

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

Questions on Notice
Additional Estimates 2014-2015,
Tuesday 24 February 2015

Infrastructure and Regional Development Portfolio

QoN No.	PDR No.	Division	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Proof Hansard page and hearing date or Written	Comments
Corporate Services (4)							
1	001	CORP	STERLE	Western Sydney Airport market research	<p>Senator STERLE: Okay. In a written answer, No. 24, to October estimates—I am talking about market research here—is it correct that the department has spent \$228,000 to date on market testing for livery for the Western Sydney airport project?</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Is that information publicly available—and the break-up?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can certainly provide for you on notice the details of the contract.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Could the committee have the whole break-up: who got what, what it was spent on, how much was livery.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Can we just have a breakdown of the \$228, 000 on the market research?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will just check those numbers for you. It is not for livery. It involves a range of communications and market-testing tasks, including the development of a community engagement strategy for the community. As you are aware, the development of the Western Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek is a very detailed project for which the community is seeking information. The work involves a consultancy which we have let to a firm to provide services which are more than just livery. It is a whole community strategy of information and the like which will be available, including information which will be available through the environmental impact statement process which is now underway. I will just get Mr Wilson to confirm that number.</p> <p>Mr Wilson: That is correct.</p>	5 24/02/15	

					<p>Senator STERLE: So the \$228,000 is total? That is the community engagement and everything, not just livery?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That is a consultant that we have engaged for a period of time to undertake a range of activities around community information, yes.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Is that information publicly available—and the break-up?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can certainly provide for you on notice the details of the contract.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: : I would appreciate that .Could the committee have the whole break-up: who got what, what it was spent on, how much was livery—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: exactly what you talked about. Is that a—</p> <p>Mr Wilson: There was no expenditure on determining livery associated with the project.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Great. Can we just have a breakdown of the \$228,000 on the market research...</p>		
2	002	CORP	CAMERON	New signage	<p>Senator STERLE: This is my last question. With the new project signage is 'building our future' the phrase?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: How much did it cost to develop this new signage?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There were a range of processes involved. We are not replacing any pre-existing signage, but there was market testing done of the concepts. That was undertaken and I will get that for you, Senator.</p>	63-64 24/02/15	
3	250	CORP	STERLE	Discretionary grant programs	<p>Can the following details be provided for each discretionary grant program in the Minister's portfolio:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name of the discretionary grant program; 2. Total funding on a year-by-year basis over the current forward estimates; 3. Committed funding on a year-by-year basis over the current forward estimates; 4. Contracted funding on a year-by-year basis over the current forward estimates; 5. Uncommitted funding on a year-by-year basis over the current forward estimates; 6. When the current round of funding is scheduled to cease; and 7. How many rounds of funding are scheduled after the end of the current round. 	Written	

4	251	CORP	STERLE	Discretionary grants programs – departmental	<p>For each discretionary grant program administered by the Department, can you provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The name of the discretionary grant program; 2. How much funding is allocated for the program in total; 3. How much funding for the program has been committed; 4. How much funding for the program has been contracted; and 5. How much funding for the program is uncommitted – <p>For each of the following financial years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 2013-4; b. 2014-5; c. 2015-6; d. 2016-7; e. 2017-8; f. 2018-9; g. 2019-20 and beyond. <p>These programs should include grants under the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Development Grants • Community Infrastructure Grants • National Stronger Regions Fund • La Trobe Valley Economic Diversification Program 	Written	
Infrastructure Investment (55)							
5	003	II	STERLE	NIC meetings	<p>Senator STERLE: How many meetings of this committee have been held since it was formed?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have that specific detail with me.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: While you are taking that on notice, can you also advise the dates the committee has held meetings since it was formed?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, I will take that on notice too.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Can you tell the committee how many of those meetings Minister Truss has personally attended?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: To my knowledge he has attended all meetings of the committee.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Can you tell us how many of those meetings Assistant Minister Briggs has personally attended?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: To my knowledge, Assistant Minister Briggs has attended all meetings</p>	4-5 24/02/15	

					<p>of the committee.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: And the Treasurer?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, to my knowledge the Treasurer has attended all meetings, but I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: How many reports has the committee made to the full cabinet since it was formed?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not have that information. I am happy to take it on notice to talk to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to see what assistance I can provide on that.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: With these questions on notice, I know the chair and committee will set a date and time—which we have not but it will not be far away—but if, for any of the easier ones, you can come back and respond after each session, it will take the workload off your department and makes it easier for us. I know that is the way you usually work, Mr Mrdak, so thank you for that. While you are at it, could you tell us on what dates did the full cabinet have a report from this committee on its agenda?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, I will take that on notice.</p>		
6	004	II	EDWARDS	SA asset recycling	<p>Senator EDWARDS: What are the assets that the South Australian government has talked to you about?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: In terms of the asset that they propose to dispose of?</p> <p>Senator EDWARDS: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will just get that detail for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator EDWARDS: Did they name those assets?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have the details with us.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator EDWARDS: Did they name the assets that they were looking at selling?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I believe they have, but we do not have the details with us. I will try and get those for you this morning.</p> <p>Senator EDWARDS: It would be great if we could detail those assets...</p>	6-7 24/02/15	Answer with contribution from The Treasury.
7	005	II	CAMERON	NSW modelling	<p>Senator CAMERON: RB Consulting raised issues about the modelling.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: What were those issues?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will get Mr Danks to provide you with that information.</p> <p>Mr Danks: I will take the actual details on notice. The overall finding at the time</p>	9 24/02/15	

					<p>was the modelling was sound; however, there are some issues around the edges we needed to work on. The New South Wales government has undertaken to look at those issues and that is what we are currently working through at the moment.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: You are not aware of the City of Sydney modelling that has been done in cooperation with WestConnex or whether it is separate modelling. Are you aware?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We are not aware of it. I presume it has been done separately, but I can take that on notice and come back to you.</p>		
8	006	II	CAMERON	NSW traffic modelling	<p>Senator CAMERON: You have looked at the New South Wales traffic modelling. Will you be releasing that for the Senate? Can you provide details of your peer review of the New South Wales traffic modelling?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice once that work is completed. I do not forecast a situation where we would not be able to provide it, but let me take that on notice and, particularly, find out what the timetable is for that work to be completed. Our interest is ensuring that the Commonwealth loan can and will be repaid in accordance with the proposed loan agreement.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Let us finish on the first one. On notice, you will take the issue of releasing the peer review of the New South Wales traffic. Just to get it clear, you will take on notice the proposition of releasing the peer review of the New South Wales traffic modelling.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: You said you cannot see any reason that it would not be released but you are taking it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will take that on notice to ensure there is no commercial information that would otherwise be compromised by that release. In principle, I do not see an issue.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: So we have \$3.5 billion worth of Commonwealth money in this project; you have in your possession, as a partner in the project, New South Wales government traffic modelling. That is the factual situation?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We have access to that traffic modelling, yes.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: My view, and what I am putting to you is: given that we are a partner in the project, given that it is partly a Commonwealth project and given that you have a document relating to a Commonwealth project, then I am seeking release</p>	10-12 24/02/15	

					<p>of that document to the estimates committee. You either release it or you have to—you cannot just claim commercial confidentiality. You know that, don't you?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, Senator. I am well aware of the orders of the Senate.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Are you claiming commercial confidentiality?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, what I was indicating to you was that the New South Wales government has made clear the basis on which we have been provided with the information. I am happy from today to take on notice the question you have asked in relation to the release of the material we have from New South Wales. I cannot at this stage give you a commitment that I will, or can, release that at the moment, but I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: We have \$3½ billion worth of Commonwealth money in this project and you are haggling with the Senate estimates committee about releasing one of the key aspects of this project—one of the aspects that could make or break this project.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not know how you would express our conversation as 'haggling'. What I have indicated to you is that I will take on notice the basis on which the information has been provided to us. I will come back to the committee with advice as to the status of that and New South Wales's view on the release of that material to the committee.</p>		
9	119	II	CAMERON	NSW funding	<p>Senator CAMERON: I will come back to this. The \$25 million has been provided, and the Auditor-General in New South Wales has raised these concerns. Ms O'Connell, what have we raised with the New South Wales government in terms of the criticism of the New South Wales Auditor-General? What have we raised with them?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: We are in discussions with New South Wales on addressing the concerns raised by the Auditor-General. The New South Wales government, I think, has accepted the comments made by the Auditor-General and is putting in place a number of measures to deal with the issues raised by the Auditor-General. We are involved closely with New South Wales in making sure those issues raised are addressed.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: In essence, if I might add, the Auditor-General, in my understanding, raised questions around the project assurance arrangements that had been put in place inside the WestConnex Delivery Authority, not so much questioning the work that had been done but to ensure the level of detail and the transparency about some of the material that had been provided. My understanding is that New South Wales has accepted those recommendations and the WestConnex Delivery Authority has</p>	14 24/02/15	

					actually made arrangements—I will check this—to satisfy the requirements of the Auditor-General in terms of those quality assurance processes. They do not go to the heart of the issue of the business plan per se; they go to project assurance quality around delivery mechanisms. That is my understanding.		
10	007	II	CAMERON	WestConnex MOU	<p>Mr Mrdak: As Ms O'Connell indicated, the MOU is designed to support the progress of the project and to bring it forward, and the M4 widening is the first stage of that.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Is that MOU a public document?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think so.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I do not think so.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you table the MOU?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will seek to table the MOU. I will take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have it with us, Senator. I will seek to do that. Again, I will take that on notice and I will seek the advice of the minister in relation to its tabling.</p>	17 24/02/15	
11	008	II	CAMERON	WestConnex steering committee	<p>Senator CAMERON: Yes, on the steering committee. How many steering committees did you personally attend?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I would have to take that on notice, but quite a few during the early development of the business case.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you provide details of where and when that steering committee met.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Certainly. To my recollection they all met in Sydney, in the offices of RMS.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Are there minutes of those meetings?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Are they publicly available?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: No.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you provide the estimates committee with those minutes.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: The owner of the minutes is the New South Wales government. I will undertake to ask them if they will release them for this committee.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: These, in my view, are government documents, and we are entitled to see those government documents. I am not going to through the same arguments again. We have been through this. I assume you will take it on notice.</p>	20 24/02/15	

					Ms O'Connell: I will.		
12	009	II	CAMERON	WestConnex steering committee	<p>Senator CAMERON: Ms O'Connell, did you attend the 16 July meeting that endorsed the WestConnex business case as complete?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: On 16 July in 2014?</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: In 2013.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: In 2013? I would have to take that on notice and get back to you. I would say that the steering committee has been superseded for quite some time now, probably over a year since the steering committee got to the point of the business case, and then it has been handed over to the WestConnex Delivery Authority.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Ms O'Connell, can I draw your attention to page 20 of the Auditor-General's report, where it says that a business case overview was presented. Do you see that?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I have page 20 in front of me.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: On 16 July 2013. That does not jog your memory?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I would have to check. I was involved in the development of the business case and the steering committee meetings. You are asking me about a specific meeting on a specific date.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I will go back to look at my diary for 2013 and check which date it was in July.</p>	21 24/02/15	
13	010	II	RHIANNON	WestConnex	<p>Senator RHIANNON: How many staff of Infrastructure Australia, Infrastructure Investment and indeed the department are now working for the WestConnex organisation?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: None.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We do not have staff with the WestConnex development authority. My officers participate in meetings as part of the steering committee and the like.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: No, the question was about people who were staff members of the department and have left and are now working for WestConnex.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I am not aware of any.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We are not aware of any departmental staff who have been working for us who are now with WDA.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: But can you take it on notice?</p>	25 24/02/15	

					Ms O'Connell: Yes, certainly. Just for clarification, the WestConnex Delivery Authority is a New South Wales government entity.		
14	011	II	RHIANNON	NSW gateway	Senator RHIANNON: As a question on notice, what I am also trying to understand is where it is up to with you, with the stage 1 and stage 2 gateway—whether you have that information yet to review or when you expect to get it.	27 24/02/15	
15	012	II	SESELJA	Majura Parkway off-ramps	<p>Senator SESELJA: There was an issue raised with me by some of the local traders—you talked about Costco, but in and around that area there are a number of businesses—about where the off-ramps will be. Has a final decision been taken on those off-ramps? Where are they likely to be at this stage?</p> <p>Mr Foulds: I would have to take that on notice. I just do not have that level of detail in my head.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SESELJA: You say 'satisfactory'. Is any regard given to whether or not there will be an impact on local businesses depending on where you put those off-ramps? That is the concern that has been raised with me and that is why I am putting to you that some of those businesses feel that they will be disadvantaged if it goes too far past those existing businesses on Majura Road.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I think it is fair to say that, with most of the roads we are engaged in, there are differences of view about where the access ramps and those designs should take place. Largely, we leave those to the state or territory government to negotiate and come to a resolution on. We could ask the ACT government where they have landed with those access points and provide that information to you.</p>	27-28 24/02/15	

16	013	II	McLUCAS	Peninsula Development Road	<p>Senator McLUCAS: In October when we talked about the Cape York roads package and you advised us that the early works on the Peninsula Development Road were going to be received imminently. Has that advice been received from Queensland?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, it has and the government has made a decision on it. I will ask Mr Pittar to give you an update in relation to decisions taken and works that are now progressing.</p> <p>Mr Pittar: The government has agreed funding for the early works package for the Cape York infrastructure package, with early works already commencing on aspects of the Peninsula Development Road</p> <p>Senator McLUCAS: In the 2014-15 year?</p> <p>Mr Pittar: Correct, in the current financial year.</p> <p>Senator McLUCAS: What are those works?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can give you a list. There are 11 projects which involve ceiling and upgrading of works on the peninsula road—the Laura and Archer River crossings concept planning; the Rocky Creek to Culburra project, paving and sealing; south of Sudley area, paving and sealing; Kalinga to Healy, paving and sealing; south of Hahn, paving and sealing over NDRA upgrades; Serraus hill, paving and sealing; south of Morehead, paving and sealing; the main deviation, paving and sealing; Coen south; Archer to Warburton, Rio Tinto boundary works, including sealing works; and the area around Musgrave, paving and sealing.</p>	29 24/02/15	
17	014	II	McLUCAS	Peninsula Development Road	<p>Senator McLUCAS: Can I get a copy of the project proposal report? Is that a public document?</p> <p>Mr Pittar: That is not generally a public document. We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator McLUCAS: Could I also get the list of projects for the early works, with figures on how much is allocated to each?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. We can table that.</p>	31 24/02/15	No document needs to be tabled.

