

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 22

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Hope dairies

Proof Hansard page: 8

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Yes, okay. Dr Grimes, obviously people are looking at this investment, from the minerals industry to the milk industry, with some interest. This is a big investment by Hope Dairies and that Rinehart Chinese conglomerate. I am interested as to whether there has been any discussion between anyone in the department and anyone associated with Hope Dairies.

Dr Grimes: Senator, a question that is so broad I would have to take on notice. I can say that there has been no discussion that I have participated in or that I am aware of. I would have to take the question on notice because it goes to anyone in the department and, obviously, we have to undertake checks.

Senator CAMERON: Yes, and obviously anyone in the Hope Dairies conglomerate.

Dr Grimes: I would have to take that on notice, Senator, but I am personally not aware of any discussions, but I will take that on notice to check.

Answer:

No. The Department of Agriculture is not aware of anyone in the department having discussions with anyone associated with Hope dairies regarding the investment.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 23

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Hope dairies

Proof Hansard page: 8

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Given that it is such a big investment, there would be issues the department would be interested in, surely?

Dr Grimes: I am aware of the fact that the investment proposals are being reported in the press, and obviously we take an interest. Foreign investment has played a very important role in the development of the agriculture sector in Australia. Our job is not to scrutinise. We do not have a regulatory role in relation to investment proposals.

Senator CAMERON: But your job is viability, isn't it?

Dr Grimes: Yes, of course, we have an interest in the viability of the agriculture sector, but we simply do not have the resourcing that would have us doing that sort of work individually. We have a free-market economy rather than one where the department is seeking to direct investment in any way. We do not have a role in that sense.

Senator CAMERON: That is not what I am proposing. I am looking at your responsibilities in terms of sustainability, profitability and competitiveness. That is the key role that the department plays.

Dr Grimes: Any investment proposal, which then resulted in the development of some sort, would be subject to planning arrangements at the state government level, potentially environmental issues, which could be state government or could be federal government. If it involves investment it might be subject to consideration by the Foreign Investment Review Board. It may be at some points along that continuum there is a point at which other agencies were to consult us, but we do not have direct regulatory roles in relation to these matters.

Senator CAMERON: I do not want to do what you have discussed, what I want to know whether you have discussed this with Minister Joyce?

Dr Grimes: No, I have not discussed it with Minister Joyce, and I would have to take on notice whether there had been any other discussions.

Question: 23 (continued)

Answer:

No. The Department of Agriculture has not discussed the proposed Hope Dairy investment with Minister Joyce.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 24

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Hope dairies

Proof Hansard page: 9

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Can you take on notice this question: has Minister Joyce had any discussions with Mrs Rinehart on this proposal? If so, when did the discussions take place? What was the scope of the discussions? Did Minister Joyce take any actions arising out of those discussions as they took place?

Senator Colbeck: I am happy to take that on notice.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture has confirmed the Minister did not speak with Ms Rinehart on this matter prior to the announcement.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 25

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Advice to the minister re: RDCs

Proof Hansard page: 13

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Has that advice been given to the minister?

Mr Glyde: That is a point I will have to check. My understanding is that there have been a number of briefing notes, et cetera, provided to the minister over the course of the last few months, but I do not have the specifics.

Dr Grimes: Senator, I am happy to confirm that there has been advice provided to the minister on these matters. As I said, I would not have specific dates but advice has certainly been provided to the minister.

Senator CAMERON: So you could provide me the dates when the advice went to the minister?

Dr Grimes: We would be able to see either whether we could have that available today or take it on notice.

Answer:

Written advice was provided to the minister on 15 April, 16 July, 3 October and 27 October 2014.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 26

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Relocation of agencies

Proof Hansard page: 14

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: How can you provide advice if you do not know what the decision is?

Dr Grimes: We have provided advice on options. Obviously advice goes before a decision is made by the government. Advice has been provided, it is currently under consideration, and a decision will be made one way or another in due course.

Senator CAMERON: Senator Colbeck, what involvement have you had with this relocation?

Senator Colbeck: I have been consulted as part of that process because some of the agencies involved have a direct relationship to the part of the portfolio that I look after.

