

Senator the Hon. Bill Heffernan Chair Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee PO Box 6100 Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Senator Heffernan

Having reviewed the proof Hansard of the Budget Estimates hearing conducted by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee on Monday 25 and Tuesday 26 May 2015, I write to provide corrections to and further clarification of information I provided to the committee at the Budget Estimates hearing.

The first clarification relates to a question from Senator Cameron for which the relevant dialogue is on page 11 of the 25 May proof Hansard:

Senator CAMERON: That is really clever. Mr Padovan, now that Ms Kennedy has passed this issue to you, what steps did you take?

Mr Padovan: Unfortunately, I went on leave the following day. That probably does not help the chronology of events. But certainly when it was flagged with me, I understood that the matter was to be raised with the secretary in due course. As you will see in the chronology from question on notice No. 48, a series of events then took place between the receipt of that email and when it was ultimately corrected.

I had advised that 'Unfortunately, I went on leave the following day'. My response should read: 'Unfortunately, I went on study leave from Wednesday 22 October 2014, the day after I had first read the email.'

The second relates to my response to a question from Senator Cameron for which the relevant dialogue is on page 12 of the 25 May proof Hansard:

Senator CAMERON: When you say that the matter was being 'escalated', what do you mean by that?

Mr Padovan: What I mean by that is that it was brought to the secretary's attention on, I think, the Wednesday. Mr Tucker, who was the deputy secretary at that time, was certainly aware of it on the Tuesday.

I had advised that 'Mr Tucker, who was the deputy secretary at that time, was certainly aware of it on the Tuesday'. My response should read: 'Mr Tucker, who was the deputy secretary at that time, was certainly aware of it on the Wednesday'.

The third relates to my response to a question from Senator Back for which the relevant dialogue is on page 79 of the 26 May proof Hansard:

Senator BACK: Or Treasury does. I will move on from that accelerated asset question. I want to ask you about the Emissions Reduction Fund auction. How much funding? How many projects related to agriculture? Could you give us a bit more background in terms of the take-up by the agricultural industry and by farmers, please?

Mr Padovan: I might start at a high level and then hand over to Ms Kennedy, who can go through some of the further detail. In terms of the high level for the first round of the Emissions Reduction Fund, the results were published on 23 April. There were 76 contracts issued that relate to the agriculture sector. Associated with them were 30.1 million tonnes of abatement.

I had advised that 'There were 76 contracts issued that relate to the agriculture sector. Associated with them were 30.1 million tonnes of abatement.' My response should read: 'There were 77 contracts issued that relate to agriculture and vegetation-based activities. Associated with them were approximately 30 million tonnes of abatement.'

The final clarification relates to my response to a question from Senator Cameron for which the relevant dialogue is on page 96 of the 26 May proof Hansard:

Senator CAMERON: Is this to fund additional counsellors? The counsellors that are there are funded out of a different pot of money? **Mr Padoyan:** That is correct.

My response should read: 'That is correct. This is to pay for additional counsellors, or for part time counsellors to increase their hours, and will increase the original Budget item from \$14.3 million to \$16.1 million.'

Thank you for the opportunity to review the transcript of the Budget Estimates hearing held on 26–26 May 2015 and to provide these clarifications and corrections.

Yours sincerely

Nico Padovan
A/g Deputy Secretary
S June 201