18	015	II	McLUCAS	Cook Shire Council	<p>Senator McLUCAS: I may have some other questions to put on notice, but going to the question of day labour for Cook Shire Council. Thank you for your answer on notice to that. The last sentence is 'No project applications for the cited work have yet been received from Cook Shire Council by QRA.' Has that changed?</p> <p>Mr Pittar: Sorry, I could not hear the question.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think it has, to our knowledge. But I will check that.</p> <p>Senator McLUCAS: What I am trying to find out is whether Cook Shire has applied to QRA for any of their day labour works following the cyclone last year.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Not to our knowledge, but I will check that and come back to you as soon as we can.</p> <p>Senator McLUCAS: The other part of that question is: were any of those works done on roads other than the Peninsula Development Road?</p> <p>Mr Pittar: I do not know. We will take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think so. I think they were all PDR projects, but I will check that and come back to you.</p>	31 24/02/15	
19	016	II	CAMERON	WestConnex	<p>Senator CAMERON: Minister Briggs said that the government was steaming ahead with WestConnex. Is that your understanding? Is it steaming ahead?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly the project is moving, yes, Senator.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Moving? You are steaming ahead?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Work on the M4 widening is about to commence. Work on the subsequent stage 1B, which is the M4 extension, I think, is going out to market or is out to market, and stage 2 is going out to market shortly once the reference design is complete. Mr Foulds may be able to give you an update in relation to the schedule.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: That is fine. You can give me that on notice...</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: We have a satisfactory traffic flow analysis now. We have one.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Okay, so you got it?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Yes, we do.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Is that available publicly?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: No, it is not. We took on notice earlier about making that available to you...</p>	35 24/02/15	

20	017	II	BROWN	North Bank	<p>Senator CAROL BROWN: With the other projects that have started, can you provide a list of when they are due to be completed? There are no completion dates here, and I know some have been completed. I would like some further information about that. With the ones that you have indicated funding has been approved for—Oak Enterprises, Tas Gas Networks and the Caterpillar underground mining project—I am interested in when those projects will actually commence.</p> <p>Mr McCormick: Until we actually have a funding agreement signed, we do not have a specific date, because part of the negotiations with the funding agreement is agreement on the actual milestones to be achieved.</p> <p>Senator CAROL BROWN: Funding was approved as of October last year, so some of them must have—</p> <p>Mr McCormick: We do. For all of the ones that have been contracted we do have estimated start dates, completion dates and actual dates as well.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can give you those.</p> <p>Senator CAROL BROWN: Can you provide that on notice for me. There are no completion dates or estimated completion dates in the information that you have provided.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will give you an updated table which has got estimated completion dates as per the funding agreement.</p>	37 24/02/15	
21	018	II	BROWN	Road and rail funding	<p>Senator CAROL BROWN: On notice, can you give me a list of projects after the announcement by the government on 11 December 2014 that have been funded at an 80-20 split and of any new ones that have been funded on a 50-50 split.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Details of that National Highway Upgrade Program are still being settled with the jurisdictions, but we can certainly provide you on notice with an update of that, following that announcement, yes.</p>	39 24/02/15	
22	019	II	RICE	East-West business case	<p>Ms O'Connell: A subsequent business case was delivered to the department on—I will just check with Mr Foulds—I think it was 1 November.</p> <p>Mr Foulds: It was dated June 2013 but delivered in November 2013.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: That business case was assessed by the department, and that has a different cost-benefit ratio.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Mr Foulds, can that assessment be provided to us?</p> <p>Mr Foulds: Again, it goes to advice to government, but I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I think that was probably released.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Given the Victorian government have released the business case, it</p>	39 24/02/15	

					<p>would seem to be that the assessment of that would—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Our assessment is advice to government, but I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. Is there any reason why you think it may not be able to be released?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will put that to the minister. I cannot give you a position at this stage. There are conventions around provisions of advice. But, recognising Senate orders and the like, I will take that on notice.</p>		
23	020	II	RICE	Memorandum of understanding	<p>Senator RICE: What is the view of the federal government about the release of that? Is the federal government happy for that memorandum of understanding to be released?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Not at this time. I am happy to go back to the government and seek advice on matters.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could do that, and any reasons as to why that was not able to be released, given the project is now in abeyance, would be good.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We await Victoria's formal advice on their position on the project.</p>	40 24/02/15	
24	021	II	RICE	East-West steering committee	<p>Ms O'Connell: It certainly has ceased operations. I will ask my colleague Mr Foulds if he has got the exact date of when the steering committee commenced, but it had been running for some time.</p> <p>Mr Foulds: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: It has not met for quite some months, and does not continue to meet at this point in time.</p> <p>Senator RICE: As was asked for the WestConnex steering committee, would it be possible to get the minutes of the meetings of that steering committee?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Even if we are not able to get the minutes of the meeting, I would like to have the full details of the operation of that steering committee and who was represented on that steering committee.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: Certainly.</p>	40 24/02/15	
25	022	II	RICE	National Partnership agreement	<p>Senator RICE: Have there been discussions with the Victorian government about the redirection of those funds to other projects?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There have been proposals put by the Victorian government about alternative projects that they would like to see funded. That is as far as it has gone.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you give us the details of which projects have been put forward by the Victorian government.</p>	40-41 24/02/15	

					<p>Mr Mrdak: Some of them have been publicly canvassed by the Victorian government in relation to projects such as their rail level crossings, their alternative proposal for truck access to the port—</p> <p>Senator RICE: The West Gate Distributor?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That is right, and myriad other small projects through Melbourne. I think they have been publicly canvassed by the Victorian government. It was provided via correspondence from Victoria. I can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Has the Melbourne Metro rail project been proposed as a project?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to check the details. I do not recall that being on the initial proposal put to the Australian government.</p> <p>Senator RICE: The managed motorways project? It had been an Infrastructure Australia assessed project.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not recall it being on the list that has been provided, so I cannot really talk about it.</p> <p>Senator RICE: The metropolitan ring road upgrade? That also was an IA assessed project.</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: The M80.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not recall that being on the list submitted by the Victorian government. My understanding is that, essentially, the projects that have been canvassed thus far by the Victorian government relate largely to their incoming government election commitments. I will refresh my memory and come back to you on notice.</p>		
26	023	II	CAMERON	VIC toll plans	<p>Senator CAMERON: Neither the secretary nor anyone in the department was made aware that there was a plan to toll the M1, the Westgate Bridge, the Westgate Freeway and the Eastern Freeway? Were you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to go to the documents. I am not familiar with that comment that you have just made. I am happy to go back and check that. But certainly the basis on which the Commonwealth entered its arrangement with the state of Victoria was that the state of Victoria would fund the cost over and above the Commonwealth contribution. How Victoria chose to do that was a matter for the Victorian government. With all due respect, I would need to see the documentation which you are referring to be able to give you a view on that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Okay. So you are going to have a look at your documents and see whether these issues were there. When you do that, can you look at the fact that congestion on the Tullamarine Freeway and Eastern Freeway would in fact increase</p>	44 24/02/15	

					<p>as a result of this project and also that it would take 56 years of tolls to pay back the construction costs? There are a range of issues I have raised there. If you can take those on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am happy to have a look at those issues. Certainly, the Victorian government contribution in terms of how they would structure the payments through the availability payments and the tolling levels were matters for Victoria. It does not go to the issue of the Commonwealth support for this project.</p>		
27	024	II	LUDLAM	WA consultants	<p>Mr Jaggars: We have certainly been working with the West Australians for some time. We have employed consultants who have done work along the way to provide assurance to us as the business case is being developed.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Who have you got working on this project in particular?</p> <p>Mr Jaggars: I do not think we have consultants working at the moment, but we have had during the past year. I can provide details.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Do you want to table those for us, down the track?</p> <p>Mr Jaggars: Yes, we can just table them later today, Senator, if you like.</p>	47 24/02/15	No document needs to be tabled.
28	025	II	LUDLAM	Perth Freight Link	<p>Senator LUDLAM: The PER—which is what I am drawing my information from, and I can table that after this session, if you like, so that you can have access to what I am looking at—indicated that the daily heavy vehicle flow in 2021 would be about 2,800 without the project, and that it would be about 2,600 with the project. Is that reasonably consistent with the modelling that you are reading from? It does not sound like it.</p> <p>Mr Jaggars: Senator, that is one year, I presume, those figures.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: It is a 2021 snapshot of an estimate, and that was contained in the PER.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Senator, are you quoting that it is 2,800 in 2021, without; and 2,600 with—?</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Roughly; I am reading off a graph.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: And I think what Mr Jaggars has indicated with the 2031 projection is that the 200 less is then 500 less by 2031.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: So it opens up.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: It seems to me that we are probably talking about a consistent document.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: It is in the ballpark, isn't it?</p> <p>Mr Jaggars: Yes. Senator, we might have to take that on notice to provide you with some more detail.</p>	48 24/02/15	

29	026	II	BACK	Noarlunga to Seaford rail project	<p>Senator BACK: I will go to South Australia for a couple. We have the Gawler rail line modernisation, \$300 million, and the Noarlunga to Seaford rail extension, \$290 million. Where are they and did we see a cost-benefit analysis released for each?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: The Noarlunga to Seaford rail project is complete and it is in operation.</p> <p>Senator BACK: And the contributions respectively from the Commonwealth and South Australian governments?</p> <p>Mr Wood: I will be a moment. I do not have that to hand, given that it is a completed project.</p> <p>Senator BACK: You might even take it on notice.</p>	50 24/02/15	
30	027	II	BACK	Ipswich Motorway – Dinmore to Goodna	<p>Senator BACK: In Queensland we have the Ipswich Motorway, \$884 million.</p> <p>Mr Jagers: There are a number of components of the Ipswich Motorway. I presume you are referring to the Dinmore to Goodna section?</p> <p>Senator BACK: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Jagers: That project is completed.</p> <p>Senator BACK: And the contribution by each?</p> <p>Mr Jagers: I would have to check. I am sorry, I cannot recall.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will get you those.</p> <p>Senator BACK: If you would, and do we know whether a business case or cost-benefit analysis was released for that project?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to check. There were certainly a business case and a cost-benefit analysis prepared but I do not know if they were publicly released in full.</p>	51 24/02/15	
31	028	II	BACK	Darwin Port expansion	<p>Senator BACK: And the Darwin Port expansion—the final one. Who paid up, how much did each pay and did we see a cost-benefit analysis released?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not have the details on Darwin Port so we will take it on notice.</p>	51 24/02/15	
32	029	II	CAMERON	Projects on IA priority list	<p>Senator CAMERON: Mr Mrdak, I want to table a response from the department to a question from Senator Sterle. This is question No. 148. It goes to the range of projects that Senator Back has raised with you. I am a bit concerned that your response was not a full response, in terms of those projects. I just want to bring you back to this answer to the question. On this list we have the Advanced Train Management System, the Hunter Expressway, Ipswich Motorway upgrade, the Gold Coast light rail, Goodwood and Torrens junctions, Gawler line, the Noarlunga to Seaford rail extension and the regional rail link.</p> <p>When you were asked by Senator Sterle for a list of all the infrastructure projects</p>	51-52 24/02/15	Document referred to regarding IA priority list was tabled on hearing day by Senator Cameron.

					<p>funded by budgets from 2008 and 2009 that were on the Infrastructure Australia priority list—this is their priority list for doing the project—all of the projects that were mentioned by Senator Back were on the Infrastructure Australia priority list. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Jagers: I would have to go back and I look at my answer this morning. I think the question I was answering though was: 'Were there published business cases and benefit-cost ratios for each of those projects prior to the government making a funding commitment?' I think that was the question I was answering. A number of these projects certainly were assessed by Infrastructure Australia, some, from recollection, after the government had taken in-principle decisions to fund them. I think I was not asked the question of whether they were assessed by—</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: For fullness, I am asking the question: of those projects that were dealt with this morning in your response to Senator Back, were they on the Infrastructure Australia priority list?</p> <p>Mr Jagers: I think they are. I will have to go back and look at the list. On notice, I will give you a fulsome answer in relation to that.</p>		<p>'Mr Jagers' was actually Mr Mrdak – reflected in Hansard corrections.</p>
33	030	II	CAMERON RICE	<p>Projects on IA priority list</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: I am not asking you about IA's assessment—I am asking you about a cost-benefit analysis. The coalition went to the election with a promise that they would do a cost-benefit analysis for all projects of value over \$100 million. Has that been undertaken in the context of the projects that your department is involved in?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I believe it has. I will check with my officers.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you provide details of all projects that are underway at the moment from this government and where the business cases are up to. That would be helpful.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator RICE: In addition to the list of projects mentioned by Senator Back and the list of projects tabled by Senator Cameron, could we have a benefit-cost ratio for each of them and an articulation of the benefit-cost ratio for each of those projects.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. As Infrastructure Australia publishes its assessments, they also publish those. Where we have others we will certainly identify that in the advice back to you.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you also have a look at this: when the money was allocated for these projects in the 2014 budget, had Infrastructure Australia completed its business case analysis, and had there been cost-benefit analyses done</p>	52-53 24/02/15		

					for every project? Mr Mrdak: I will come back to you with the detailed advice. In essence, though, as we discussed this morning, Infrastructure Australia was continuing its assessment at the time the Australian government made its funding commitments.		
34	031	II	CAMERON	Pacific Highway	Senator CAMERON: Can you provide details of changes to the funding for the Pacific Highway since the election of the Abbott government? Mr Jagers: Certainly.	54 24/02/15	
35	032	II	CAMERON	Pacific Highway funding in previous years	Senator CAMERON: Mr Mrdak, can you tell me the amounts that the federal government paid to the New South Wales government for the Pacific Highway projects for the following years: 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Do you have them here? Mr Mrdak: I do not know if I have those with us. I will just check with my officers. We can get that for you on notice. Mr Jagers: I do not have that with me. ... Mr Mrdak: The change, in late 2013, was the lift in funding given on the sections north of Woolgoolga, which went to 80-20 funding rather than 50-50, so that changed the funding split over the out years. But we can get you that information for the full profile, back to 2008-09.	54 24/02/15	
36	033	II	CAMERON	Tintenbar to Ewingsdale	Senator CAMERON: For Tintenbar to Ewingsdale, you have given a figure of \$148.95 million. Is that the federal government's 20 per cent? ... Mr Mrdak: We can read that in. We will get you the file. Woolgoolga North is 80-20, Tintenbar to Ewingsdale is—	54-55 24/02/15	
37	034	II	CAMERON	Project break-ups	Senator CAMERON: So you will take on notice these other individual break-ups under 2014-15? Mr Mrdak: That is right.	55 24/02/15	
38	035	II	BULLOCK	Reduction in infrastructure expenditure	Senator BULLOCK: I will look forward to the Western Australian budget this year with interest. One other thing which goes to the additional estimates: I just noticed that since the budget the estimated expenditure on improved infrastructure across Australia through investment in and coordination of transport and other infrastructure has dropped by \$67¾ million, and I wonder if you could give us a breakdown of	56 24/02/15	

					<p>where that nearly 13 per cent reduction has occurred. Ms O'Connell: Could you tell us which page? Senator BULLOCK: Page 21. Mr Mrdak: We will get that breakdown for you. Senator BULLOCK: It would be good. It is a significant reduction. That means that there must be many things going undone. It would be interesting to know what they were. Mr Mrdak: I think it probably reflects a movement from the out years as we have got better definition of when project delivery will be. But I will get you a breakdown of those and the rationale for that reduction.</p>		
39	036	II	PERIS	Northern Territory asset recycling funding	<p>Mr Jagers: Under the Infrastructure Investment Program there is \$601.79 million allocated to the Northern Territory for the period 2013-14 to 2018-19. ... Senator PERIS: We have some documents here. It is the Northern Territory projects National Partnership Agreement on Land Transport Infrastructure. It had that the total Australian government committed funding of \$833.72 million. But it says here that the asset recycling fund project is \$90 million. Ms O'Connell: It includes more than the specific projects we have listed, yes. Senator PERIS: Okay, so— Mr Jagers: So the asset recycling funding would come from the Treasury portfolio, not from this portfolio. The numbers I have provided are just this portfolio's contribution under that national partnership agreement. We might take that on notice just to double-check that figure for you and come back to you.</p>	61 24/02/15	
40	037	II	STERLE	NSRF proposals	<p>Senator STERLE: I have got about a dozen questions, Mr Mrdak. I will be precise, and I trust the answers will be short and succinct too. I just want to confirm that the government has received 400 proposals in relation to the National Stronger Regions Fund. Mr Mrdak: Yes. Senator STERLE: You have received 405 proposals for that fund; is that correct? Ms O'Connell: Yes, that is correct. Senator STERLE: Fantastic. Do you have a list of where these proposals came from? Mr Mrdak: We do have a list. Ms O'Connell: But we do not have it with us. Senator STERLE: That is fine. Please take it on notice. Could you provide the</p>	61-62 24/02/15	

				<p>committee with the information on how many are from each state and territory, each local government area and each electorate.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes. I do not know if we have the information by electorate, but we can certainly get you information by jurisdiction.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: We will soon work that out if you have a list of the names next to it. Thanks, that is good. What proportion of the applications came from regional, rural or remote Australia versus the proportion from the metropolitan area? If you have got the answer now, great. If you have not—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We do not have that.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Take that on notice, thank you. Has the department done any analysis on the types of local governments and organisations that have applied for the NSRF?</p> <p>Ms O'Connell: We are currently in the process of doing assessments on all of those projects. We are part way through the 405 assessments.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: This is a tricky question, I know, but how long do you think it will be before that work is completed? Bear in mind you have the budgets coming up and all sorts of stuff.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: By the end of March we anticipate completing our assessment process, which would enable the ministerial committee to then consider the funding recommendations.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Will that information be available at the same time for the committee?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will endeavour to give you the information you have sought.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Thanks, because I do get nervous—not because of you guys, because you pull your fingers out and get going, but because answers to questions on notice can get lost in this building. Has the department got any information on how many local governments applied for funding the NSRF?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can get that for you.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: You will take that on notice as well?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes. We do not have that detail here.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Will a full list of all applicants be published even after the decisions are announced so we know who is in and who is out?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Sure.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think that has been done in the past, but I can take that on notice. I do not think that has been done in the past.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