Senator CAMERON: Will you be involved in the decision making process?

Senator Colbeck: The minister has asked for my opinion and I have given it to him.

Senator CAMERON: How did you form your opinion?

Senator Colbeck: I have had the opportunity to look at some of the advice.

Senator CAMERON: So you have seen the advice—

Senator Colbeck: Some of the advice.

Senator CAMERON: When did you get that advice?

Senator Colbeck: I would have to take that on notice. I have seen some of the work around cost-benefit, but I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

4 September 2014.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 27

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Methodology

Proof Hansard page: 15

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Mr Glyde, what was the methodology used for this thing? What is it? What did you do?

Mr Glyde: We provided advice in relation to the benefits, costs, implications, risks et cetera in relation to the potential move of these organisations. I would have to take it on notice or hopefully my colleagues from the Agriculture Policy Division might have a little bit more detail to be able to help you answer those questions. As Dr Grimes pointed out, I have been in this job for a couple of weeks, so I do not actually have the specifics. The best way to answer those questions would be for us to go through these with Agriculture Policy Division in terms of the specifics of what has been done by either the affected RDCs or us pulling that together and summarising it for minister's consideration.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture sent a questionnaire to portfolio agencies asking them to provide information on costs and benefits, risks, the likely impact on business operations, an indicative estimate of the percentage of staff likely to relocate, timeline, estimates of costs, an outline of the known likely response from key stakeholders and a list of regional areas for potential relocation. Senior departmental officials also had discussions with senior representatives from the relevant portfolio agencies and key associated industry groups.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 28

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Correspondence from FRDC

Proof Hansard page: 16

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Yes, but this question I am asking you, the department. You did receive a letter on 27 October, Dr Grimes?

Dr Grimes: I would have to check the records in the dates of correspondence.

Answer:

Dr Grimes received a letter from the Hon. Harry Woods, Chair of Fisheries Research and Development Corporation on 4 September 2014.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 29

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Correspondence from FRDC

Proof Hansard page: 16

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Senator Colbeck, you wrote to the Hon. Harry Woods on 27 October, didn't you?

Senator Colbeck: I would have to check that. I have had correspondence with Mr Woods, who is the chair of the FRDC, but I would have to do check the date.

Senator CAMERON: Was it on this issue?

Senator Colbeck: I am aware of correspondence from them but I am not aware of having written back. I would have to check that.

Senator CAMERON: Can I tell you that you have written to them.

Senator Colbeck: Thank you for that confirmation.

Senator CAMERON: You cannot remember what you said?

Senator Colbeck: Not specifically in that letter. I would have to have it in front of me. I do have some correspondence to deal with.

Senator CAMERON: That is fair enough. You would confirm, then, that the board had indicated to you that they do not support this move.

Senator Colbeck: I would have to check my correspondence before I confirmed that.

Senator CAMERON: Surely you would know that.

Senator Colbeck: Let us put it this way: I am aware of their views, but I do not recall the specific letter. I am sorry.

Senator CAMERON: You are aware of their views?

Senator Colbeck: Yes.

Senator CAMERON: What are their views?

Senator Colbeck: The information they have given me is that they are not keen on the move.

Question: 29 (continued)

Senator CAMERON: After the board wrote to you on 27 October, what have you done to contact the board since then to discuss this issue?

Senator Colbeck: I have not had any discussions regarding—

Senator CAMERON: None?

Senator Colbeck: I have not finished my answer yet. I have not had any discussions regarding this matter with FRDC in that period of time. I have discussed other matters with them but not this one.

Senator CAMERON: When will you discuss their opposition to this move?

Senator Colbeck: I have had a number of meetings with FRDC over a period of time. I would have to check dates on those. We have had a number of general conversations around the operations of the organisation, the government's priorities and a number of other matters. Some of those have been very general conversations around these sorts of matters and, of course, other government priorities for the FRDC.

Senator CAMERON: Surely this is a very significant position where the board says to you as the parliamentary secretary: 'We don't support this policy position.'

Senator Colbeck: The government will take that position into account when we make our decision.

Senator CAMERON: What issues will you deliberate on in terms of their view?

Senator Colbeck: The issues that are provided to us in the advice from both the FRDC and the department.

