fund) please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For Science for Australia’s Future please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted 	Written question – 2 November		

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the Square Kilometre Array Radio Telescope Project please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the Cooperative Research Centres please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of ongoing CRCs ○ 2009-2019 Number of new CRCs ○ For the Innovation Investment Fund please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of customers assisted / payments administered ○ 2009-2019 value of funds invested by licensed fund managers ○ For Commercialisation Australia please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of grants awarded / payments administered (total) ○ 2009-2019 number of Proof of Concept grants awarded ○ 2009-2019 number of Early Stage Commercialisation grants awarded 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the R&D Tax Incentive please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2009-2019 Number of registrations (total) ○ 2009-2019 Number of registrations for 45 per cent refundable offset ○ 2009-2019 Number of registrations for 40 per cent non-refundable offset ○ 2009-2019 Number of firms that sought pre-approvals/advanced confirmation sought from AusIndustry for eligible activities in future years ○ 2009-2019 Number of firms that sought advance confirmation ○ 2009-2019 Percentage of registrations from manufacturing firms ○ For Enterprise Connect please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of client services provided / customers assisted ○ 2009-2019 Number of business reviews delivered ○ 2009-2019 Number of Tailored Advisory Service (TAS) grants awarded ○ For the Researchers in Business program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of RiB placements / researchers engaged ○ 2009-2019 Number of businesses assisted 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For Expediting Clinical Trial Reform in Australia please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ For Industry Innovation Precincts please provide the total cost of the program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the Industry Growth Centres program please provide the following against for the overarching program and a breakdown for each of the five individual Growth Centres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For Buy Australian at Home and Abroad Initiative please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ For the Australian Industry Participation measures please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2009-2019 Number of AIP plans under the Australian Jobs Act 2013 ○ 2009-2019 Number of AIP plans for Commonwealth procurement ○ For the TCF Investment and Innovation Programs please provide: 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of customers assisted ○ 2009-2019 Number of BIC grants awarded ○ 2009-2019 Number of TCF Small Business grants awarded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the Textile Clothing and Footwear - Strategic Capability Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of grants awarded ○ For the Textile Clothing and Footwear - Structural Adjustment Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the Geelong Region Innovation and Investment Fund please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of grants awarded ○ 2009-2019 Number of participants ○ For the Melbourne's North Innovation and Investment Fund please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2019 Number of grants awarded ○ 2009-2019 Number of participants ○ For the Steel Transformation Plan please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ For the Automotive Transformation Scheme please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2019 Number of registrations ○ 2009-2019 Budget estimate and actual (capped and uncapped) ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed (capped and uncapped) ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Total ATS funds committed ○ For the Automotive New Markets Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of grants awarded ○ For the Entrepreneurs' Infrastructure Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 No. of business evaluations (actual & projected) ○ 2009-2019 No. of evaluation growth grants (actual & projected) ○ 2009-2019 No. of research connections services (actual & projected) 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the Growth Fund please provide the total cost of the program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ For the Automotive Diversification Fund please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) ○ For the Automotive Industry Structural Adjustment Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 Number of workers who have accessed services (actual and projected) ○ For the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) ○ For the Regional Infrastructure Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted 			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) ○ For the Skills and Training initiative please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of workers who have accessed services (actual and projected) ○ For the Manufacturing Transition Grants Program please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual ○ 2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed ○ 2015-2019 Contracted ○ 2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) 			
SI-83	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	Commonwealth Science Council	<p>In relation to the Commonwealth Science Council meeting on 21 October 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How long was the meeting? b. Which Ministers attended? c. Have there been any changes in the arrangements for the CSC following the change of Prime Minister? If so, what are the changes? If not, are any changes planned? 	Written question – 2 November		