41	101	II	LUDWIG	Infrastructure Growth Package – WestConnex Stage 2 – Provision of a Concessional Loan	<p>During Supplementary Estimates in 2014, Finance flagged changes to the Infrastructure Growth Package – WestConnex Stage 2 – Provision of a Concessional Loan program (Q F83).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please provide a summary of these changes? 2. What is the timeframe for implementation? 3. Who is the responsible agency for actioning these changes? 4. When was the Minister last briefed on this item? Was this briefing requested or initiated by the Minister or was it initiated by the department? 5. What action has the Minister taken on this policy? 	Written	
42	102	II	WHISH-WILSON	Tasmanian Jobs Programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many applications have been received from businesses for funding under the Tasmanian Jobs Programme? 2. How many applications have been approved? 3. Has the scheme been modified in any way? 	Written	
43	103	II	WHISH-WILSON	Tasmanian Jobs and Growth Package	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are you able to provide any information on the economic activity that has been generated, or is predicted to be generated, as a result of the jobs and growth package? 2. Are you able to provide any information on jobs that have been generated, or are predicted to be generated, as a result of the jobs and growth package? 	Written	
44	104	II	STERLE	WestConnex	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Department agree with NSW Government’s December decision to undertake a “formal and thorough revisiting” of the business case for Stages 2 and 3 of WestConnex and other major scope additions, in response to the Auditor-General’s recommendations? 2. How has the Government’s decision to lend \$2 billion to Stage 2 of WestConnex been affected by this recommendation? 3. Has any of this loan been called upon yet? If yes, how much and when? 4. Given there is still no effective business case, how can the Government be offering taxpayers money via the cost of a loan to a project of unknown merit? 	Written	
45	105	II	STERLE	NSW infrastructure projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have any fund allocations to the NSW projects under the National Partnership Agreement of October 10, 2014 been changed since? If yes, what is the detail of the change (ie which project, how much, has it been reallocated – if so to where?) 2. Has the NSW Government agreed to this reallocation? 	Written	

46	106	II	STERLE	NSW urban rail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Department had any discussions with the NSW Government or any of its agencies about Federal support for urban passenger rail projects, since September 2013? 2. If yes, which projects? 	Written	
47	107	II	STERLE	East West	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the Government's stated position on the role of IA in recommending projects, why did the Department facilitate the June 30, 2014 payments before they had completed their analysis? 2. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the BCR for Stage 1? 3. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the Victorian Government's claimed BCR for Stage 1? 4. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the BCR for Stage 2? 5. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the Victorian Government's claimed BCR for Stage 2? 6. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the BCR for the whole project? 7. At the time you made the June 30, 2014 payment, what did the Department understand to be the Victorian Government's claimed BCR for the whole project? 	Written	
48	108	II	STERLE	State profiles	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In written answer 123 from October Estimates you indicated that State and Territory funding contribution profiles for federally-funded projects were a matter for them. Is it the case that the Department does not know or knows, but does not feel at liberty to tell? 2. How does the Department ensure that the Commonwealth pays no more than its agreed share for projects? 3. For each State and Territory, please provide detail of actual (or forecast actual) Commonwealth Government spending for the 2013-4 and 2014-5 financial years, broken into these three categories: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Road project spending b. Rail project spending c. Maritime project spending (including ports). 	Written	
49	109	II	STERLE	Land transport approvals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since September 18, 2013, has any funding been provided to a funding recipient under section 17 of the National Land Transport Act, or the same 	Written	

					<p>provision in the predecessor Act?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. If yes, in respect of which projects? 3. For each project, list the approving Minister, and the amount approved for payment? 4. For each project, what document outlines the terms of the payment? 		
50	110	II	STERLE	National Stronger Regions Fund	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Department done any analysis on the types of local governments and organisations that have applied for the NSRF? 2. Has the Department got any information on how many local governments applied for funding under the NSRF? 3. Will a full list of all applicants be published – even after the decisions are announced? 4. Does the Department know if there has been a noticeable impact on smaller local governments or smaller community organisations applying for the NRSF as compared to the Regional Development Australia Fund? – if yes, is this due to the eligibility criteria which requires applicants to match funding on a dollar for dollar basis? 5. Has the Department received any feedback on this requirement and whether it is affecting the ability of small and regional local government to apply for the funding? 6. Are there any safeguards in place to ensure that smaller local government organisations and community groups receive funding under the NSRF? 7. Are there any plans to tailor any rounds of the NSRF for smaller regional cities or quarantine some of the funding for these areas? 8. Why did the Government drop a commitment built into previous regional funding guidelines to support projects which helped Close the Gap and addressed indigenous and social disadvantage? 9. Is there the potential for the Ministerial Panel to reject the Department’s advice given to it on whether to fund a project? 10. I note in a previous answer to a QoN, the Government had not decided which of the Parliamentary Secretaries to the Prime Minister would be on the Ministerial Panel, when will this decision be made? 	Written	
51	111	II	STERLE	Economy-wide investment target	<p>I refer to the Department’s written answer 135 from October Estimates and I ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the date of the first submission to the PC actually 24 December 2013, instead of 2014? 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Why is the second submission dated February 11, 2014 apparently not listed on the Productivity Commission website as either public or confidential? 3. Are the contents of pages 2 and 3 of the February 11 2014 submission publicly available? 4. If yes, where? 5. If not, why not? 6. Can and will the submission be provided to the Committee? 7. If not, why not? 		
52	112	II	STERLE	National Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the eligibility criteria for this program changed from Round Three to Round Four? [Round Three was former Labor Govt, Round Four was Abbott Govt] If yes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Can you outline the Round Three criteria? b. Can you outline the Round Four criteria? c. Why did the criteria change? d. Who authorised the change to the criteria? e. Minister Truss/Assistant Minister Briggs involvement? f. Did the Department consult with any external stakeholders on the change to criteria? g. Has the safety focus been weakened in the new criteria? 2. Can you indicate the category of projects funded in Rounds Three and Four – under the following list – by number of projects and total value for each category: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rest Area projects: which improve the provision of heavy vehicle rest areas on key interstate routes; b. Parking/Decoupling Bay projects: which provide heavy vehicle parking/decoupling areas and facilities in outer urban/regional areas; c. Technology Trial projects: which include the trial technologies to improve heavy vehicle safety and/or productivity; d. Road Enhancement projects: which enhance the capacity and/or safety of roads (including bridges) to allow access by high productivity 	Written	

					<p>vehicles to more of the road network;</p> <p>e. Demonstration projects: which facilitate innovation to improve heavy vehicle safety and productivity projects; and</p> <p>f. Livestock Transport Industry projects: which improve heavy vehicle safety and productivity for specific livestock transport operations.</p>		
53	113	II	STERLE	Projects 2013-4	The Department's Annual Report states that 22 road and rail projects were commenced in construction in 2013-4 – can you provide a list of these (similar to the completed list on pp 32-3 of the 2013-4 Annual Report)?	Written	
54	114	II	STERLE	Roads to Recovery/FAGs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has the Federal Government satisfied itself that Roads to Recovery Funds have been genuinely additional to other planned road expenditure? 2. How will the Government address the additionality of Roads to Recovery funding in light of its freeze (that is, real cuts to future local govt budgets) on Financial Assistance Grants, which include road funding? 	Written	
55	115	II	STERLE	\$11.6 billion Infrastructure Growth Package	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government has indicated that this package will leverage \$58.0 billion in new investment (DIRD Annual Report 2013-4 p 33) – please indicate how the \$58 billion figure is calculated. 2. Please indicate how this is profiled by year. 	Written	
56	116	II	STERLE	Major projects facilitation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please list the 19 projects that were provided with Major Project facilitation services by the Department in 2013-4. 2. How many projects are currently being provided with this service? Please list them. 	Written	
57	117	II	STERLE	Notes on Administration for Land Transport Infrastructure Projects – 2014-5 to 2018-9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who prepared this document? 2. Who approved the document? 3. Appendices include requirements for receiving Commonwealth funding under different Acts – correct? 4. How is Infrastructure Australia's role incorporated into these approvals? 5. Can I put to you that IA is not an essential part of the funding approval process at the Commonwealth level, according to these Notes? 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In fact, the only recognition of IA’s role is via the Building Australia Fund, section 116 – which is a legislated requirement – correct (see Notes p 13) 7. Why isn’t IA integrated into the process listed here? 8. Why was “estimated capital cost” of over \$100 million selected as the trigger for demonstrated consideration of State/Territory PPP options under the National Partnership Agreement (see Notes Appendix A, p 41)? 9. What process identifies this “estimated capital cost”? 		
58	118	II	STERLE	Road funding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What work is the Department undertaking on roads access and charging? 2. Given the Government’s response to the PC Inquiry into Public Infrastructure included the passage: “..opportunities to test the practical application of road funds could be implemented as pilot schemes, such as building on the regional-based Roads and Transport Alliance model currently in place in Queensland, which allows multiple local governments to cooperate and have greater input into road improvements specific to their regions needs” (p6), what new steps is the Department undertaking or aware of? 3. What work is the Department doing towards the development of Road Funds with States and territories as per recommendation 8.1 of the PC report, which the Government supports? 	Written	
59	170	II	STERLE	Commonwealth spending figures done by BITRE p 39 Budget 2014-5 official Infrastructure glossy	<p>Looking at Appendix B on page 39 of <u>that document</u> – headed “Commonwealth expenditure on infrastructure”.</p> <p>Right at the bottom it says BITRE is the source of these numbers, unless otherwise specified.</p> <p>With respect to the numbers on that page:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Footnote (a): this indicates some spending is in 2013-4 – can you indicate how much spending in this column occurred in 2013-4? 2. Any other spending in this period results from privatisation – correct? 3. Given the Queensland outcome on assets recycling, isn’t the spending of \$5 billion on this initiative by 2019 now highly unlikely? 4. How much of the estimated State Asset Recycling expenditures were crowded into the Forward Estimates rather than beyond (see footnote d)? 5. What construction will occur after 2019-20 (see footnote d and *)? 	Written	

Infrastructure Australia (32)								
60	038	IA	CAMERON	NSW tolling strategy	<p>Senator CAMERON: Is the tolling strategy unchanged?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: We will have to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: So you do not know about the tolling strategy?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: There was economic modelling and financial modelling considered as part of the original business case, but I will have to take the details on notice.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Have you factored in the tolling strategies in terms of the cost of the project?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Have you really not done that, or is it that just do not know?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will just have to take that on notice. We have assessed the economic costs and we have had a look, also, at some of the financials, but I will take the details on notice.</p>	66 24/02/15		
61	039	IA	CAMERON	NSW AG report – modelling	<p>Senator CAMERON: Do you have similar concerns to the Auditor-General that the traffic data raises questions about the underlying quality of the modelling?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I would have to take that on notice.</p>	67 24/02/15		
62	040	IA	MCLUCAS	Northern Australia white paper	<p>Senator McLUCAS: Have you been requested, either through your minister or in any other way, to provide input into the Northern Australia white paper?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I do not recall, but I will take that on notice if I may.</p>	80 24/02/15		
63	041	IA	MCLUCAS	Hann Highway	<p>Senator McLUCAS: Yes. On a different matter: has Infrastructure Australia provided any advice to government, or to Northern Australia Taskforce, about the Hann Highway?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will have to take that one on notice. Paul, you don't recall anything?</p> <p>Mr Roe: I am not aware of a public submission.</p>	80 24/02/15		
64	042	IA	GALLACHER	Reports/research on IA website	<p>Senator GALLACHER: I will get to the audit, but have you published anything on the website in the last 12 months?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I would have to take that on notice, but I do not recall—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What about reports or research published by IA on its website in the previous 12 months—from 2013 to 2014?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: There would have been material published, but I would have to take that on notice.</p>	81 24/02/15		

65	043	IA	GALLACHER	CEO shortlist	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Is there a shortlist?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: That would be my understanding, but I am not across the detail.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So we may be at the shortlist stage. Is the minister's office aware of the state of the recruitment process?</p> <p>Senator Cash: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So we do not know any of the candidates? Does the assistant minister or the minister or anyone in their offices not know any of the names?</p> <p>Senator Cash: Again, I would take that on notice.</p>	82 24/02/15	
66	044	IA	GALLACHER	Board meetings	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Could we have how many meetings of the IA board there have been since October, and what were the dates?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I think there have been five meetings, but I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Five meetings—</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will take that on notice.</p>	82 24/02/15	
67	045	IA	GALLACHER	Audit cost	<p>Senator GALLACHER: We were advised that the audit would be about \$4 million. Is there any increase in the cost now that these matters are rolling along— intergenerational report and that?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I would have to take that on notice, because it is split between costs for the northern audit and the national audit and 2013-14 versus 2014-15.</p>	83 24/02/15	
68	046	IA	GALLACHER	Ministers' directions to IA	<p>Senator GALLACHER: In terms of ministers' directions, how many directions has the minister issued to Infrastructure Australia under section 6 of the act?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Does that mean you do not know the exact number? Or you do not know the answer?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I just do not know the exact number.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: But there have been some directions.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will take that on notice.</p>	83 24/02/15	
69	151	IA	GALLACHER	IA board	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Has the minister met with the new board?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I understand he has had meetings with the chairman, but I will take that on notice.</p>	84 24/02/2015	

70	047	IA	BACK	Caravel review	<p>Senator BACK:... The concern I have is that, with the billions of dollars now in major projects either underway or in the pipeline, what, if any, of the Caravel findings are going to find their way into the oversight of projects, particularly as they relate to governance rather than project management? That is the essence of my concern and my question.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I will make a couple of high-level observations. Firstly, the governance and the project delivery issues are important ones for Infrastructure Australia. Last year, the Productivity Commission report on infrastructure identified issues around project selection and delivery that are important. We are looking at governance issues as part of the infrastructure audit, and I expect there will be a treatment of governance issues in the audit report. Our assessment of the framework for projects does deal with delivery issues and the like, and governance is part of that. Beyond that, if I may, I will take the question on notice to give you a more specific response. I can say unequivocally that those issues are being addressed.</p> <p>Senator BACK: It seems that the governance question really goes to highly experienced and possibly either retiring or semiretired people who have themselves been top project managers, are no longer looking to work the hours that a project manager has to work, but come in and identify those who are doing well and those who require a little bit of tweaking. Again, I would be very keen on your views, perhaps on notice, as to whether or not in the allocation of funding governments should be having a role to very strongly propose and, indeed, insist that there be those standards of governance that Caravel have identified.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: If I may, I will take that on notice. It is an important issue.</p>	86 24/02/15	
71	048	IA	RICE	WestConnex transport modelling	<p>Senator RICE: I was wondering whether you may be able to share one aspect of that transport modelling, and you might have to take it on notice—looking at the mode share that is forecast for various travel segments over time, what the model shows the public transport mode share to be.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: Sorry, Senator, just to be clear—is this in relation to East West or WestConnex?</p> <p>Senator RICE: No, WestConnex. It is a big issue that the transport modelling is not available to the public. I think it is a very poor way of planning infrastructure for that not to be able to be reviewed by the wider community.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I think we would have to take that one on notice, if we may.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Certainly, a key criticism of the transport modelling that underpins the East West project is that the public transport mode share is lower than what it currently is—that is, the forecast out to 2031 that you are only going to have a nine</p>	88-89 24/02/15	

					<p>per cent public transport mode share across Melbourne. I am interested to know whether the WestConnex transport modelling similarly has an unreasonably low level of public transport mode share out in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Mr Alchin: We would need to have a look at the details of the material and get back to you, if we may.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you put that on notice and see what you could give to us.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: I know we are short for time. Perhaps I could put that on notice—just what methodologies you are looking at, and what are the various aspects you are looking at in that review.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: Will you be providing a proposed methodology or will you propose guidelines that proponents would have to meet in order to be assessed by you?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I expect we will, but I will take that on notice. I am mindful of the comments that Ms O'Connell made before about the material that has been released by the department.</p>		
72	049	IA	RICE	Quarterly update	<p>Mr Alchin: Our assessments of projects are updated on a quarterly basis as project appraisals are undertaken.</p> <p>Senator RICE: When do you expect the next update will be?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: Later this year. I do not have the precise details, but I will happily come back to you if that is of any assistance.</p>	89 24/02/15	
73	050	IA	STERLE	East West Link Stage 2 and WestConnex	<p>Senator STERLE: What about for East West Link stage 2?</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What about for WestConnex—any stage?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: We had looked at the East West Link and WestConnex. It was on our priority list at the time. I would have to take on notice exactly where it was on the priority list.</p>	90 24/02/15	
74	062	IA	STERLE	Perth Freight Link	<p>Senator STERLE: ... What about the Perth Freight Link? ...</p> <p>Mr Roe: There are components of the Perth Freight Link which are on the priorities list, so—</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Did you complete any assessment before money was allocated?</p> <p>Mr Alchin: I would have to take that on notice.</p>	90 24/02/15	
75	133	IA	RICE	Northern Australia	<p>1. To inform the Northern Australia audit, did Infrastructure Australia conduct any economic/financial feasibility or other assessments of the proposed water</p>	Written	