Senator CAMERON: Have there been any other concerns raised with either the department or the minister by any other groups about this policy decision?

Senator Colbeck: I do not know specifically with respect to the department. I have not had a specific conversation with the minister around other concerns that might have been raised with him, so I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The minister has received correspondence from the Chair of the Commonwealth Fisheries Association Incorporated, the Chief Executive Officer of the Western Australian Fishing Industry Council Incorporated and the Executive Officer of Southern Rocklobster Limited on this matter.

State/territory government agencies and industry representative organisations raised a number of concerns during the department's consultations regarding a potential relocation of the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 30

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Contract between ACT government and department

Proof Hansard page: 27-28

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: If there is a legally binding contract in place, that would make this political promise just not a goer, wouldn't it?

Mr Koval: The promise that has been made is for the government to look at whether agencies should or should not be located at Canberra. I am not aware of any promise made about any agency such as APVMA to be moved out of Canberra.

Senator CAMERON: So how long have your staff been looking for this agreement?

Mr Koval: I did not ask that question but I am happy to ask them after this, and, when I come back this afternoon, provide you with an answer.

Senator CAMERON: Have they found anything yet?

Mr Koval: Not that I am aware of. I have not asked them this week to that extent. But I am not aware of them finding anything as yet.

Senator CAMERON: Is this a matter of priority for your department?

Mr Koval: It is, yes.

Senator CAMERON: Who can I ask questions about this? Who is carrying out the search?

Mr Koval: As I mentioned, the search is being carried out in conjunction with people in my division, people within the agvet chemical policy team, and we have been liaising with the legal counsel from APVMA as well.

Mr Glyde: We will do our best to give you an answer.

Senator CAMERON: So you are talking to APVMA; it is not separate?

Mr Koval: They are separate. The advice that Dr Grimes gave, that they are a separate legal team—

Senator CAMERON: But you are talking to them?

Mr Koval: We are talking to them.

Question: 30 (continued)

Dr Grimes: My evidence previously was that we work very closely with the APVMA—that was my evidence.

Senator CAMERON: I heard that. Who is the officer that is charged with dealing with this?

Mr Koval: People in my division.

Senator CAMERON: Are they here?

Mr Koval: No, they are not.

Senator CAMERON: But they would be able to tell the Senate whether they have found the document or not?

Mr Koval: I will ask them once I leave here how the search is going, and I will come back after the lunch break this afternoon and let you know

Answer:

Yes. The Department of Agriculture has located a copy of the document.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 31

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Lease on current building - RIRDC

Proof Hansard page: 28

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Where is RIRDC stationed now?

Mr Koval: Canberra.

Senator CAMERON: Ms Evans, how long is their lease in Canberra?

Ms Evans: It is in the same question on notice answer, so I can give this to you in hard copy later as well.

Senator CAMERON: That would be good.

Answer:

The Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation has a five year lease which expires on 30 September 2015.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 32

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Lease arrangements - GRDC

Proof Hansard page: 29-30

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: These are, as Senator Sterle reminds me, election promises by the government. The government is saying they are going to do this. I am not asking you to comment on that; I am just thinking out loud. What is the value of the 10-year lease that has just been signed off?

Ms Evans: If I am reading this correctly, the cost in the budget statement for the GRDC in relation to that lease over the period is \$10.5 million.

Senator CAMERON: It is \$10.5 million for the lease? Where were they previously?

Mr Koval: They were in premises in Blackall Street. They moved 500 metres or 600 metres into bigger premises because they had outgrown what they were in.

Senator CAMERON: They have moved into the bigger premises and they have signed a 10-year lease worth \$10.5 million. When did they sign the lease?

Ms Evans: I do not have that information.

Senator CAMERON: Can you get me that?

Ms Evans: We can find out from the GRDC when they signed the lease.

Senator CAMERON: When did you start discussing the possibility of moving with the Grains Research Development Corporation?

Mr Koval: I do not recall the exact date, but we had detailed conversations in June or July of this year. Maybe I can take that on notice.

Dr Grimes: Like Mr Koval, I do not have the specific dates either, but some of the questions relating to this were covered in our last estimates hearing, so certainly these matters were under consideration prior to the last estimates hearing of this committee.