SI-84	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	International Science and Research Engagement	<p>The consultation paper Vision for a Science Nation, released on 22 June 2015, includes a section on international engagement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What kind of response have the international engagement proposals received? QON response BI-91 says that roundtables were being held in Canberra, Sydney, Adelaide, Brisbane and Perth addressing international matters as one of the four themes of the paper. Are these roundtables are completed now? How did people respond to the international engagement proposals in these meetings? What are the next steps in considering whether and how to boost Commonwealth Government investment or involvement in international science and research engagement? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-85	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	Vision for a Science Nation consultation paper	<p>In relation to the Vision for a Science Nation consultation paper released in June:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many written submissions were received? Will these be made public? How many people participated in the roundtables or other consultations? Please provide details. What other consultation was undertaken, if any? Please provide details. What are the next steps in this process? How does this process relate to the Boosting the Commercial Returns from Research process and the proposed innovation statement to be delivered before the end of 2015? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-86	Carr	Corporate	Website traffic	<p>In relation to the various websites the Department manages (for example, Chief Scientist, science.gov.au, business.gov.au):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many hits and unique visitors has each website attracted so far this calendar year? How many hits and unique visitors has each website attracted so far this financial year? 			

SI-87	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	PolicyHack	In relation to the PolicyHack event held on Saturday, 17 October 2015, please detail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The overall budget for the event. b. The overall budget for the program responsible for the event. c. Expenses incurred, inclusive of dollar value and description, of the event. d. The number of officers working on the PolicyHack program and their levels. e. The number of officers working at the PolicyHack event and their levels. f. What access to Government data participants had or have, including which Government databases. g. What data management and security protocols are put in place for access to Government data at the event. h. If funding for PolicyHack is ongoing? i. How many events are planned for the future? j. How many events per year are planned? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-88	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	PolicyHack	Please detail the funding allocation for PolicyHack in the following financial years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 2014-15 b. 2015-16 c. All future years where budgeted 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-89	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	GovHack	In relation to the Government's involvement in GovHack, please detail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What support is provided to GovHack from the Government? b. What access to Government data participants have, including which Government databases? c. What data management and security protocols are put in place for access to Government data at GovHack events? d. If funding for the program is ongoing? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-90	Carr	Science and Commercialisation	GovHack	Please detail the funding allocation for GovHack in the following financial years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All years since the Government commenced funding GovHack b. 2015-16 c. 2016-17 d. 2017-18 	Written question – 2 November		

				e. 2018-19			
SI-91	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Automotive Transformation Scheme	When Ford, GM Holden and Toyota cease manufacturing operations in Australia, will there be any eligible participants in the Automotive Transformation Scheme (ATS), under current legislative instruments, after that date?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-92	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Automotive Transformation Scheme	In relation to the Automotive Transformation Scheme (ATS) – how many firms are currently registered for the ATS and have there been any new entrants to the program in 2015?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-93	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Australia’s steel industry	Please provide an update on what action is this government taking to address the crisis in Australia’s steel industry.	Written question – 2 November		
SI-94	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Australian made steel	What percentage of Australia-made steel is used in Commonwealth procurement projects and what is the source of that steel?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-95	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Building Ministers’ Forum	The Building Ministers’ Forum Communique of 31 July 2015 referred to the establishment of a Working Group of senior officers to report to Ministers on strategies to minimise the risks associated with non-conforming building products. In relation to the Working Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many members are on the Working Group? Please provide a breakdown between the state and federal government agencies? b. Has the Working Group delivered a report or interim report? If so, what strategies were recommended? If not, when can we expect that report? c. Will the Working Group consult with industry and other stakeholders? d. Will the Working Group take into account the Senate Inquiry into Non-Conforming building products, which has received submissions from more than 60 businesses, association and industry stakeholders? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-96	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Building Ministers’ Forum	The Building Ministers’ Forum Communique of 31 July 2015 stated that the Australian Building Codes Board (ABCB) would investigate options for a possible mandatory scheme for high risk building products and report to the Ministers within six months. In relation to that work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Has the ABCB delivered a report or interim report? b. If so, what options have been suggested? c. If not, when will the ABCB deliver the report? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-97	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Disability (Access to	Please provide a comprehensive update on the status of the Disability (Access to Premises – Building) Standards review.	Written question – 2		