					<p>and other infrastructure outlined in the Agricultural Competitiveness Green Paper?</p> <p>2. What is Infrastructure Australia’s opinion of the ANZ Mountain to Molehill – Agriculture in Northern Australia Report (2014) findings that large-scale water/irrigation infrastructure in Northern Australia is not economically viable but small scale mosaic grazing is? Will the findings of the ANZ report inform the audit?</p>		
76	134	IA	RHIANNON	WestConnex	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On what date did Infrastructure Australia begin its assessment of the WestConnex business case? 2. On what date was this concluded? 3. On what date, and at what time was the 2014-2015 Assessment Brief of the WestConnex business case uploaded and made publicly available on the Infrastructure Australia website? 4. How many projects have been awarded Commonwealth funding while still being categorised as “Early Stage” by Infrastructure Australia, since Infrastructure Australia’s inception? What were these projects and how much funding was awarded to them? 5. What interest rate is being charged on the \$2 billion concessional loan provided by the Commonwealth to the NSW Government for construction of the WestConnex? 6. When was Infrastructure Australia notified the NSW Government was preparing a new business case for the WestConnex incorporating the new proposed North-South link? 7. Will Infrastructure Australia be reviewing this businesses case? When? 8. Has Infrastructure Australia estimated the BCR for the WestConnex project with capital costs at P90? If so, what is the BCR under these conditions? If not, why not? 9. What other projects assessed by Infrastructure Australia have estimated capital costs at P50? Have any of these projects received capital funding from the Commonwealth? 10. What is the BCR of the WestConnex project individually for each of Stage 1 and Stage 2? 11. What is the cost of the WestConnex estimated by Infrastructure Australia at P90? If Infrastructure Australia has no estimated this cost why not? 12. What were the “time constraints for the estimation of costs” referenced in the 2014-15 Assessment Brief of the WestConnex business case on page 5? 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. What other projects assessed by Infrastructure Australia did not model induced trips? 14. What other projects awarded funding by the Commonwealth did not model induced trips? 15. Is the “major scheme in Victoria” referenced on page 5 of the 2014-15 Assessment Brief of the WestConnex business case the East-West motorway? 16. What was the specific impact of induced trips in modelling undertaken for that “major scheme”? What impact did it have on the expected costs and benefits of the project and the BCR? 17. Has Infrastructure Australia estimated the impact of the WestConnex’s BCR with the inclusion of induced trips? 18. Can Infrastructure Australia quantify the “degree of confidence” it has that the BCR for the WestConnex will remain positive once induced trips are included and the capital costs are adjusted for P90? 19. What is the BCR of the WestConnex project factoring in induced trips and capital costs at P90 as estimated by Infrastructure Australia? If Infrastructure Australia has not estimated the BCR why not? 20. Does the business case of the WestConnex assessed by Infrastructure Australia include estimations of revenue (ie. tolls)? What are these estimations? 21. How can Infrastructure Australia rely on the 1.8:1 BCR for the WestConnex as the basis for moving the project into the “threshold” category when in the same document Infrastructure Australia proposes an update to the business case based on the factoring in of induced trips and capital costs at P90? 		
77	135	IA	STERLE	NSW Coalition Government Infrastructure Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has IA been asked to evaluate the projects proposed by the NSW Government in its Rebuilding NSW initiative announced in June 2014? 2. What new projects have been submitted for evaluation by the NSW Government since June 2014? 	Written	
78	136	IA	STERLE	East West	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On the last occasion, you indicated that you received the full business case from the Victorian Government on July 7 2014. To what point did Infrastructure Australia progress on the assessment of the business case: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For Stage 1? b. For Stage 2? 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Has Infrastructure Australia ever made a recommendation to the Government on the merit of Stage 1? 3. If yes, what was it? 4. Is there an IA assessed BCR for Stage 1? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If <i>no</i>, why did the Department recommend an advance payment? b. On what date was the recommendation made? c. If <i>yes</i>, what is it? 5. Has Infrastructure Australia ever made a recommendation to the Government on the merit of Stage 2? 6. Is there an IA assessed BCR for Stage 2? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If <i>no</i>, why did the Department recommend an advance payment? b. On what date was the recommendation made? c. If <i>yes</i>, what is it? 7. What is Infrastructure Australia’s current position on Stage 1/Stage 2? 		
79	137	IA	STERLE	Recent work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What reports or research has been published by IA on its website in the twelve months to today (February 23, 2015)? 2. What reports or research has been published by IA on its website in the previous twelve months (to February 23, 2014)? 	Written	
80	138	IA	STERLE	Major projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You are aware of the Government’s election commitment that IA will “regularly publish cost-benefit analyses for all projects being considered for Commonwealth support or investment” (Coalition policy to Deliver the Infrastructure for the 21st Century”, released September 5, 2013, p 2). 2. For each of the above projects, is there an IA published cost-benefit analysis? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. East West Link in Victoria b. Toowoomba Second Range Crossing in Queensland c. Perth Freight Link in WA d. Darlington Interchange on South Road Adelaide 	Written	
81	140	IA	STERLE	Assessed projects	What projects has IA published a cost-benefit analysis for since September 2013? Please list them.	Written	
82	141	IA	STERLE	Published IA assessments	<p>Which of the following projects had assessments published by IA on its website on May 14, 2014?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. East West Link in Victoria 2. WestConnex in NSW 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Toowoomba Second Range Crossing in Queensland 4. Perth Freight Link in WA 5. Darlington Interchange on South Road Adelaide 6. Western Sydney Infrastructure Package 		
83	142	IA	STERLE	Perth Freight Link	<p>We note that as of 20 October 2014 (Answers to Questions on Notice, Supplementary Budget Estimates – Question 156) that Infrastructure Australia was not assessing the Perth Freight Link.</p> <p>Also, your Project Assessments page on the IA website, updated on Thursday February 19, makes no reference to the Perth Freight Link.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has IA been asked to assess the project at any time? 2. If yes, when is it expected to be completed? 3. What analysis has IA undertaken of the timetable for the development of alternative container facilities in the Fremantle Port’s Outer Harbour? 	Written	
84	143	IA	STERLE	Juturna consulting report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I refer to the Juturna Consulting Report that was funded by taxpayers to the tune of \$59,400. Are you familiar with that? 2. Which agency of Government paid Juturna for its work? 3. If IA has paid for this work, when will this \$60,000 piece of taxpayer-funded work be published on the IA website? 4. If IA has paid for this work, when will this \$60,000 piece of taxpayer-funded work be put out for community consultation and feedback? 5. If IA has paid for this work, when will this \$60,000 piece of taxpayer-funded work be discussed by the IA Board? 	Written	
85	144	IA	STERLE	Asset recycling	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given IA’s answer to written question 153 from October, what assurances exist in the Asset Recycling Initiative to protect the interests of customers of privatised entities from potential fire sales? 2. In the Infrastructure Australia section of the Annual Report 2013-4, IA indicates it is developing a policy on Asset Recycling focussed on the output of the coming audit and 15 year plan. Can you elaborate? (see p. 117 of DIRD AR) 	Written	
86	145	IA	STERLE	Proposals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has IA received any proposals for the following since we last asked on October 20 (<i>see written answers 156 and 160</i>): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Energy project proposals? b. Water project proposals? 	Written	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Dams proposals? d. Communications project proposals? e. Transport project proposals? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. If yes, to any, what is the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. name of the project; b. details of the proponent; and c. estimated capital cost of the proposed project. 3. For each project referred to, have any been evaluated as nationally significant infrastructure? 4. For each project referred to, have any been evaluated as not nationally significant infrastructure? Why? 		
87	146	IA	STERLE	Statement of Expectations – 6 November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has IA developed a “Statement of Intent” in response to the Government’s Statement of Expectations yet (Statement of Expectations said by end of 2014)? 2. When will this be made public? 3. Has IA endorsed a Corporate Plan? 4. How does the Minister’s Statement of Expectations interact with the IA Corporate Plan to be developed under s 39B of the Act? 5. How is the Board consulting with other stakeholders under section 39B(6)? That is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State Governments? b. Local Government? c. Commercial and industrial entities? d. Investors in, and owners of, infrastructure? 6. Which other organisations is IA consulting with about the Corporate Plan? 7. Is the Board aware that it is the Board that is ultimately responsible for finalising the Corporate Plan? 	Written	
88	147	IA	STERLE	Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many permanent full-time employees are currently employed by IA? 2. How many permanent part-time employees at currently employed by IA? 3. For those FT/PT employees how many are not engaged under the Public Service Act? 4. How many seconded employees are there? Full-time/part-time? 5. For those seconded employees how many are not engaged under the Public Service Act? 6. Where are these employees seconded from? 	Written	

					<p>7. How many employees are seconded from State or Territory Governments?</p> <p>8. How many consultants are currently engaged with IA?</p> <p>9. What project is each working on?</p> <p>10. What is the budget allocation for their consultancy services?</p>		
89	148	IA	STERLE	National Land Freight Strategy	<p>IA indicated in the DIRD Annual Report for 2014-5 (p. 117) that it began testing land freight ideas in the Freight Strategy via a proof-of-concept programme.</p> <p>1. What ongoing work is occurring in this area?</p> <p>2. Is this a matter that the Minister listed in his Statement of Expectations?</p>	Written	
90	149	IA	STERLE	Benchmarking	<p>1. What work has IA undertaken with respect to establishing benchmarks for infrastructure delivery?</p> <p>2. What benchmarks are being considered:</p> <p>a. cost;</p> <p>b. timing;</p> <p>c. return on investment; or</p> <p>d. others.</p>	Written	
91	150	IA	STERLE	Road funding	<p>1. What work is IA undertaking on roads access and charging?</p> <p>2. Given the Government's response to the PC Inquiry into Public Infrastructure included the passage: <i>"..opportunities to test the practical application of road funds could be implemented as pilot schemes, such as building on the regional-based Roads and Transport Alliance model currently in place in Queensland, which allows multiple local governments to cooperate and have greater input into road improvements specific to their regions needs"</i> (p. 6), what new steps is the Department undertaking or aware of?</p> <p>3. What work is the IA doing towards the development of Road Funds with States and Territories as per recommendation 8.1 of the PC report, which the Government supports?</p>	Written	
Australian Rail Track Corporation (3)							
92	051	ARTC	WILLIAMS	Derailment at Kankool	<p>Senator WILLIAMS: How many services were disrupted and held up—do you know?</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I would have to take that on notice in particular, but certainly there were the coal trains that operate for Indemitsu and Whitehaven were not able to run</p>	69 24/02/15	

					for that period so there was loss of product being moved through the supply chain.		
93	052	ARTC	RICE	Melb-Sydney rail line maintenance issues	<p>Senator RICE: Was there any written documentation that you might be able to make public? I am responding for constituents who are concerned about potential ongoing problems and they would like to be assured, as you obviously are, that it is not going to be an ongoing problem. Would there be documentation that you would be able to make public?</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I might have to take that question on notice. I do not think there is any specific documentation about that other than our—all our conditions of the track are in our asset maintenance system. We formed a view about how much damage to the formation there was. We believed there were other problems that were causing it and we are dealing with it.</p>	75 24/02/15	
94	064	ARTC	RICE	Inland Rail, between Albury and Melbourne	What consideration has been given to the problems with the formation of the Albury rail line, in terms of its capacity to take heavier (e.g. double stacked) freight on rail and form part of the Inland Rail line?	Written	
National Transport Commission (2)							
95	245	NTC	STERLE	Heavy vehicle charging	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it the case that the heavy vehicle road user (fuel) charge of 26.14 cents per litre is backed up by proper analysis? 2. Is the NTC aware of concerns from the heavy vehicle industry that they are being over charged by \$200 million this year due to the decision of the Transport & Infrastructure Council to freeze the charge for 2014-5? 3. Given that changes to the charging system come into effect from 1 July 2016, what is the proposed charge for 2015-6? 4. Has the NTC calculated what the underlying actual charge should be for 2015-6 yet? 5. If so, what is it? 6. Using the existing methodology, would it be expected that the road user charge would rise or fall? 7. Has the NTC calculated how much the heavy vehicle sector would be duded if 26.14 cents per litre applies in 2015-6? 	Written	
96	246	NTC	STERLE	National Ports Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What work is currently underway at the NTC with respect to the National Ports Strategy? 2. Does the NTC have any concerns about port charging oversight mechanisms 	Written	

					that have been put in place for recently privatised ports? 3. Does the NTC monitor port charges?		
Surface Transport Policy (8)							
97	053	STP	STERLE	Coastal shipping	<p>Senator STERLE: Let's work our way through it. I refer to the comment by member for Leichhardt, Mr Warren Entsch, in the <i>Cairns Post</i>, date 28 January 2015. In that article Mr Entsch described the issue of a licence to <i>Caledonian Sky</i> as a 'departmental stuff up'. Ms Zielke, could you give us a rundown on what happened to the <i>Caledonian Sky</i>?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I do not believe I can give that detail to you, Senator. I would need to refresh my memory on the case.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Can I give you some more information—</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Please do. Help me out.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: by noting that the licence would not have been granted—again, I will note that we are taking these questions without having all of the detail in front of us, so we will confirm our answers later—had the voyages been able to be undertaken by the Coral Princess cruise ship</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: So the Australian owned vessel with an Australian crew could not do the work that the <i>Caledonian Sky</i>—</p> <p>Ms Zielke: That is the requirement of the legislation. The legislation says that we need to look at the Australian vessel and see if it can undertake the work that is being asked of it. If it could have undertaken that work then the licence would have been given to the Australian vessel.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What was the work?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I do not have the details with me.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Is there somebody who can find that out for me?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Not at this stage. We would have to take that on notice for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I can give you examples of the criteria. For example, could they travel on the dates that the cruise was looking to travel? Were they able to carry the number of passengers?</p> <p>From my recollection—but, again, I would need to check—the vessel could not carry the number of passengers that were actually required for the cruise.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Okay. Take it on notice: how many ventures were there, how</p>	127-130 24/02/15	

					<p>many voyages were there, how many passengers were they required to carry and from where to where in what time—because I would not see one trip putting an Australian business out of work. That would not be cheap, a boat like that.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: No, and I also cannot understand how one voyage would actually put another business out of business.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes. So can you come back to us notice and let us know all that. Plus I want to know how many people were put off, please—how many people lost their employment—and what are the foreign crews working under.</p>		
98	054	STP	URQUHART	<p>PC inquiry report on TAS shipping and freight</p>	<p>Senator URQUHART: The government has had the Productivity Commission inquiry report on Tasmanian shipping and freight since 7 March 2014. On 18 February 2015, the department refused to answer a number of detailed questions and said that the government was currently considering the report and will be responding in due course—that was the comment. Can you provide a timeframe around when you plan to respond to the productivity report, because 'in due course' is no longer acceptable to the Tasmanian exporters who were promised action on the cost of shipping.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Senator, I am afraid I am not able to give much more detail than the response that was given to those questions on notice, other than to note that I understand that government will be considering those issues shortly.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So is that the expectation before the end of this quarter or before the half year?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I am unable to give a definite answer on that, Senator, but at the moment, it is expected that would be considered within the next few months.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to follow that up and advise? Or is that the answer?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I can ask the question, Senator, but I expect that the answer will be the same. I am happy to take that on notice and come back and confirm.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Thank you. Has the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics or the department provided the minister with any advice or options regarding your response to the productivity report?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: We are, of course, providing government with briefing as a result of the consultation process that has been undertaken.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So you have provided advice and options?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: We have provided advice to government on that issue.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide that to us?</p>	131-132 24/02/15	

					<p>Ms Zielke: Not at this time, Senator. Senator URQUHART: When would that be? Ms Zielke: When the response is provided. Senator URQUHART: In the coming months? Ms Zielke: Yes. Senator URQUHART: I would appreciate some detail around what the definition of 'coming months' is. Ms Zielke: Thank you, Senator.</p>		
99	153	STP	LEYONHJELM	Shipping cabotage	Will your department release all documents it has worked on in the past year on shipping cabotage restrictions and options to reduce restrictions?	Written	
100	154	STP	STERLE	Caledonian Sky licence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Department received representations about the decisions to provide a licence to the Caledonian Sky? 2. Who from? 3. Has the Department reviewed the process it undertook to award a licence to the Caledonian Sky? 4. Was Coral Princess Cruises consulted on the proposed licence issue prior to the licence issuing? 5. Has the Department made any change to its procedures arising from this issue? If yes, what changes? 6. Did the Minister's office have any communication with the Department about the issue of the licence prior to it being issued? If so, on what date? 7. Is the Department aware of how many jobs have been lost in Coral Princess Cruises resulting from this decision? 8. Will the Caledonian Sky be operating in Australian waters under the Department's licence? 9. What Australian laws, regulations or standards applied - at the time of the issuing of the licence - to Coral Princess Cruises' Australian-flagged vessels (eg Oceanic Discoverer) that would not apply to the Bermuda-flagged Caledonian Sky, when in Australian waters? 10. How does Australian OH&S regulation apply to (i) the Oceanic Discoverer and (ii) Caledonian Sky? 11. How does Australian industrial relations regulation apply to (i) the Oceanic Discoverer and (ii) Caledonian Sky? 12. How does Australian tax law apply to (i) the Oceanic Discoverer and (ii) 	Written	<p>Parts 10 and 11 have been accepted by the Department of Employment .</p> <p>Part 12 has been accepted by The Treasury.</p>