Senator CAMERON: That does not help me much.

Dr Grimes: It does give you an indication that it is a date prior to June. It was probably late May.

Question: 32 (continued)

Senator CAMERON: What I am interest in is when the decision was made to enter into this 10-year lease. You have taken that on notice.

Dr Grimes: Yes

Senator CAMERON: When you first started talking to the Grains Research and Development Corporation about packing their bags again and moving, what was the cost of this 500-metre move going to be?

Dr Grimes: We can take that on notice and find it out from them for you.

Answer:

Grains Research and Development Corporation signed its lease on 17 December 2013. The Department of Agriculture first discussed the possibility of relocation with Grains Research and Development Corporation in April 2014. Grains Research and Development Corporation's removalists costs for moving from Level 1, 40 Blackall St, Barton, ACT to Level 4 East Building, 4 National Circuit, Barton was \$7250.00.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 33

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: GRDC staff located in Perth

Proof Hansard page: 30

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: What about Perth? Tell me about Perth? How many people are stationed in Perth? And I am not holding you to it.

Dr Grimes: We are just discussing it ourselves.

Senator CAMERON: Roughly.

Mr Glyde: We do not really know. We can find out for you.

Answer:

One Full Time Equivalent is located in Perth.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 34

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Potential relocation of APVMA

Proof Hansard page: 32

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: So you can confirm that Armidale is an option that is being looked at. Is that correct? For the APVMA.

Senator Colbeck: I am aware of public reports in relation to that, but I have not been involved in specific conversations in relation to that, because it is not an area of the portfolio that I have specific responsibility for.

Senator CAMERON: Okay. That would be the minister, would it?

Senator Colbeck: Correct.

Senator CAMERON: Okay. You represent the minister, so can you take on notice whether that has been in the same terms I have asked you about whether you have been involved in discussions?

Senator Colbeck: Yes.

Answer:

In supporting the government's consideration of options to implement its commitment to boost jobs growth and strengthen communities across regional Australia, all states and territories have been considered as possible locations for agency relocations.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 35

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Cost-benefit analysis – relocation of RDC's

Proof Hansard page: 33

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: So this will be a government decision based on advice, either yes or no—I cannot put it any higher than advice because we have found that it is not a cost-benefit analysis—and then people will be told, 'You will be required to move.' Is that correct?

Senator Colbeck: I do not you can classify it that way, Senator. If the government makes a decision that it might like to relocate one of these RDCs, they will not be told that they will be required to move but they would be told that the RDC is going to move and they would be given a range of options, I would have thought. It would not be a dictation that they will move because as has been indicated before there are personal considerations about that potential relocation to be considered as part of this process.

Senator CAMERON: Again, I am not asking you what the advice is that you are going to provide, but how many different areas or different regional towns are being considered for this relocation, in your analysis?

Dr Grimes: I think a question of that sort would be most appropriate for us to take on notice, to refer to the minister and provide a response to you.

Senator CAMERON: I thought it was a fairly simple question, that you have indicated that you are doing what was first described as a cost-benefit analysis. You pared that back to providing advice. I am not asking you what advice you are going to give to the government but the simple question is: are you considering any locations other than the locations that were mentioned today? That is a simple question. You should not need to take that on notice.

Dr Grimes: We would be considering a range of locations in any advice we provided to the government.

Senator CAMERON: When you say 'a range' is that Canberra, or one, or more?

Dr Grimes: An officer here may be able to provide you with further information but I think it would be most appropriate for us to take it on notice.

Senator CAMERON: I have asked a question about the locations and I am still waiting for the answer that there have been several. Can you provide me with details of all the locations for each agency that has been looked at.

Question: 35 (continued)

Dr Grimes: I think that is appropriately something that we take on notice and refer to the minister.

Answer:

All states and territories have been considered as possible locations for agency relocation.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 36

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Western Australia as a base for agencies

Proof Hansard page: 55

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Senator Back raised the issue of Western Australia earlier. Are there any plans to analyse Western Australia as a base for any of these agencies?