			Premises – Building) Standards review.		November		
SI-98	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	ICT Sustainability Plan - Australian Paper	In relation to the ICT Sustainability Plan, which expired this year, did the Department consult with Australian Paper at any point over the last 12 months on the expiration of the Plan? If so, please outline in detail the nature of the Department’s consultations with Australian Paper.	Written question – 2 November		
SI-99	Ludwig	Corporate	Ministerial Personalised Stationery	Since the leadership change in September, 2015, how much has been spent by the Ministerial office on personalised stationery for the Minister and the Minister's staff? Please provide a cost breakdown by type of stationery purchased and the quantity of each and whether it was for the Minister or for staff.	Written Question 30 October 2015		
SI-100	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Support for Cadburys	Is the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science responsible for the \$18 million that was originally earmarked for Cadburys? a. If yes, what is the process for companies/organisations seeking to apply for funds, including timeframes? b. Will the Tasmanian State Government or the Commonwealth Government be making the final decision on what projects receive funding? c. When will the funds be available? In what financial year?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-101	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Industry Capability Network	In relation to the Industry Capability Network (ICN) Ltd: a. How much Commonwealth funding does the organisation receive each year? Please provide a breakdown over the life of the program, including any funding committed over the forward estimates. b. Does the ICN have a funding agreement with the Commonwealth detailing how these funds are to be used? If so, please provide details. c. Does the ICN operate under a fee for service model with private enterprises? If so, please provide details. d. Does the Department monitor how much funding the ICN collects from private enterprise? If so, please provide details. e. Is the Department aware of the ICN charging private enterprises additional money in order to access ‘premium’ services? If so, please provide details.	Written question – 2 November		
SI-102	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Commonwealth of	What is the Department’s knowledge of the Commonwealth of Australia is the Contractor Asset Acquisition Program (CAAP), which is procuring 18	Written question – 2		

			Australia is the Contractor Asset Acquisition Program	new vessels and 110 replacement vessels for the Royal Australian Navy? Please provide detailed information on how this program operates, including which Commonwealth departments or agencies are responsible for the program.	November		
SI-103	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Australian steel makers - duties	In relation to the Anti-Dumping Commission and applications received from Australian steel makers for duties or other action since 2010: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many of these applications from Australian Steel makers were successful? b. Of those that were upheld, what was the outcome in terms of duties imposed? What was the highest and lowest duty imposed? c. How long did these applications take to determine - what was the shortest amount of time and what was the longest? d. Are you aware of similar applications in terms of products and countries of origin in other countries – such as the US and Canada – having imposed significantly higher duties than those imposed in Australia? Did they have more successful applications as well? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-104	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Exporter Data Assessment	Please provide a summary of how the Anti-Dumping Commission verifies exporter data to assess dumping claims, including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the Commission conduct in-country assessments? If so, how many in-country assessments are conducted each year (please provide a breakdown)? b. Does the Commission rely mostly on in-country assessments or desktop monitoring and questionnaires? On balance, what's the split between in-country versus desktop monitoring and/or questionnaires? c. How does the Commission verify the accuracy of exporter claims? d. Are there statutory obligations for exporters or penalties for providing incorrect or misleading information? 	Written question – 2 November		
SI-105	Carr	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Anti-dumping system - fees for review	In relation to Australia's anti-dumping system what's the status on the proposal to implement fees for review, which was proposed in the Customs Amendment Bill under the previous Minister? If this is still government policy and if so, what is the status of the legislative instrument proposed to implement this measure?	Written question – 2 November		
SI-106	Bilyk	Corporate	Ministerial functions	In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by the current or former Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries/Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in 2015, can the following please be provided:	Written question – 2 November		

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. List of functions; b. List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff; c. Function venue; d. Itemised list of costs; e. Details of any food served; f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; and g. Details of any entertainment provided. 			
SI-107	Bilyk	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Ministerial international travel	<p>In relation to any international travel undertaken in 2015 by the current or former Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries/Assistant Ministers in the portfolio, can the following please be provided to the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A copy of the itinerary for each overseas trip; b. An itemised list of the costs of each trip including the class of travel for any flights; c. Copies of receipts for any food or beverages that the Minister consumed at taxpayer expense during each trip; d. Copies of receipts for any self-drive hire cars or chauffeured services utilised by the Minister during each trip; e. Details of any spouse travel; f. Copies of receipts for any other ground transport; and g. Copies of receipts for any hotel accommodation. 	Written question – 2 November		
BI-108	Bilyk	Corporate	Secretary's speeches to staff	Can a copy of any speeches delivered by the Secretary of the Department at any staff meetings in 2015 please be provided?	Written question – 2 November		
BI-109	Bilyk	Corporate	Secretary's office upgrades	Have the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office been upgraded in 2015? If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided?	Written question – 2 November		