					Caledonian Sky?		
101	155	STP	STERLE	Cross modal impacts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you accept that road, rail and coastal trading can compete for freight in certain domestic markets? 2. Do you accept that a sudden change in cost of one mode can impact volumes on the other modes? 3. Do you accept that modes especially with high fixed costs may respond by increasing unit price on customers lacking alternative options? 4. Given your Predictive Analytics cost-benefit analysis did not model this effect (see written answer 184(v) and (x) from October Estimates), will any use of relevant outputs from this report will be qualified to acknowledge this? 5. How many jobs were estimated to be lost in the following competing freight sectors arising from implementation of each of the three modelled options under coastal shipping reform undertaken by Predictive Analytics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Road freight; b. Rail freight? 	Written	
102	157	STP	STERLE	National Rail Safety Regulator	I refer to answer 190 (2) re. the Queensland Government withdrawing from the NRSR; which Queensland Government is being referred to – current or former?	Written	
103	159	STP	STERLE	National Ports Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What new work has the Department undertaken since the last Estimates on implementing the Ports Strategy? 2. Has the Department had any discussions with the ACCC re competition and pricing issues at any Australian ports? If so, please provide details...when, which port, what were the issues? 	Written	
104	160	STP	STERLE	National Land Freight Strategy	What new work has the Department undertaken since the last Estimates on implementing the Land Freight Strategy?	Written	
Australian Maritime Safety Authority (5)							
105	055	AMSA	STERLE	Detained ships	Senator STERLE: On notice, Mr Kinley, can you let us know, for the last four or five years, say, how many ships from what countries have been detained and for what reason?	138 24/02/15	

					<p>Mr Kinley: From our port state control report, I can give you that. They have all those statistics.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: If you take that on notice, that would be very helpful...</p>		
106	056	AMSA	STERLE	Liberian-registered ships	<p>Senator STERLE: Fine. It goes to Senator Heffernan's phobia about tax avoidance. What about cruise ship companies? Do any of them have Liberian-registered ships, or are any of the cruise ship companies registered in Liberia?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I would have to check on that. My experience is they tend to mostly be flagged in Bermuda or the Bahamas.</p>	139 24/02/15	
107	163	AMSA	STERLE	Ships list	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it the case the regulatory scope applies to Regulated Australian Vessels as defined by s 15 of the Navigation Act 2012? 2. What scope applies – does it include ship safety? 3. Why won't AMSA publish on its website a list of ships that are Regulated Australian Vessels (RAVs) as defined in s15 of the Navigation Act 2012, and therefore subject to such regulation? 	Written	
108	164	AMSA	STERLE	Treaty ratification	<p>Can you confirm that all the 50-60 nations with flagged ships that visit Australia (see table 10, Port State Control Report 2013) have ratified the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SOLAS Convention (Safety of Life at Sea)? Why has Australia ratified it? What does this Treaty do? 2. If not all countries that visit Australia have ratified, which ones haven't? 3. International Convention on Load Lines? Why has Australia ratified it? What does this Treaty do? 4. If not all countries that visit Australia have ratified, which ones haven't? 5. Marine Pollution also known as MARPOL? Why has Australia ratified it? What does this Treaty do? 6. If not all countries that visit Australia have ratified, which ones haven't? 7. Maritime Labour Convention? Why has Australia ratified it? What does this Treaty do? 8. If not all countries that visit Australia have ratified, which ones haven't? 9. International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage? Why has Australia ratified it? What does this Treaty do? 10. If not all countries that visit Australia have ratified, which ones haven't? 	Written	

109	165	AMSA	STERLE	Ratings	Why did AMSA extend the Navigation Act Qualifications (Ratings) Exemption 2014 on 1 December 2014 for a further 12 months to 31 March 2016, without limitations on its effect or scope, thus allowing some shipping operators and employers to remove qualified crew and replace them with crew who don't meet the licensing standards under Marine Order 73, in circumstances where AMSA had representations about the negative employment practices of some employers under the exemption that has operated since 2 April 2014?	Written	
Policy and Research (12)							
110	057	PAR	STERLE	Savings to industry within the department or its portfolio agencies	<p>Senator STERLE: ... Mr Mrdak, can you indicate whether any of the following acts have been accounted for as delivering savings to industry within the department or its portfolio agencies? I will go to the Omnibus Repeal Day (Spring 2014) Act 2014.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, I do not believe we had any portfolio acts in that omnibus bill.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What about the Amending Acts 1970 to 1979 Repeal Bill 2014?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will have to take that on notice. I do not believe so, but I will take that on notice for you.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: No worries. While I am at it, what about the Statute Law Revision Bill (No. 2) 2014? I am looking for the nods behind.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will just get the responsible officer to the table.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Great, thank you.</p> <p>Ms Spencer: Again, we would have to take that particular one on notice. They are all coordinated through the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: That is fine. If those bills were passed unamended, that would be helpful too. That was painless. I am finished. I am done.</p>	5-6 24/02/15	
111	058	PAR	URQUHART	TAS irrigation schemes	<p>Senator URQUHART: Given that some of these projects were shovel ready for funding 18 months ago, why was the funding delayed?</p> <p>Ms Power: There was not a delay. The Commonwealth has responded to the request made by the Tasmanian government.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When was that request made?</p> <p>Ms Power: I am not aware of the exact date, but 18 months seems long to me. But I am not aware of the exact date.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you suggesting that there is not a delay?</p> <p>Ms Power: Certainly these projects were considered as part of the work of the Water Infrastructure Ministerial Working Group. But I am not aware of the exact date that it</p>	147 24/02/15	

					<p>was first raised with the Commonwealth government. Senator URQUHART: Are you happy to take that on notice and get back to me? Ms Power: Yes.</p>		
112	060	PAR	STERLE	<p><i>Budget 2014-2015: Building Australia's Infrastructure</i></p>	<p>Senator STERLE: Okay. Can you indicate how much of the spending in this column—in the green—occurred? It says 35 down the bottom, but can you tell us how much you have spent? Ms O'Connell: Senator, we will have to take that on notice. Obviously the green column is the forward estimates but, as that footnote says, it includes some 2013-14 investment expenditures. We will need to identify exactly which projects include 2013-14, and how much. ... Senator STERLE: Yes. What I really want to know is what construction will occur after 2019-20. I am alluding to the fact that there are a lot of figures there and, on that glossy table there, it looks like there is a heck of a lot of spending being done. I really want to decipher how much has already been in the previous 2012-13 budget, because that—without any secrets—is not the Abbott government's spend; it is money that has already been allocated. And then we are talking about 10 billion years so, when you take out the asset recycling, I think that these figures have been blown up to look a lot better than what can actually be credited to the Abbott government. I do not think that is an unfair question. Senator Cash: Albeit still a significant investment, Senator Sterle. Senator STERLE: Senator Cash, at this late hour, I would be bitterly disappointed if you sat there and could even for one minute think, 'uh-oh, maybe we have been a little bit flippant with the figures'. Senator Cash: It is a significant investment, and it is something that I have to say the government is very proud of. Senator STERLE: But let us not let the truth get in the way of a really good story. Can you please find that out for me, Ms O'Connell, and take that on notice? Ms O'Connell: We will take that on notice, Senator.</p>	149-150 24/02/15	
113	061	PAR	STERLE	<p>HSR senior officials meetings</p>	<p>Senator STERLE: ...On notice, how many meetings of the high-speed rail senior officials group have occurred to date, in 2014-15? You might even be able to tell us while we are waiting. Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice. Senator STERLE: Okay—and the dates if you can, please, Mr Mrdak. Senator STERLE: I want to refer to written answer 205, part 7, from October</p>	151 24/02/15	

					estimates, about changed station locations. Have these changes come about? Mr Mrdak: Changed station locations for high-speed rail? Senator STERLE: Yes. Mr Mrdak: I will check those. Thank you.		
114	169	PAR	McLUCAS	Office of Northern Australia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide information on what current programs ONA is working on. b. What is the current budget of the Office of Northern Australia? c. Do you have a forward workplan that can be provided to this Committee? d. Has the Office been given directions from Government in terms of its future? 2. Does the Office know when the Northern Australia White Paper will be released? If so, when is it expected to be released? 3. Staffing: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What are the current staffing levels and locations of these staff? b. Have staff levels changed in the past 12 months? If so, please find an explanation as to the changes. 	Written	
115	171	PAR	STERLE	Australia's contribution towards G20 growth target	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is BITRE involved in measuring all or part of Australia's G20 contribution to 2.1% additional global growth? 2. If not, which agency is? 3. If yes, what is being measured? Is the period of measurement from October 2013 baseline to October 2018? 	Written	
116	172	PAR	STERLE	State of Australian Cities 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will it be released? 2. Why is there no linkage to the National Urban Policy? 3. How does the report therefore link to Federal Government policy and decision processes? 4. Has the report been tabled or discussed at COAG? If so, when? 	Written	
117	173	PAR	STERLE	Labour demand projections	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What work has BITRE commenced with the Department on Industry in labour market projections for public infrastructure projects? [PC recommendation 14.1, supported by the Govt in its response] 2. What data is being collected and how will it be published? 	Written	

118	174	PAR	STERLE	Project benchmarking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is BITRE involved in transport project benchmarking? 2. If yes, what work is currently being undertaken in this area? 3. What metrics are being developed to compare transport systems in cities and regions? 4. Have all States and Territories agreed to provide data to the Federal Government? [see PC Govt response to recommendation 9.2 – “governments have agreed to the systematic collection of project information for land transport infrastructure” p5] 	Written	
119	177	PAR	RICE	Active transport	<p>The below questions are made with reference to the statement on <i>Walking, Riding and Access to Public Transport — supporting active travel in Australian communities</i> (www.infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure/pab/active_transport/files/infra1874_mcu_active_travel_report_final.pdf)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The statement notes that the Australian Government’s evaluation of proposed transport infrastructure will take appropriate account of the needs and benefits of walking, riding and access to public transport. What steps is the Department taking to achieve this? 2. The Australian Government will work with states and territories to review the National Guidelines for Transport System Management, and supporting documents, to incorporate improved methodology for assessing the costs and benefits of walking, riding and public transport. How is the NGTSM progressing? Stage 2 will include active and public transport specifically. How can the government be helping to progress this? 3. The Australian Government will work with states and territories to ensure that infrastructure projects funded through Nation Building and other relevant investment programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect routes for walking, riding and accessing public transport so that existing connections are not severed; • reflect consideration of all transport modes – for example , where a project corridor follows, or intersects with, an identified walking or riding route, the project scope should include walking and riding infrastructure as part of the works; and • ensure that the relevant infrastructure is appropriate for the speed and volume of traffic. <p>How is this being communicated to states and territories? How is this being</p> 	Written	

					<p>reported?</p> <p>4. The Australian Government will work with states and territories to ensure all pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure funded through Nation Building and other relevant investment programs meets appropriate technical standards and best practice approaches. How is this being communicated to states and territories? What proportion of transport projects requests from state/territory governments include pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure?</p> <p>5. The Australian Government will partner with states and territories, including through the Australian National Preventive Health Agency, to encourage behaviour change in support of increased walking, riding and use of public transport, as part of healthy lifestyle choices. Without ANPHA how is this being progressed to ensure a whole-of-government approach, particularly given health benefits are 80% of the economic benefits of walking/cycling infrastructure?</p> <p>6. The Australian Government will work with stakeholders to provide resources that support communities, businesses and local governments to plan for active travel in their local areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating Places for People: an urban design protocol for Australian cities (www.urbandesign.gov.au) which includes principles for creating more connected, walkable and vibrant communities; and • healthy Spaces and Places (www.healthyplaces.org.au) which provides guidance and training to local governments in partnership with the Australian Local Governments Association, National Heart Foundation, Planning Institute of Australia and Department of Health and Ageing. <p>What actions/ steps is the Government currently undertaking to progress this?</p> <p>7. The Australian Government will work with states and territories to consider establishing a new Walking, Riding and Access to Public Transport council, reporting to the COAG Standing Council on Transport and Infrastructure. Priority actions could include broader adoption of the principles of this statement; and agreement on a national approach to walking, riding and access to public transport. What actions/steps is the Government currently undertaking to progress this with the Council on Transport and Infrastructure?</p> <p>8. The Australian Government will work with states, territories and other stakeholders to collect relevant data, and undertake research and analysis, to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>support walking, riding and access to public transport. How is this being reported?</p> <p>9. The Australian Government will continue to work with states and territories to support the implementation of the National Cycling Strategy. What is the status of this? What is the government doing to support implementation?</p>		
120	178	PAR	STERLE	Active travel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the current Government have an explicit policy supporting active travel?; and 2. How is it implemented by the Department?; and 3. Which Departmental guidelines reflect this? 	Written	
121	180	PAR	STERLE	Post-build assessments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What projects is the Department currently conducting post-build assessments on? [Dept indicates will do this under Govt response to PC Inquiry p5] 2. Will the Department publish its assessments? 	Written	
Office of Transport Security (1)							
122	179	OTS	URQUHART	Hobart Airport – Australian Federal Police	<p>The Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police has confirmed in correspondence that the Office of Transport Security was consulted about the likely security risks at Hobart International Airport on 17 March 2014. The Office of Transport Security gave evidence to Estimates Hearings in both May and October 2014 that they were not consulted about the decision to remove AFP officers from Hobart airport. They then amended their advice shortly after.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In light of the heightened security concerns the Prime Minister outlined in his National Security speech has the Office for Transport Security asked the AFP to review its decision to removed AFP officers from the Hobart Airport? 2. Has the Tasmanian Government made any representations to the Minister or the Department raising concerns about the security risks at the Hobart airport as a result of the decision to removed AFP officers? 3. When and how was it brought to your attention that your evidence to this Committee in relation to consultation with the AFP in relation to the Hobart International Airport was false and needed to be amended? 4. Can you explain why you did not know in May and in October that this consultation had occurred in March? 5. When the Office of Transport Security was consulted by the Attorney- 	Written	

					<p>General's Department on 17 March 2014 about "likely security risks at Hobart International Airport" was the issue of the removal of AFP officers from the Hobart International Airport specifically raised? What were the specific concerns raised if any about the loss of AFP at the airport?</p> <p>6. Were there any further consultations between the Attorney-General's Department and the Office of Transport Security in regards to security risks at the Hobart International Airport prior to the announcement of the decision to remove AFP officers from the airport?</p> <p>7. If yes, can you please provide the date and method of all consultations (i.e. face to face meeting, teleconference, email exchange etc.) between the Attorney-General's Department and the Office of Transport Security in relation to the removal of AFP officers from the Hobart International Airport?</p> <p>8. Did the Office of Transport Security undertake a risk analysis on the security implications of removing AFP officers from the Hobart International Airport?</p> <p>9. When was the Office of Transport Security informed of the final decision to remove AFP officers from the Hobart International Airport?</p> <p>10. Has the Office of Transport Security been consulted in relation to the transition security arrangements in place at the Hobart International Airport?</p>		
Office of the Inspector of Transport Security (1)							
123	63	OITS	STERLE	Training inquiry	In December 2013 the Office of the Inspector of Transport Security was commissioned to inquire into aviation and maritime transport security education and training (see DIRD Annual Report, 2013-4 p6). Can you advise on the progress of this inquiry?	Written	
Aviation and Airports (16)							
124	065	AAA	BACK	Third party report	Senator BACK: Mr Mrdak, this might go a little bit wider than just CASA. There are three recommendations, and perhaps rather than ask for your comments on them, I will read them out from the report from that particular group—first of all, the recommendation that the review include the possible impact of a turbine upon the signal of a navigation aid; secondly, the recommendation of an assessment surface of 5.24 per cent—three degrees—which is extrapolated from ICAO and CASA criteria,	97-98 24/02/15	