Mr Glyde: I might have to take that on notice. What I am aware of is that GRDC has offices in Western Australia, as we heard earlier, and options around that may involve part of the organisation moving or something like that. But, other than that, I am not aware of any other aspect to do with Western Australia.

Answer:

In supporting the government's consideration of options to implement its commitment to boost jobs growth and strengthen communities across regional Australia, all states and territories have been considered as possible locations for agency relocation.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 37

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Agencies relocation

Proof Hansard page: 56

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Some of the initial work has been done. Has all of the work been done? Have recommendations been made to the minister?

Mr Koval: As mentioned earlier, we have provided advice to government.

Senator CAMERON: So you have provided advice. It is done. What has been the cost of providing the advice?

Mr Glyde: I think we would have to take that on notice. We have not created a particular task force or business unit within Mr Koval's division or within the department to do this, so digging out the costs will require estimating what the time is that Mr Koval and my predecessor spent on it and what other officers have worked on it. It is not necessarily a trivial task to give you an accurate estimate of how many resources we have already put into it.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture does not undertake activity based costing and is unable to estimate the cost of providing advice on this matter.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 38

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Portfolio relocation

Proof Hansard page: 57

Senator CAMERON asked:

Senator CAMERON: Can you provide me details of meetings that have taken place, how many officers have been involved and an estimate, if you can, of the cost to get to this position? Can you also provide me some details of the management systems that are used to deal with what is millions of dollars of public money and the lives of individual public servants and their families being uprooted? These are big decisions. They may not be big decisions in dollar terms for the overall government budget, but they are big decisions in terms of dollars for this department and in relation to individuals. I am trying to get some feel for the robustness of the process that is in place to come to a recommendation going to the minister.

Mr Glyde: I understand and am happy to provide that on notice.

Answer:

Senior departmental officials have consulted widely on the potential for portfolio agency relocation. This consultation included face to face meetings and telephone conversations with representatives from the relevant portfolio agencies and key associated industry groups. The Department of Agriculture is unable to provide an assessment of the costs of this consultation nor the specifics of meetings as the department does not undertake activity based costing and does not record centrally the details of all meetings and calls.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 39

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Boards

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator LUDWIG asked:

Since Budget Estimates in June, 2014 for each board in the portfolio or agencies:

1. how often has each board met, break down by board name;
2. what travel expenses have been incurred;
3. what has been the average attendance at board meetings;
4. List each member's attendance at meetings;
5. how does the board deal with conflict of interest;
6. what conflicts of interest have been registered;
7. what remuneration has been provided to board members;
8. how does the board dismiss board members who do not meet attendance standards?
9. Have any requests been made to ministers to dismiss board members?
10. Please list board members who have attended less than 51% of meetings
11. what have been the catering costs for the board meetings held during this period?
Please break down the cost list.

Question: 39 (continued)

Answer:

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation (RIRDC)

1. RIRDC has met three times in June, August and September.
2. Flights, accommodation, taxis, private car usage and meals.
3. 85 per cent
4. List each member's attendance at meetings

Face to face meeting – 24 June 2014

- Professor Daniela Stehlik
- Ms Alana Johnson
- Mr Alex Campbell
- Dr Marilyn Sleigh - apology
- Mr Michael Guerin
- Ms Roseanne Healy
- Mr Sam Archer
- Mr Craig Burns
- Dr Len Stephens – apology

Face to face meeting - 26 August 2014

- Professor Daniela Stehlik
- Ms Alana Johnson
- Mr Alex Campbell
- Dr Len Stephens
- Mr Michael Guerin
- Ms Roseanne Healy
- Mr Sam Archer

Question: 39 (continued)

- Mr Craig Burns
- Dr Marilyn Sleigh - apology

Face to face meeting – 24 September 2014

- Professor Daniela Stehlik
- Dr Marilyn Sleigh
- Ms Alana Johnson
- Dr Len Stephens
- Mr Michael Guerin
- Ms Roseanne Healy
- Mr Sam Archer
- Mr Craig Burns
- Mr Alex Campbell – apology

5. A Director who has a direct personal interest in a matter that is being considered by the Board must disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Board.

