

**Economics Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Industry, Innovation and Science Portfolio  
2015-16 Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing  
22 October 2015

---

**DEPARTMENT:** DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND SCIENCE

**TOPIC:** Enhanced Project By-law Scheme

**REFERENCE:** Question on Notice (Hansard, 22 October 2015, page 96)

**QUESTION No.:** SI-35

**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?

**Mr Chesworth:** It is a deregulation saving.

**Senator KIM CARR:** How is that? You just do not implement them—is that how you deregulate it?

**Mr Chesworth:** I am not sure of the document that you are reading from.

**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?

**Mr Chesworth:** It relates to the savings to industry.

**Senator KIM CARR:** Yes, that is what I mean. Does industry save money by not having to do these things anymore?

**Mr Chesworth:** That is correct.

**Senator KIM CARR:** How does that fit with the requirement to encourage the development of Australian industry capacity?

**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.

**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?

**Mr Chesworth:** It relates to administrative processes. I could get you a more detailed response to that on notice.

**ANSWER**

The saving of \$79,000 was based on administration savings of \$66,000 per annum from closing the Supplier Access to Major Projects (SAMP) programme and \$13,000 per annum from discontinuing funding for the Industry Capability Network Limited (ICNL).

The savings are from discontinuing funding for SAMP and ICNL. There is no change to Australian Industry Participation (AIP) activities.