					<p>if that is the case; and, thirdly, that CASA and/or the department undertake a full review on wind turbines and their impacts on aviation safety and aviation activities. Obviously, there are a number of issues—firefighting aircraft come to mind, crop dusting aircraft and, naturally enough, recreational aircraft in the vicinity. If it is the case that you or CASA do not have more information now, I will not take more time of the committee, but I would be very keen to get a response once you have had a chance to consider the report and recommendations of that group. Indeed, their recommendation, which was accepted by the New South Wales department, was that that particular industrial wind turbine facility should not proceed.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly, Senator. The issues raised there are, as Mr Cromarty has indicated, matters of grave concern. Over the last three or four years the department has been leading work to try and have state regulatory agencies—land planning agencies—look at these types of aviation issues much more seriously in their planning consideration. The reality is that the Commonwealth has limited powers in relation to such facilities. Our powers are largely concerned with making sure that planning authorities require them to be properly marked. But you are right. For low-flight operations, particularly agriculture aircraft, recreational aircraft and the like, we are seeing an increasing number of hazards coming into our aviation operations. I am happy to look at that report and come back with a full response to you in relation to it. We have the next meeting of Commonwealth state group, the NASAG group, coming up. We will ensure that we come back to you with a full report on how that is traversing.</p>		
125	066	AAA	HEFFERNAN	<p>Bankstown Airport floodplain</p> <p>CHAIR: Could you provide to this committee the environmental approval that allowed that build-up to be done?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: Certainly, Senator. I do not have it with me, but I can take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: What we might do, Senator, is, if you could set out the issues, then we will answer what we can tonight or take them on notice and give you detailed answers. So, if you could give to us your questions or assertions.</p> <p>CHAIR: As you know, the destruction of this flood plain is going to have an affect on the residential people in the area in the event of a flood incident. It is going to have a serious impact on the people who have had nothing to do with this dodgy deal, but who happen to live adjacent. The flood plain has been filled and the flood has to go somewhere. The council knows about it and the guys that did it knew about it as they were doing it. To add to that the fill, which was the cheapest that they could</p>	125-126 24/02/15		

					find, is full of contaminated material, which allegedly was supposed to be supervised under the environment approval process. I rest my case. You have a problem, boys. Mr Mrdak: Senator, with those matters, we will take them up and come back to you with a detailed response.		
126	067	AAA	LEYONHJELM	Aviation cabotage	Senator LEYONHJELM: I will be much quicker. At the last estimates I asked Treasury about the issue of aviation or shipping cabotage restrictions and options to reduce them. I was told that Treasury is aware that work has been done elsewhere in the public service on these issues and 'we have contributed a briefing, if you like'—those are Treasury's words. Will your department release documents it has worked on in the past year on aviation cabotage restrictions and options to reduce restrictions? Mr Mrdak: I am not aware of any specific work that we have done on aviation cabotage in that form. There have been proposals—for instance, our response to the Harper competition review. As indicated, I am happy to provide you with that material—our submission to the Harper review—but I am not aware of any specific proposals that we have worked on in relation to aviation cabotage beyond that competition review. Senator LEYONHJELM: I am perplexed. Treasury said somebody did and I assumed it was you. Mr Mrdak: We certainly did provide a submission to the Harper competition review, which I am very happy to provide you, which sets out our comments in relation to the proposal in the competition review to look at aviation cabotage. Senator LEYONHJELM: I would like to see it. Mr Mrdak: Certainly. I am happy to provide that.	126 24/02/15	
127	069	AAA	GALLACHER	Comcare legal allegations	Senator GALLACHER: There are some findings in the coronial inquiry which are quite damning of Airservices Australia's lack of adherence to proper training and proper procedures, down to the fact that an oversized vehicle, not registered for Northern Territory roads, travelled through an intersection at significantly higher speed than would be expected. Three people are dead. There is a news article saying that Comcare is going to sue Airservices Australia. You have no role in any of that? Mr Mrdak: We do have a role in providing advice to the minister in relation to these matters. Primarily, the responsibility rests with Airservices. Obviously our role is to ensure that proper governance takes place in relation to the organisation. Senator GALLACHER: Clearly there has been a failure of governance, as per the coronial findings, and an indication that another Commonwealth entity is going to sue Airservices Australia.	107 24/02/15	

					Mr Mrdak: I am not aware of that comment from Comcare but I will take it on notice and check that out.		
128	184	AAA	LEYONHJELM	Aviation cabotage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will your department release all documents it has worked on in the past year on aviation cabotage restrictions and options to reduce restrictions? 2. How have reduced aviation cabotage restrictions <i>within</i> Europe and <i>within</i> the US affected prices and services? 	Written	
129	185	AAA	RICE	Aviation Industry Consultative Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What criteria were in place to determine selection of members of the Aviation Industry Consultative Council, established in December? 2. How do you anticipate that workers, who deliver aviation services and monitor aviation safety and security for example, will contribute to the issues that the Council engages with? 3. Is there a mechanism by which civic or community groups will be able to contribute to the high level strategic issues being discussed by the Council? For example, will community consultative groups adjacent to airports or areas of significant aircraft movement be engaged with the issues? 	Written	
130	186	AAA	STERLE	Australian designated airlines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many Australian international airlines are there currently? 2. Which are they? 	Written	
131	187	AAA	STERLE	Bilaterals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do the free trade agreements recently announced impact bilateral air services agreements? 2. Is aviation included in these agreements? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Japan b. South Korea c. China d. Trans-Pacific Partnership 3. If any do impact air services agreements, for each, how? 	Written	
132	188	AAA	STERLE	Parking infringement revenue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For which airports does the Commonwealth collect parking infringement fines? 2. Why only eight of 21 leased Federal airports? 3. For each airport, please list how many infringements were issued by the Commonwealth in 2013-14. 4. For each airport, please list the total value of infringements issued by the 	Written	

					Commonwealth in 2013-14. 5. For each airport, please list how much was collected by the Commonwealth in 2013-14.		
133	189	AAA	STERLE	Aircraft CO2 standard	1. Is the Department still involved in setting a carbon emission standard for aircraft via ICAO? 2. Has the project concluded? When did it conclude?	Written	
134	190	AAA	STERLE	Perth Airport	In the 2014 Masterplan it appears that 310 hectares of conservation land has now been incorporated into airport planning. 1. Is this 310 hectares still categorised as it was in the 2009 Masterplan? 2. If not, what has changed? 3. If not, how was the community consulted about this change? 4. Was the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group involved in any decision to change the treatment of the 310 hectares? If so, how?	Written	
135	192	AAA	STERLE	Aviation Industry Consultative Council	Given that the Deputy Prime Minister said, when <u>establishing the Consultative Council</u> that “the Australian Government is committed to ensuring aviation's many voices are heard”. 1. Why are there no organisations representing workers in the industry on the Aviation Industry Consultative Council? 2. Were any unions or professional organisations representing workers in the industry considered by the Government? 3. Does the Government value the input of employees working in the industry? How?	Written	
136	193	AAA	STERLE	Enroute scheme	1. How many routes are receiving funding under the Federal Government’s enroute scheme? 2. Please list them. 3. How many airlines have participated in this scheme since its revival? 4. Please list the airlines and the financial amounts they have received.	Written	
137	194	AAA	STERLE	Harper Competition Review – airport charging access regimes	The Department says that, “a move away from light-handed regulation for individual airports may be required if prices continue to increase as fast as they have been” (page 5, Harper Review submission). 1. Which airports are of most concern? 2. What stronger regulatory options are there?	Written	

138	195	AAA	STERLE	Airport curfews and slot arrangements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the Department aware of any current proposals to change curfew arrangements at Sydney, Adelaide or Gold Coast airports? 2. Is the Department aware of Government proposals to change the curfew times (ie between 11pm and 6am) at any of these three airports? 3. If yes, please outline what work is being undertaken. 4. On what date was advice last provided to the Government on the subject of curfew changes (including slot arrangements) at either of (a) Sydney, (b) Adelaide or (c) Gold Coast airports? 5. Is the Department aware of legislative drafting to change curfew arrangements at any of these airports? 6. If yes, what is the date of the last draft, and to which airports does it apply? 	Written	
139	196	AAA	URQUHART	Hobart Airport runway extension	<p>On 16 February 2015 the Government announced the approval of \$3.035 million of a \$38 million election promise for planning and development work necessary to expand Hobart International Airport’s runway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What details of the project did the Government receive from Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd that allowed for the approval of funding - that had not been received at any point since the Government took office almost 18 months ago? A spokesman for Infrastructure Minister Warren Truss said on 15 October 2014 the funding agreement for the \$38 million was expected to be finalised before the end of the year. 2. Has the total project funding agreement being finalised and if so, what is the timeline for the remaining funding to flow and what is the construction schedule for the project? The Coalition Economic Growth Plan for Tasmania applied three conditions to the funding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. entering into commercial negotiations for regular international flights such as Qantas, Singapore Airlines or Air New Zealand; b. an agreement for use by large Antarctic research aircraft; or c. negotiations for international charter flights. <p>On October 15, The Mercury confirmed that none of Qantas, Singapore Airlines or Air New Zealand had any plans to operate direct services to Hobart.</p> 3. As the funding has now commenced, which strict conditions of the funding agreement, as outlined in the Coalition’s Economic Growth Plan for Tasmania, has Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd actually met? 	Written	

					4. Has the Department performed any other analysis, including due diligence, value for money, cost-benefit or job creation projections, on the project?		
Airservices Australia (21)							
140	070	Airservices	HEFFERNAN	457 visas	<p>CHAIR: Do you use 457 visas?</p> <p>Ms Staib: We have done, and we have some people on 457s.</p> <p>CHAIR: Could you give us the details of those, on notice?</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes.</p>	105 24/02/15	
141	071	Airservices	STERLE	Fire engine colour	<p>Ms Staib: We have studied this and, based on American studies, lime green is the better colour to use—particularly when you are going through night and day. If you look around the ACT you will see that their fire vehicles are the same, colour.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Ms Staib, I am no expert on colours of fire engines—and, if you could provide that information to the committee, it would be very helpful—</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes.</p>	108 24/02/15	
142	211	Airservices	WONG	Board decision regarding TCU	<p>Senator WONG: But no decision was made to close the TCU?</p> <p>Ms Staib: In 2011?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Correct.</p> <p>Ms Staib: No.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Are you aware what led to the minister and the board—the board ultimately—determining not to proceed with the closure when it was previously attempted?</p> <p>Ms Staib: I would have to go back and look at the records for that.</p>	109 24/02/2015	
143	072	Airservices	WONG	Adelaide TCU closure	<p>Senator WONG: When do you say the decision to close the Adelaide TCU was made?</p> <p>Mr Rodwell: Only very recently.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can I have a date? It is a pretty big decision.</p> <p>Ms Staib: It was at the December board meeting. I will get the exact date for you.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Do you have minutes of that board meeting here?</p> <p>Ms Staib: No.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Well, I am requesting the minutes in relation to that decision.</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes, Senator</p>	110 24/02/15	

144	073	Airservices	WONG	Informing employees of TCU closure	<p>Senator WONG: Thank you. Subsequent to that decision, did you inform the employees?</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes, that is right.</p> <p>Senator WONG: And you advised them by email, or CEO—sorry, what was your position again?</p> <p>Ms Staib: I am the chief executive officer.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes. Did you do a CEO note or something like that?</p> <p>Ms Staib: There was extensive consultation—</p> <p>Senator WONG: No, I have not asked that question. I will ask that question, but I am actually asking how you informed them of your decision.</p> <p>Ms Staib: Of the board's decision?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Correct.</p> <p>Ms Staib: I would have to check that.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Did you or did you not post a CEO message in which employees were informed, on 12 December?</p> <p>Mr Hood: Each of the employees were advised by their line managers, both in Cairns and in Adelaide.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When?</p> <p>Mr Hood: I believe it was one or two days after the board meeting. I will confirm that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WONG: Did you or did you not post a CEO message on 12 December in which you advised employees that a decision had been made to close the Adelaide TCU?</p> <p>Ms Staib: I would have to go back and check the date, but I know we did release information after the board had considered the matter.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I would like a copy of whatever correspondence you as CEO or another person in line management provided to employees to advise them of the decision. I want all communications with employees about this. Can you do that?</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes.</p>	110 24/02/15	
145	074	Airservices	WONG	Briefing minister's office of TCU closure decision	<p>Senator WONG: Thank you. At the point when the board made the decision, had you already consulted with the minister's office?</p> <p>Ms Staib: Yes. Sorry: we consulted with the minister's office about the consideration, but it was up to the board to make the decision.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But at the time the board made the decision, what contact in relation to the proposed closure of the Adelaide TCU had been made?</p>	110-112 24/02/15	

					<p>Ms Staib: With the minister's office? Senator WONG: Yes, or the minister. Ms Staib: We had briefed the minister's office—I would have to check the dates for you—along with a number of other members of parliament and senators. I would have to get those dates for you. ... Senator WONG: Was it at the minister or his office's request that you briefed other MPs and senators? Ms Staib: No. That was our undertaking. Senator WONG: Who did you brief? Ms Staib: I would have to get you the list. I can do that. ... Senator WONG: Could I, on notice, get a full list of the parliamentarians briefed on this issue, by date, please.</p>		
146	075	Airservices	WONG	Terms of redundancies for TCU	<p>Mr Hood: That is a guarantee that they would be able to remain in situ in Adelaide with a job at Airservices. Senator WONG: At the same rate of pay? Mr Hood: I cannot recall the details of that, but I am happy to take that on notice. Senator WONG: Can you also— Mr Hood: In all course events, we would maintain salary for those people. Senator WONG: Can you, on notice, provide the details of what you say are the terms and conditions? Mr Hood: Certainly.</p>	114 24/02/15	
147	212	Airservices	XENOPHON	Safety case for CASA	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes, thank you. Nothing like a vet giving you medical advice! I do not want any ketamine. I just want to go further to those questions raised by Senator Wong, Ms Staib. Has a safety case been prepared to CASA? Ms Staib: It is currently being prepared. Senator XENOPHON: Can you provide us with a copy of that case? Ms Staib: When it is completed.</p>	115-116 24/02/2015	
148	076	Airservices	XENOPHON	Business case	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Sure. Has Airservices prepared a business case regarding the move that justifies the proposed savings and the like? Ms Staib: Yes, that is correct. Senator XENOPHON: Has this been released publicly?</p>	116 24/02/15	

					<p>Ms Staib: No.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Why not?</p> <p>Ms Staib: That is not our normal practice to do that, because it was a submission put to the exec and then to the board.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You are not suggesting it is commercial-in-confidence, are you?</p> <p>Ms Staib: There are some commercial—but if you wish to see the business case I can furnish that for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Okay. So, on notice, could you provide that to the committee as a matter of urgency...</p>		
149	077	Airservices	XENOPHON	INTAS ground radar	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I am told that the ground controller, although very calm, advised that they had lost all information pertaining to aircraft movements. I want to find out whether that is true. Someone on the ground frequency asked, 'Was it INTAS again?' I presume that may have been one of the pilots speaking to the controller. The answer, I am informed, was 'Yes.' Can you confirm this, because I am getting a number of complains about INTAS. If this was a foggy night in Melbourne it potentially could have been quite a serious incident.</p> <p>Mr Hood: If I can outline the circumstances. Firstly, I have not got the detail with me. I did not expect that to come as a question. But I am aware of the incident and I am happy to talk to it. Firstly, my understanding of the night in question is that there was thunderstorm activity and a number of aircraft taxiing in from the runway after landing were unable to reach their gate because, obviously, what happens in thunderstorms now is that ground handlers vacate the tarmac and you are left with several aircraft in stand-off bays that are unable to get in there. Sometimes you can be sitting on the aeroplane for more than an hour. I will confirm all of this on notice, because I do not have the details with me.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Hood: My controllers did report it to me, because we did submit the ESIR event. So they did report it to me. In fact we have taken immediate action. Looking at the parameter of what happens, if it happens again, if there is another thunderstorm in Melbourne and they are taxiing in, and it is for longer than one hour, will the strip disappear? So we have taken action immediately, following the receipt of that event, to change—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I have a text message from somebody who was there that night saying, 'Crap, the storm had passed.' Could you just check that for me?</p>	118 24/02/15	