The Board manages the potential for conflict of interest for Directors and senior management by an annual declaration of potential conflicts and by a standing agenda item at each Board meeting that requires Directors who may have a conflict of interest in any matter to be discussed at that meeting to identify the potential conflict. Where a material potential conflict is identified the Director leaves the meeting during discussion of the matter. Potential conflicts are recorded in the Board minutes and are available for consideration by the Corporation's Auditors.

6. None.

7. As per the Remuneration Tribunal.

8. N/A.

9. No.

10. N/A.

11. \$1152 comprising biscuits, sandwiches, fruit and cheese platters.

Question: 39 (continued)

Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC)

1. Between 28 May – 30 November 2014 the GRDC Board held three formal face to face Board meetings.
2. Travel expenses provided during the period 28 May 2014 to 30 November 2014 was \$59 153 made up of:
 - Travel Allowance: \$21 974
 - Flights, Accommodation and Miscellaneous: \$34 552
 - Mileage Allowance: \$2627
3. One Director was unable to attend one of the three face to face Board meetings.
- 4.

Director	June Board Meeting	July Board Meeting	September Board Meeting
Mr Richard Clarke -	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mr Richard Brimblecombe	No	Yes	Yes
Dr Jeremy Burdon	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ms Jenny Goddard	Yes	Yes	YEs
Mr Kim Halbert	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mr John Harvey	Yes	Yes	Yes
Professor Robert Lewis	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ms Sharon Starick	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mr John	Yes	Yes	Yes

Woods			
-------	--	--	--

5. The Roles and Responsibilities of the Board provides for the management of conflicts of interest as follows:

6. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

6.1 Obligations & Duties

A fundamental legal and fiduciary duty of the GRDC’s directors is to exercise their powers, perform their functions and discharge their duties in good faith and for a proper purpose (section 26 PGPA Act). In the context of financial management, a ‘proper purpose’ is taken to mean the efficient, effective, economical and ethical use and management of the Corporation’s resources for the achievement of its purposes as described in the PIRD Act.

As a result of these obligations, as well as broader general law duties on directors, GRDC directors must be constantly alert to any matter falling within the scope of their service to the GRDC in which they may have a personal interest or inconsistent engagement with a third party.

Note: this part is a summary only of the relevant sections of the PGPA Act and general law relevant to director’s duties and conflicts of interest. Refer to Division 3 of Part 2.2 of the PGPA Act (and related PGPA Rules) for further details.

6.2 Meaning of ‘Conflict of Interest’ and ‘Material Personal Interest’

A director can have a *conflict of interest* including, but not limited to, a *material personal interest that relates to GRDC’s affairs*.

A ***conflict of interest*** means an actual, potential or perceived conflict between the obligations and duties that a GRDC director has to the GRDC, and their own personal interests or the interests of other individuals or organisations with whom they may have a relationship. In this regard, a conflict of interest includes both *direct* and *indirect* conflicts, as well as situations in which a director may reasonably be *perceived* to be unable to discharge their duties to the GRDC in an objective and independent manner to the best of their ability.

A conflict of interest includes, but is not limited to, the existence of a ‘material personal interest that relates to GRDC’s affairs’.

A material personal interest is an interest:

- that has the capacity to influence the advice, recommendation or decision of a GRDC director; and

Question: 39 (continued)

- would be considered material in that it is reasonably significant enough to divide that director's loyalties to GRDC.

Note: See GRDC [Guidance on Conflicts of Interest](#) for further explanation and examples of Conflicts of Interest and Material Personal Interests. See also [GRDC Policy \[Conflicts of Interest\]](#). The Board will regularly review the implementation of this Policy, together with this section 6, to confirm that it provides directors and the Corporation with sufficient guidance to meet their obligations.

6.2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Each GRDC director is legally required to disclose to the GRDC Board any 'material personal interest that relates to the affairs of the GRDC' under section 29 of the PGPA Act and related PGPA Rules.

6.2.1 Making a disclosure

A GRDC director must disclose any conflict of interest, including a material personal interest that relates to the affairs of the GRDC, to each other member of the GRDC Board.

The disclosure must include details of:

- (a) the nature and extent of the interest; and
- (b) how the interest relates to the affairs of the GRDC.