SI-110	Bilyk	Portfolio Strategic Policy	Visit to Torres Strait	<p>Did any of the former or current Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries/Assistant Ministers in the portfolio , their personal staff or the Department participate in the former Prime Minister’s trip to the Torres Strait?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What was the duration of the visit to Torres Strait? b. Which locations did the Minister/his Department travel to? c. Which communities did the Minister/his Department engage with? d. What type of activities did they undertake? e. What were the outcomes of the trip? f. Was an official report or communique or similar published in relation to the trip? g. Are you able to please provide an itinerary for the A Minister/his Department’s trip? h. Which hotel or hotels did the Minister/his Department stay in? i. Could you please provide an itemised cost breakdown in relation to the Minister/his Department’s involvement in this trip? This should be broken down into categories such as accommodation, ground transport, meals, incidentals etc. j. How many members of the Minister’s staff participated in the trip? k. Could you please advise the number of staff, their title and staffing classification under the MOPS Enterprise Agreement? l. In terms of departmental officials from the Department, could you please advise the names and roles of each departmental official in attendance? m. Could you also please provide an itemised list of costs for departmental officials in terms of flights, accommodation, ground transport, meals and other incidentals? This should specify the officials which travelled in business class and those that travelled in economy, the hotels they stayed in and which businesses supplied ground transport. 	Written question – 2 November		
--------	-------	----------------------------	------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--

SI-111	Ludwig	Corporate	Departmental Rebranding	<p>1. Has the department/Agency undergone a name change or any other form of rebranding since the leadership change in September, 2015? If so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please detail why this name change / rebrand were considered necessary and a justified use of departmental funds? i. Please provide a copy of any reports that were commissioned to study the benefits and costs associated with the rebranding. b. Please provide the total cost associated with this rebrand and then break down by amount spent replacing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Signage. ii. Stationery (please include details of existing stationery and how it was disposed of). iii. Logos iv. Consultancy v. Any relevant IT changes. vi. Office reconfiguration. c. How was the decision reached to rename and/or rebrand the department? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Who was involved in reaching this decision? ii. Please provide a copy of any communication (including but not limited to emails, letters, memos, notes etc) from within the department, or between the department and the government regarding the rename/rebranding. <p>2. Following the changes does the department share any goods/services/accommodation with other departments?</p> <p>3. What resources/services does the department share with other departments; are there plans to cease sharing the sharing of these resources/services?</p> <p>What were the costs to the department prior to the Machinery of Government changes for these shared resources? What are the estimated costs after the ceasing of shared resource arrangements?</p>	Written Question 30 October 2015		
--------	--------	-----------	-------------------------	---	----------------------------------	--	--

SI-112	Ludwig	Corporate	Staffing – employment non-Australian citizens	<p>I refer you to section 22 (8) of the Public Service Act 1999 which says:</p> <p>"An Agency Head must not engage, as an APS employee, a person who is not an Australian citizen, unless the Agency Head considers it appropriate to do so."</p> <p>1.Does the department have guidelines or similar to assist Agency Heads to assess when it is appropriate to hire non-Australian citizens? If no, do individual agencies have their own guidelines? If yes to either:</p> <p>1.Please provide a copy.</p> <p>2.When did they come into effect?</p> <p>3.Can Agency Heads decide to go against the advice? If yes, under what circumstances?</p> <p>2.Are Agency Heads required to provide a reason to anyone for hiring non-Australian citizens? If yes:</p> <p>1.Who are they required to report the reason to?</p> <p>2.Does this reporting happen before or after the hire has been made?</p> <p>3.Is this reason provided in writing? If no, how is it provided?</p> <p>4.Can you please provide a list of reasons that have been used since the Federal election in September, 2013.</p> <p>3.Are there any provisions to over-rule a Head of Agency’s decision to hire a non-Australian citizen? If yes:</p> <p>1.Who can over-rule this decision?</p> <p>2.Under what circumstances can it be over-ruled?</p> <p>3.How many times has this occurred since the Federal election in September, 2013.</p>	Written Question 30 October 2015		
--------	--------	-----------	---	---	----------------------------------	--	--