					<p>Mr Hood: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am just quoting the text message.</p> <p>Mr Hood: I did not bring the details with me and I am happy to confirm it on notice. But we have taken action to change the system parameter for strips finishing to a five-hour period instead of a one-hour period.</p>		
150	078	Airservices	XENOPHON	<p>Incident of 12 Nov 2013</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I want to go to a specific incident that occurred on 12 November 2013. There were departures from Melbourne runway 16 and Essendon runway 26. I think Essendon is to the south of Melbourne airport. Is that correct? ...</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: The information I have is that this did not occur—that for a period of time no coordination was in effect. Can I put this to you. In their report dated 12 November 2013, Airservices reported the incident as a breakdown of communication. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Hood: I do not have that with me but my understanding is that that is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You may want to take some of this on notice because these are actually—</p> <p>Mr Hood: If I can, that would be great, because that one was a fair while ago.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: To the extent you can answer please do so. This report basically talks about a breakdown in communication, although the answer to question on notice No. 237 makes reference to approximately three hours having elapsed before the error was corrected, and I think we are talking about the same period. That is quite a significant period of time. The ATSB would have reviewed this report and noted the breakdown of communication and filed it, as would have CASA. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Hood: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Some time later a REPCON, which is the confidential reporting system for an issue involving a safety issue, was generated that said a loss of separation and separation assurance occurred. That is much more serious, isn't it? A breakdown in communication and a loss of separation and separation assurance is fundamentally much more serious than a breakdown of communication?</p> <p>Mr Hood: It can be. We treat each of them as a serious incident. A breakdown in coordination can of course lead to something worse, and a breakdown of separation assurance can lead to something worse.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: This may have to be the subject of a separate hearing, but the information I have received today is that the ATSB went back to Airservices and were again assured that it was a breakdown of communication that occurred. Can you</p>	119-120 24/02/15		

					<p>confirm—</p> <p>Mr Hood: I will take that on notice. It was a fair while ago. I am aware that the coordination between Essendon goes to the terminal area coordinator, which goes to the controller, which goes to the tower. So there are a number of links in that chain.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Sure, but this was a three-hour period when there was not only a breakdown in communication but there would have been a loss of separation or issues in respect of loss of separation.</p> <p>Mr Hood: I will certainly look into that. I will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You could perhaps tell me how many take-offs and landings there were on those two runways at Essendon and Melbourne airports for that three-hour period.</p> <p>Mr Hood: I will let you know that, too.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And God bless all of the people who keep talking to me. Airservices state that 'the provision of the other information requested is complex and would require a significant diversion of resources'. Do you remember that?</p> <p>Mr Hood: No, I do not. As I said, I will take that on notice if I may.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can I suggest to you that that is actually untrue. The information I have is that getting this information is less than six mouse clicks away. So could you please revisit that issue, because my information is that from multiple sources you could obtain this information very easily and Airservices purported statement that it is too complex and requires too many resources is not accurate at all.</p> <p>Mr Hood: I will certainly look at that.</p>		
151	079	Airservices	RICE	East Melbourne aircraft noise	<p>Senator RICE: I want to talk about East Melbourne. I understand that the issue of aircraft noise over East Melbourne was raised with you in Senate estimates by my colleague Lee Rhiannon in 2013, and that Adam Bandt MP has made representations to you about this issue since 2013. I am interested to find out what Airservices Australia has done in this time to respond to the concern of East Melbourne residents?</p> <p>Ms Staib: I will ask my colleague from corporate affairs to join me, just to amplify my answer and just in case you want further detail. My staff have met—I have not met with the member—and we have worked with him and some constituents to certainly explain how we manage noise and what processes are available to people to submit suggestions for improvement. I cannot recall, but it was several months ago when we did respond to that letter.</p> <p>Ms Barton: I do not have the specifics of how we have addressed that issue, so I</p>	122 24/02/15	

					<p>would need to take it on notice... Having said that though, we have implemented a number of initiatives in recent years in order to improve the way we are managing noise. Those initiatives include active participation in community forums in around 21 airports around Australia to ensure that we are consulting and receiving feedback from the community; using short-term trials in order to test out flight path changes where we can.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Have you done those in East Melbourne?</p> <p>Ms Barton: I do not have specifics of that. As I said, I will need to come back to you with specifics on East Melbourne.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Perhaps if you have not got specific East Melbourne examples, let us not use up the time of the committee.</p> <p>Ms Barton: I will take that on notice.</p>		
152	080	Airservices	RICE	Fights in the East Melbourne area	<p>Senator RICE: Does Airservices Australia monitor the number of flights in the East Melbourne area?</p> <p>Ms Barton: We monitor all flights and we record that information.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell us how many flights there and the increase in flights over a period of time, say, over the last 10 years?</p> <p>Ms Barton: We can absolutely provide that information, so I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What noise monitoring has Airservices Australia conducted in East Melbourne?</p> <p>Ms Barton: Again, I would need to take on notice specifically about what is happening in East Melbourne.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you do not know.</p> <p>Ms Barton: I do not have that information to hand.</p>	122 24/02/15	
153	081	Airservices	XENOPHON	Incident of 12 Nov 2013 - Cirrus	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Can I follow on with the line of questioning in respect of the incident on 12 November. I have got a copy of this document from your website. Is it Cirrus?</p> <p>Mr Hood: Yes, Cirrus.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Just looking at it, maybe I have misread it. There does not appear to be any mention there of the three-hour period when this occurred when not only was there a breakdown in communication but, arguably, loss of separation, given what occurred. Can you take that on notice? I do not see any reference to that. If there is no mention of the time in this seminal report, as distinct from what was answered on notice, I would have thought that CASA and the ATSB would have taken much more interest in it if it was a three-hour time period. How many aircraft</p>	123-124 24/02/15	

					<p>movements can you have out of Melbourne Airport—one a minute?</p> <p>Mr Hood: Probably up to 60 or so, depending on which runway and the configuration.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Sixty an hour? If it is a three-hour period we are potentially looking at up to 180.</p> <p>Mr Hood: Sixty in a three-hour period—20 or so departures per hour.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So if you are looking at 60 and if you are looking at major passenger aircraft you are looking at a number of thousand passengers that may have been on the deck.</p> <p>Mr Hood: I am happy to take that on notice, Senator.</p>		
154	204	Airservices	RICE	Aircraft noise	Does Airservices Australia have a process or approach for exploring new or additional regulatory options regarding aircraft noise?	Written	
155	205	Airservices	XENOPHON	INTAS technology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noting that Airservices has entered into a further contract to install INTAS technology in more Control Towers, is there a provision in the contract for Airservices customers to be compensated for any extra expenses incurred as a result of a similar number of defects/failures being encountered as occurred at Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne? If so, does the contract stipulate that the contractor shares Airservices compensation risk? 2. In terms of its answers to QoN #245 (Budget Estimates May 2014) can Airservices Australia provide an update on the number (if any) of additional INTAS issues beyond the already reported 2,467 that have occurred at Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide & Melbourne Towers and how many remain outstanding? 	Written	
156	206	Airservices	XENOPHON	Cirrus report #ATS-0125061	<p>Cirrus #ATS-0125061 states that the ML TAC received coordination from Essendon Tower that it was unable to separate its Runway 26 aircraft from Melbourne’s departures but the ML TAC did not subsequently pass the coordination to the Melbourne approach controller. LOA_3263 para 4.5.3 (as provided in answer to QoN 237) indicates that a number of parties have responsibilities when Melbourne is using Runway 16 for departures and Essendon Tower is unable to separate its Runway 26 instrument approach from the Melbourne departures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the “MPL” and what relationship does it have to the ML TAC? 2. What is the “MLC” and what relationship does it have to the ML TAC? 3. What is the “MAE” and what relationship does it have to the ML TAC? 	Written	

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. What is the “MLA” and what relationship does it have to the ML TAC? 5. Did Melbourne Tower receive coordination that Essendon Tower was unable to separate its Runway 26 instrument approach aircraft prior to further Melbourne departures being approved (i.e. the provisions of LOA-3263 para 4.5.3 (3) had become effective)? 6. What event occurred that triggered the detection of the breakdown of communication some 3 hours prior? 7. Can Airservices provide a copy of the radar tapes it gave ATSB regarding this incident? 8. Can Airservices explain why the provision of the radar tapes requested in QoN #237 (5) is complex and would require a significant diversion of resources? 9. Can Airservices explain why the provision of the relevant Essendon Tower, Melbourne Tower and Melbourne Approach Airways Operation Journal entries for the incident is complex and would require a significant diversion of resources? 		
157	207	Airservices	STERLE	Sydney Airport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a staff member dedicated to managing the Airservices Australia relationship with Sydney Airport? 2. If yes, what is their title, and where do they sit in the reporting structure? Which other customers do they manage? 3. If none, what other customers have a dedicated staff member? If none, why Sydney Airport? 	Written	
158	208	Airservices	STERLE	Sydney Airport – post-curfew flights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please list the type of aircraft that have landed at Sydney Airport between 11pm and 6am since (date). 2. What impact on flight numbers has the change in types of aircraft permitted to land at Sydney Airport? 	Written	Date is 3 February 2015.
159	209	Airservices	STERLE	Adelaide Airport – post curfew flights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please list the type of aircraft that have landed at Adelaide Airport between 11pm and 6am since (date). 2. What impact on flight numbers has the change in types of aircraft permitted to land at Adelaide Airport? 	Written	Date is 3 February 2015.
160	210	Airservices	STERLE	Harper Review – Airservices Australia	<p>The Department of I&RD submission notes the Review says that Airservices charges should be a focus for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has Airservices taken note of these comments? 	Written	

				charges	<p>2. What does Airservices say about its charging?</p> <p>3. How does Airservices ensure that it is providing a service at reasonable cost to airlines and passengers?</p>		
Australian Transport Safety Bureau (6)							
161	087	ATSB	XENOPHON	REPCON	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Perhaps you could take on notice whether the ATSB's views would have been different if they were aware that, for three hours, the INTAS failed. I will clarify these questions on notice for you, to assist. The concern I have is that both CASA and the ATSB may not have been, for whatever reason, fully appraised of the circumstances of that night of 12 November 2013.</p> <p>Mr Dolan: Happy to take it notice. The only point I would make is we did receive a REPCON on this which we looked into very carefully, including obtaining a copy of the radar tapes, and we are satisfied that there was no loss of separation.</p>	151 24/02/15	
162	088	ATSB	XENOPHON	Canadian TSB report	<p>Senator XENOPHON: ...What I am trying to understand is this: do you consider there are inconsistencies in these statements in respect of what the Canadian TSB stated about what it appears to be relying on what the ATSB told it and evidence previously to the committee? I am genuinely just trying to understand whether there is a contradiction between the two, because on the face of it there does appear to be.</p> <p>Mr Dolan: I understand the point of your question. I think you will find that the key to that is in fact the table we supplied to the inquiry, which was the result of the query of the commissioners. What is the work that took the special audit and how does that relate to the matters that we raised in our report? The table that we supplied to the committee was the answer to the commission's question: what is the relevance of the special audit to this investigation? So that is the missing bit that is not picked up in—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You can understand it is not unreasonable to conclude that there appears on the surface to be an inconsistency, but you are saying that it is dealt with by the table.</p> <p>Mr Dolan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And that table, just remind me, gave an analysis of what was—</p> <p>Mr Dolan: That went through the various findings of the special audit and—I am relying on my memory here—matched them against the matters in the report. It was really a lining-up to say: 'These matters were considered in the development of the report.' I am not sure whether Mr Sangston has any further memory.</p>	152 24/02/15	

					<p>Mr Sangston: That is the case; it was a comparative.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can I invite you genuinely, if you feel that there is something that you want to add, to take it on notice to elaborate on that. I would happy for you to do so. I guess the further question is whether, Mr Dolan, you and other commissioners were concerned about the lack of reliance on the special audit, despite what appeared to have been told to the committee. Or do you and the commissioners still not see the special audit as relevant, despite what, on the surface, appears to have been told to the committee and TSB?...</p>		
163	089	ATSB	XENOPHON	Flight data recorder info Pel-Air	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Would there be any difficulty, once they are recovered and digital copies are made, for a copy of that to be provided to this committee, if the committee was minded to request it?</p> <p>Mr Walsh: I would need to take that on notice. There would certainly be issues to address in terms of the CVR, more so than the FDR. The flight data recorder information would be classified as restricted information, and obviously there are mechanisms to provide that to the committee. The CVR data obviously is a lot more sensitive and comes under the guise of an on-board recording. I would need to understand a bit more fully the implications of that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Dolan: The commissioner has asked for regular updates on the progress of the reports and that is the extent of our involvement at this stage, so we would be happy to provide that material to this committee as well.</p>	154 24/02/15	
164	090	ATSB	BULLOCK	Response to Canadian Review	<p>Senator BULLOCK: Of course, had you been going to respond to the Canadians, I would have asked you to provide a copy of the response. Given that you are responding to the minister, I do not know whether I can. But if I could, I would.</p> <p>Mr Dolan: We will check with the minister, once we provide something to him.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Probably as part of the update to the committee.</p>	156 24/02/15	
165	215	ATSB	RICE	Safety investigation reports	<p>With reference to the Melbourne-Sydney rail line, particularly the approximately 58 kilometres where the mud holes have been a problem, I refer to John Fullerton from the ARTC's comments in Senate Additional Estimates hearings regarding the ATSB's view in its August 2013 report that treatments applied to date are unlikely to correct the more deep-seated formation problems.</p> <p>Mr Fullerton noted that "We [ARTC] do not totally agree with that particular matter that was raised by the ATSB. We had a lot of discussion with them about the extent</p>	Written	

					that the problem relates to formation failure.” What do you consider to be the factors leading to differing assessments of the problems and treatment?		
166	216	ATSB	XENOPHON	Cirrus report #ATS-0125061	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the time ATSB reviewed Airservices Cirrus report #ATS-0125061 was it aware that approximately 3 hours had elapsed between the time the reported breakdown of communication occurred and the time it was detected and corrected? 2. At the time ATSB reviewed REPCON AR201300090 relating to Cirrus report #ATS-0125061 was it aware approximately 3 hours had elapsed between the time the reported breakdown of communication occurred and the time it was detected and corrected? 3. When and how did ATSB become aware of the three hour time delay between the error referred to in Cirrus #ATS-0125061 occurring and its subsequent detection and correction? 4. Can ATSB provide a copy of the request it sent to Airservices for the radar tapes relating to Cirrus #ATS-0125061? 5. When did ATSB seek the radar tapes relating to Cirrus #ATS-0125061 – after the CIRRUS report was received or after the REPCON report was received? 6. When did ATSB review the radar tapes – after the CIRRUS report was received or after the REPCON report was received? 7. What period of time did the radar tapes provided by Airservices Australia cover? 8. Can ATSB provide a copy of the radar tapes it reviewed? 	Written	
Civil Aviation Safety Authority (11)							
167	068	CASA	BACK	Yass Valley Wind Farm report	<p>Senator BACK: I just want to draw your attention to the <i>Yass Valley Wind Farm—Final Report of a Peer Review of Aviation Impact Assessments and Consultation</i>, prepared for the New South Wales Department of Planning and Environment by The Airport Group in consideration of an application for the Yass Valley Wind Farm. Is that a report with which you are familiar, by any chance?</p> <p>Mr Skidmore: I am not familiar with the report.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator BACK: On notice, having had a chance to consider the report, could you</p>	97 24/02/15	

					<p>provide this committee with some advice on your comments on it? Could I take you to a couple of points and ask for your response? In the executive summary of their report to the department, they raise the question as to whether CASA needs additional powers. If I can quote: Current legislation in Australia does not allow CASA to satisfy this ICAO requirement... the current Australian aviation legislative framework does not satisfy ICAO requirements with respect to the identification and management of man-made obstacles that are located away from the vicinity of aerodromes. Before I ask you to comment, the report and recommendations of this particular group, The Airport Group, was that this particular wind farm should not proceed, based on a number of what they saw as obstacles, I think, associated with safe aviation. ... Mr Mrdak: ... I am happy to look at that report and come back with a full response to you in relation to it. We have the next meeting of Commonwealth state group, the NASAG group, coming up. We will ensure that we come back to you with a full report on how that is traversing.</p>		
168	083	CASA	FAWCETT	ATOs	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Is that grandfathering open-ended? Is there a time frame on that? Mr Crosthwaite: I cannot recall, Senator, whether that instrument goes to the end of the transition period or whether it was a shorter period. I cannot recall. I will take that on notice if you like. But it will certainly provide us with some time to deal with how we manage those flight reviews, and who can conduct them. Mr Skidmore: Would you like us to get back to you with the actual numbers of ATOs, Senator? Senator FAWCETT: Yes, that would be useful. I am particularly interested in the geographic distribution...</p>	94 24/02/15	
169	084	CASA	FAWCETT	Commercial sector licensing	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Okay. This is the last question that I have in this area. It appears that the commercial sector have self-regulated and under 101 have done quite a good job of their training and licensing. There appear to be a number of people who are running businesses using UAS as a platform, particularly around photography. Where there is commercial activity by someone who is not a licensed commercial operator, are you taking any enforcement action in those spaces? Mr Boyd: That is probably not a question for me; but I am sure that, when we find out, we do and we have. But that is probably more—</p>	96 24/02/15	