The director must make the disclosure at a GRDC Board meeting:

- (a) as soon as practicable after the director becomes aware of the interest; and
- (b) if there is a change in the nature or extent of the interest after the director has previously disclosed the interest to the Board—as soon as practicable after the director becomes aware of that change.

6.2.2 Recording a disclosure

As a matter of course, disclosures should be made in writing to the Corporate Secretary and the Chair for incorporation into the papers for the next Board Meeting. Nothing prevents a director from making the disclosure at a GRDC Board meeting, as required.

Notwithstanding, the director making the disclosure must ensure that the disclosure is recorded in the minutes of the Board meeting.

Question: 39 (continued)

The Corporation will maintain a formal register of interests of all directors, updated at least annually. The Corporate Secretary will also request declarations of conflict of interest, as a standing agenda item at the start of each Board meeting (for the purposes of section 6.2.1 above).

6.3 CONSEQUENCES OF INTERESTS DISCLOSED

The Board will consider the details of all disclosed conflict of interest (including, subject to the sections below, any declared material personal interest), in satisfaction of its legal duties and in order to identify and address the risks to GRDC associated with a director's participation in matters in which they have disclosed a conflict of interest.

6.3.1 'Non-material' Interests

The Board may consider that a conflict of interest is 'non-material' if it is satisfied that any potential benefit to the director, or to a person, company or organisation with which the director has a relationship, is sufficiently far removed from the director's consideration of the matter that the interest would not reasonably be considered to be material based on a 'reasonable' view of the circumstances viewed objectively from outside GRDC.

In such a case, the Board may allow for that director to be present while the matter is being considered at the meeting and/or vote on the matter.

Where the interest being considered by the Board under this section may be a material personal interest, the director affected must not be present while the matter is being considered at the meeting, pending determination of the materiality of that interest. The Board may however seek additional information from that director regarding that interest, pending determination.

The Chair must ensure that the consideration of the Board is recorded in the minutes of the Board meeting and the register of declared conflicts is updated as required.

6.3.2 Material Personal Interests

If a matter in which the director has the material personal interest is being considered at a GRDC Board meeting, that director must not:

- (a) be present while the matter is being considered at the meeting; or
- (b) vote on the matter,

Question: 39 (continued)

unless:

- (c) the other GRDC directors (who do not have a material personal interest in the matter) have decided that that director is not disqualified from being present or voting (or both), and the decision is recorded in the minutes of the Board meeting; or
- (d) the Minister for Agriculture has declared, in writing, that that director may be present or vote (or both), pursuant to the relevant PGPA Rules.

If a director is not entitled to be present during the Board's consideration of a matter because of a material personal interest, the Board may invite the director to provide input based on the director's expertise and answer questions on the issues from other directors. However, the director must not be present for or participate in the Board's consideration of, or decision in relation to, the matter.

The Chair must ensure that any decision of the Board under (c) or of the Minister under (d) above is recorded in the minutes of the Board meeting and the register of declared conflicts is updated as required.

6.3.3 Other 'Material' Interests

In respect of any other conflict of interest (that is not a material personal interest or non-material interest as per section 6.3.1 or 6.3.2 above), the Board may consider the overall nature of that interest and the risks to GRDC associated with the participation of the director in the relevant matter before the Board. In such a case, the Board may take such actions that it considers appropriate which may include allowing for that director to:

- be present for some or all of the matter while it is being considered the meeting and/or
- vote on the matter.

The Chair must ensure that any decision of the Board under this section is recorded in the minutes of the Board meeting and the register of declared conflicts is updated as required.

6.3.4 General

Notwithstanding any decision of the Board under sections 6.3.1 to 6.3.3 above, a director may choose not to participate in the consideration or a vote on any matter before the Board in which they have disclosed any interest.

Question: 39 (continued)

6.3.5 Distribution of papers

The Corporate Secretary is not to distribute papers, Minutes or other information to a director in relation to a matter for which a director has disclosed a material personal interest, or an interest that the Board has determined that the director be excluded from under section 6.3.3, unless specifically requested to do so by the Chair despite the conflict of interest.