					<p>Senator FAWCETT: Can I ask you to take that on notice, then? I would be interested to know what positive steps you have taken if it is within your remit or, if you do not believe you have the head of power to take action, what advice you have provided to government so that, collectively, government can take an appropriate response.</p> <p>Mr Skidmore: We will take that on notice, if I understand the question correctly, Senator, and we will work on getting you an answer to that. I think it comes down to the fact that we can only enforce what we have become aware of in regards to violations. We are not out everywhere, we cannot be policing everything, so we do rely on the information being provided to us.</p>		
170	085	CASA	FAWCETT	AAT decision on legal case	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Sure, I understand that. I will ask you to take this on notice as well. Since the committee last met with you in estimates, the AAT has handed down its decision in the case of Mr John O'Brien, with regard to colour vision deficiency. CASA lost that case. Mr O'Brien has been given the privileges of exercising the airline transport pilot licence on the basis that he has a safe flying history as a co-pilot and they do not anticipate any increase in risk to the travelling public or others with him exercising the privileges of being a captain. I would be interested in your answer, on notice, about how you plan to move forward with this issue, in that this is twice now that the AAT has found against the CASA position. The AAT's judgement recognises, during the very long period under Liddell and Brock and other principal medical officers within CASA, the very proactive and positive approach to enabling people to fly with appropriate individual assessments. I guess I would like you to, on notice, explain to the committee how you plan to respond to not just this judgement about Mr O'Brien as an individual but also the very clear statements that came out of the AAT around their concerns about the broad application of the CAD Test and the fact that, essentially, each individual should be given the opportunity to demonstrate their competence and safety, regardless of the clinical diagnosis of CVD that may be identified through various forms of testing.</p> <p>Mr Skidmore: You quite correctly identified that we have only just received the response in regard to Mr O'Brien from the AAT. There is still time for us to appeal that response, and we will provide the information you requested in regard to that. But I would state that the AAT response was in regard to Mr O'Brien, and they did say it was in regard to Mr O'Brien only.</p>	96 24/02/15	
171	086	CASA	HEFFERNAN	European blacklist of	<p>CHAIR: Could you table to this committee the documents that backed up the black listing of those places that fly into Australia that are black listed in Europe?</p>	100-102 24/02/15	

				airlines	<p>...</p> <p>CHAIR: But there are still two airlines flying into Australia, as I understand it, that do not have the rights to fly into Europe?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Before we are definitive, let me go and check that and give you an accurate piece of information on that evidence so far. Let us take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Mr Skidmore: We can take it on notice and confirm to you exactly the numbers there, but Australia still conducts its own assessment in regards to the application put forward to it.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Perhaps if we come back to the committee with some advice in relation to, firstly, foreign air operators certificate requirements and then our safety surveillance program in relation to foreign carriers. If necessary, we can happily provide a briefing to the committee on those matters.</p> <p>CHAIR: I was just going to suggest that it may be appropriate to prepare a set of documents to brief this committee.</p>		
172	091	CASA	XENOPHON	Chief pilot of Pel-Air	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I am happy to ask you further questions on this, because it was quite a seminal report about aviation safety investigations and interrelationship between the agencies. Further, in respect of that report, you may be aware of the significant regulatory failures found within Pel-Air by CASA after the ditching, both in that special audit and in the Chambers report. Does the former chief pilot of Pel-Air, who was with the company when these breaches occurred, now hold, or has he held recently, a regulatory compliance position within CASA?</p> <p>Mr Skidmore: I cannot answer that with my estimation—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Mr Farquharson may know.</p> <p>Mr Farquharson: I am aware that he did.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: This is something that Senator Heffernan was particularly interested in, in terms of the former chief pilot of Pel-Air working with CASA.</p> <p>Mr Farquharson: I am aware that he did join CASA. I am not sure whether he is still with us.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Could you take that on notice, please, and if he did leave, on what date did he leave?</p> <p>CHAIR: That was with regard to the downgrading of the incident judgement call.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes. What due diligence did CASA undertake to ensure this individual was not responsible for the many and significant breaches found within Pel-Air and was arguably unsuitable to hold such a role within CASA? I am happy if</p>	103 24/02/15	

					you take it on notice, but it is a key— Mr Skidmore: I think we will have to take it on notice.		
173	220	CASA	WILLIAMS	Cessna regulations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am getting complaints about the costs involved in upgrading Cessnas under the SIDS programme. One owner tells me he has heard of people having to spend up to \$200,000 to comply as it involves essentially dismantling the aircraft and rebuilding them. In the case of the owner I have spoken with, he had a quote of \$60,000 and was debating whether to just stop flying because of the cost. The common complaint seems to be these aircraft are no more unsafe than any other - same materials, same ages, common motors – yet Cessna owners feel they are being victimised. I understand Cessna itself has instigated this programme but is the cost of compliance a concern that has been raised with CASA? 2. How many complaints have CASA received about the new regulations? 3. Are you able to determine if any aircraft are no longer flying in Australia due to this new compliance regulation? 4. Can CASA tell me if anywhere in the world a wing has fallen off a Cessna in the 1, 2 or 3 series category? 	Written	
174	221	CASA	XENOPHON	Cirrus report #ATS-0125061	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the time CASA reviewed Airservices Cirrus report #ATS-0125061 was it aware that approximately 3 hours had elapsed between the time the reported breakdown of communication occurred and the time it was detected and corrected? 2. At the time CASA received ATSB’s advice that no loss of separation or separation assurance had occurred as suggested in REPCON AR201300090 was it aware that approximately 3 hours had elapsed between the time the reported breakdown of communication occurred and the time it was detected and corrected? 3. When and how did CASA become aware of the three hour time delay between the error referred to in Cirrus #ATS-0125061 occurring and its subsequent detection and correction? 4. Did CASA independently review the Cirrus #ATS-0125061/REPCON AR201300090 radar tapes or did it rely on the advice of Airservices and ATSB that no loss of separation or separation assurance had occurred over the three hour period? 5. CASA’s response to ATSB with regards to REPCON AR201300089 states in part, “... CASA is aware that the Melbourne Surface Movement Control 	Written	

					<p><i>(SMC) position is a complex and high workload area. CASA has recommended that Airservices conduct a review of the SMC position post INTAS transition. CASA will be monitoring the results of this review.”</i></p> <p>CASA’s answer to QoN #257 regarding its recommended Melbourne Surface Movement Control review states, “...CASA is aware Airservices Australia conducted a Post Implementation Review (PIR) of the Melbourne Tower Integrated Tower Automation Suite (INTAS) and was not specifically required to provide it to CASA”. The answer further states, “...CASA is satisfied that the PIR conducted by Airservices Australia covers the intent of CASA’s recommendation for a review as stated in REPCON AR201300089”.</p> <p>How did CASA satisfy itself that the INTAS PIR conducted by Airservices covered the intent of CASA’s Melbourne Surface Movement Control review recommendation and also fulfil its monitoring assurances without obtaining a copy of the Airservices PIR?</p>		
175	222	CASA	XENOPHON	Guidance material/airworthiness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to CASA’s answer to Questions on Notice number 245 (Supplementary Estimates) - CASA says that unlicensed personnel have been able to certify for the airworthiness of their tasks a result of the changes to Parts 42 and 145 of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What were the changes to Parts 42 and 145 that permitted this and when did they occur? 2. Guidance Material (GM) provides explanations and amplification of a CASR policy intention. Guidance Material (GM) was published with the Regulations and Manual of Standards for Part 145 and was last updated in April 2014 and is still current. This Guidance Material MOS GM 145.A.30 (f) says that unlicensed personnel aren’t to certify for airworthiness and this must be done by the holder of a licence that covers the work. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why does the Guidance Material say that airworthiness determinations and certifications must be made by a licenced engineer but CASA says that the changes to Part 42 and 145 removed this requirement? b. Did CASA inform the industry when they were making the changes to Part 42 and 145 (referred to in their answer) that the effect of the changes would be to remove the requirement for an airworthiness signature for a non-licenced persons work? 3. In relation to CASA’s answer to Questions on Notice number 245 - CASA says that unlicensed personnel have been able to certify for the 	Written	

					<p>airworthiness of their tasks a result of the changes to Parts 42 and 145 of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations. What were the changes to Parts 42 and 145 that permitted this and when did they occur?</p> <p>4. Guidance Material (GM) provides explanations and amplification of a CASR policy intention. Guidance Material (GM) was published with the Regulations and Manual of Standards for Part 145 and was last updated in April 2014 and is still current. This Guidance Material MOS GM 145.A.30 (f) says that unlicensed personnel aren't to certify for airworthiness and this must be done by the holder of a licence that covers the work.</p> <p>a. Why does the Guidance Material say that airworthiness determinations and certifications must be made by a licenced engineer but CASA says that the changes to Part 42 and 145 removed this requirement?</p> <p>b. Did CASA inform the industry when they were making the changes to Part 42 and 145 (referred to in their answer) that the effect of the changes would be to remove the requirement for an airworthiness signature for a non-licenced persons work?</p>		
176	223	CASA	STERLE	Extra resources and wider regulation	<p>I refer to Corporate Strategy 1.2 which relates to ongoing completion of the regulatory reform program in place at the start of 2013-4.</p> <p>1. I note two ticks to indicate substantially completed – where are we in the three phases regulatory reform program that was in place at the start of 2013-4?</p> <p>2. Where are we with Phase 3 of the reform program? Is this still a priority?</p>	Written	
177	224	CASA	STERLE	Maintenance organisations	<p>I refer to an answer CASA gave to QoN 252 from the 2014-15 Supplementary Budget Estimates round:</p> <p>Question no.: 252 Program: n/a Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority Topic: Misleading and False Information Proof Hansard Page: Written Senator Sterle asked: If CASA became aware that an Approved Maintenance Organisation has provided misleading and false information to them during an investigation what actions would CASA take?</p>	Written	

					<p>Answer: CASA would firstly consider whether information provided to it was false or misleading. Secondly, it would determine if the organisation intentionally provided false or misleading information. CASA would also consider the nature of the false or misleading information, that is, the gravity or nature of the information and any safety consequences of the information being false or misleading. In appropriate cases, CASA would consider taking action against the organisation, which could range from involving a counselling notice or referring the matter to the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (CDPP) for prosecution. In some cases, the most appropriate action would be to refer the matter to the Australian Federal Police (AFP) for investigation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is CASA aware of any Maintenance Organisations that were under investigation by CASA that had provided false or misleading information to them? 2. What action did CASA take? If no action was taken why not? 3. Were any of these Maintenance Organisations based overseas? 4. What administrative actions are CASA able to take against an overseas based Maintenance Organisation that have breached aviation regulations? 5. What are the powers of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecution and the AFP in a foreign jurisdiction? 6. How is an offence of Strict Liability prosecuted in a foreign jurisdiction? 7. When an Australian aircraft is undergoing maintenance in a overseas based Maintenance Organisation with a CASA approval are the employees of the Maintenance Organisation working under the Australian aviation regulations and offence provisions or the regulations and offence provisions of the country in which the maintenance is being undertaken? 8. Did CASA receive misleading information during an investigation into ST Aerospace in Singapore in relation to Scribe Line inspections using an SDMS measuring system? 9. If so what actions did CASA take? 		
Local Government and Territories (4)							

178	095	LGT	STERLE	FAG funding	<p>Senator STERLE: I am going to try to put a lot on notice, and I want to talk about the FAG funding. We did touch on it today, and I am sure you would have heard it, so perhaps we can get straight to it. Could you let us know whether the department has done any analysis on the loss to each local government because of the FAG cut?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We certainly have done analysis of the quantum of the impact on local government from the nonindexation, but we have not done an analysis of the impact of that. We have the quantum amounts but not an analysis impact.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Can you supply us with that, or are you taking it on notice? Do you have it here?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, we do not have that here.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Then perhaps you could take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: For each council?</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, please...</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: I have some rough calculations on a council—Western Downs in Queensland is one that was given to me. Under the cuts, they stand to lose about \$7.6 million over four years, I am told, because of the decision to pause the indexation of FAG. Could you confirm whether that is true? Would you have that in front of you?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: We will take that on notice. I do not think we would be able to confirm the differential across the four years.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, take that on notice, because you are going to come back to us with the figures that you do have so that we can put figures next to councils and states and all that sort of stuff...</p>	143-145 24/02/15	
179	096	LGT	STERLE	FAG councils	<p>Senator STERLE:... Has the minister received any correspondence from local governments complaining about the cuts?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Could the department tell us which councils have written to the government?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: We would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Please do, because I have written to every council in Western Australia. That is no secret. People know that. Half of them shit themselves because they think, 'Why is a Labor senator writing to a Liberal council?' It was because I actually wanted to know. It is amazing what they wrote back. Has the minister received any representations from any members of any parliaments regarding the paused indexation, to your knowledge?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: I would think that the Deputy Prime Minister and the assistant minister</p>	145 24/02/15	

					<p>would have had conversations with members of parliament regarding the issue. But I cannot give you a detailed—</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Because you do not know.</p> <p>Mr Wilson: list of who that might be at the moment.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: But if you do know, can you give it to us?</p> <p>Mr Wilson: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: You are taking that on notice. Great...</p>		
180	230	LGT	STERLE	Federation White Paper	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Department been consulted on the Government’s Reform of the Federation paper? 2. Has the Department been consulted on the funding arrangements for Local Government as part of the Reform of the Federation paper? If so, which aspects? 3. Has the Department been asked to do analysis on the Commonwealth Government funding for Local Government for the white paper? If so, what details? 4. Has the Department done any analysis on how the indexation pause has impacted on Local Governments now that they have been cut? If so, what details? 5. Has the Department received any correspondence relating to Local Governments having to increase their rates due to the indexation pause on FAGs? If so, which councils? 	Written	
181	231	LGT	STERLE	RDAs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was there any independent oversight of the appointment process for the Chair and Deputy Chairs of the RDA Committees? 2. How many people nominated for the Chair and Deputy Chair roles of the RDAs committees? Can we get a list by RDA? 3. Has Government made any further decisions on how and when the review of the RDA Committee system will occur? 4. When do you expect a terms of reference for the review will be available? Will it be public? Will there be public consultations on the role that RDAs play as part of the review? 5. When do expect the review the will be complete? 6. What do you expect the review will cost? 	Written	
Western Sydney Unit (2)							

182	235	WSU	STERLE	EY contract	<p>On Christmas Eve, the Unit notified award of a contract to Ernst & Young for Business Adviser Services for Second Sydney Airport, at an estimates value of just over \$3 million.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is this for? 2. What is the scope of the contract, as expressed in the contract? 	Written	
183	236	WSU	STERLE	Second Sydney Airport – naming rights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What entity will ultimately be responsible for determining the name of the airport at Badgerys Creek? 2. When will a name be nominated? 3. Is this a matter to be determined by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Federal Government? If so, who or what agency? b. The State Government? If so, who or what agency? c. The operator of the airport? 4. What opportunity will there be for the general public to nominate names and participate in choosing the name? 5. What names is the division aware of at this point? 	Written	
National Capital Authority (3)							
184	097	NCA	XENOPHON	Pay parking	<p>Senator XENOPHON: But it may be relevant. In terms of the amount of revenue that you collect, Mr Snow, how much of that is chewed up in overheads? In other words, if you collect \$100,000, how much of that is overheads, administrative costs, capital costs and the like to install the parking system?</p> <p>Mr Snow: Thank you, Senator. I would have to take that on notice. The scheme has only been operating for less than five months. A number of the services you are referring to—the enforcement, coin collection—those services have only just been introduced. I would be pleased to try and make that calculation and provide that to you.</p>	140 24/02/15	
185	098	NCA	HEFFERNAN	Parliamentary parking and revenue estimates	<p>Mr Mrdak: The essence is that I am sure the NCA has that data in terms of what is happening. The question then is: has the take-up of parking in the Parliamentary Triangle since paid parking was introduced matched revenue estimates?</p> <p>CHAIR: No, I am not interested in revenue estimates. I am interested in what is in the bank—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That is what I am saying.</p> <p>CHAIR: and what it cost to get that in the bank. So, if you could take that on</p>	142-143 24/02/15	

					<p>notice— Mr Mrdak: We will. CHAIR: and give us a three-monthly, a six-monthly and then a nine-monthly and a 12-monthly update, I would be grateful. Mr Mrdak: That is fine. CHAIR: And if you cannot do it in three-monthly grabs, how do you know someone is not taking you down in the meantime? Mr Mrdak: I think we have clarity now about what we are being asked for. ... CHAIR: I understand that. I want to know if what is going to go back to revenue is 30 per cent of what was spent—the cost-efficiency of the deal. Mr Mrdak: We will get that.</p>		
186	099	NCA	BULLOCK	Paid parking on national land	Taking into account all revenue, expenses and capital measures what is the projected net profit from the paid parking on national land scheme for 2014-15 and each year of the forward estimates?	Written	