6.4 PROTOCOL FOR MANAGEMENT TO ASSIST DIRECTORS' MANAGEMENT OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

This protocol applies where GRDC management considers a director may have a conflict of interest in relation to a matter that is due to be considered by the Board. The protocol for management to follow is:

6.4.1 Notify Managing Director and Corporate Secretary

Management is to notify the Managing Director and Corporate Secretary where there is a known risk that a director could experience a conflict of interest.

Management is to notify the Chair directly where the Managing Director is the director with the possible conflict of interest.

6.4.2 Managing Director to notify Chair

The Managing Director should inform the Chair of the potential conflict.

6.4.3 Chair contacts relevant director

The Chair, exercising procedural control over the Board, should contact the relevant director in relation to the potential conflict and outline the nature of the matter in question.

If there is a reasonable basis for a conflict of interest to arise, the relevant director must disclose the conflict of interest at the next meeting in accordance with the requirements set out in this section 6.

6.4.4 Outcomes

The Chair is to advise the Corporate Secretary of the outcome of any discussions under section 6.4.3.

Question: 39 (continued)

The Corporate Secretary is not to distribute papers or other information to the director in relation to the matter in which that director has a possible conflict of interest, unless specifically requested to do so despite the possible conflict of interest, by the Chair.

The Chair will advise the Board at the next meeting of the above discussions and the outcome. This advice, and any resolution by the Board, is to be minuted

6.

Director	Entity 1	Entity 2
Richard Clark	Director NSW Northwest Local Land Services Board	James Clark – Chair of Northern Panel <i>Perceived direct</i>
Richard Brimblecombe	Managing Director and Shareholder in Quantum Power Ltd	
Jeremy Burdon	CSIRO Fellow	Trustee, Bioversity International [part of CGIAR system]
Kim Halbert	Mid West Ports Authority Board	
Rob Lewis	Adelaide University (Special Projects Waite Research Institute)	Australian Genome Research Facility Pty Ltd (Director)
Sharon Starick	SA Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board.	Rural Business Support (Chair)

7. *Remuneration for Holders of Part-Time Public Office* as prescribed in the Remuneration Tribunal Determinations. YTD remuneration to 30 November 2014 for Board members was \$144 898.

Question: 39 (continued)

8. Under section 73 of the PIRD Act the Minister may terminate the appointment of the Chairperson or a Director if the Chairperson or Director is absent, except with the leave of the Minister or the Chairperson respectively, from 3 consecutive meetings.

9. No.

10. Nil

11. Catering costs from 28 May 2014 to 30 November 2014 was \$3302 – breakdown is as follows:

Provider	Location	Date	Amount
Hudsons Catering	Canberra	3/6/14	\$451
Hudsons Catering	Canberra	4/6/14	\$52
Melbourne Convention Exhibition Centre	Melbourne	30-31/7/14	\$1466
Swirl Catering	Canberra	23-24/9/14	\$1333

Australian Grape and Wine Authority

1.

- Wine Australia Board met in June 2014,
- GWRDC Board met in June 2014
- Australian Grape and Wine Authority Board has met in August 2014, September 2014 and November 2014;

2. Flights, accommodation and transport are provided for those board members who have to travel from interstate and the total expenses incurred were;

- Wine Australia Board meeting in June in Canberra cost \$7335 for flights and accommodation
- GWRDC Board Meeting in June was held in Adelaide cost \$3843 for flights and accommodation
- AGWA Board meetings in Adelaide have cost \$27 825 for flights and accommodation

3. Average attendance is eight board members.

Question: 39 (continued)

4. List each member's attendance at meetings;

AGWA Board Members

- Eliza Brown – 3
- Giovanni Casella - 2
- Brian Crosser - 3
- John Forrest - 3
- Ian Henderson - 3
- Jane McDonald - 3
- Brian Walsh - 3
- Kim Williams – 3

GWRDC June 2014

- Rory McEwen
- Terry Hill
- Helen Garnett
- Jan O'Connor
- Chris Day
- Phil Laffer

Wine Australia June 2014

- George Wahby
- Kevin McLintock
- Josephine Rozman
- Kate Thompson
- Brian Walsh
- Bill Moularadellis
- Anthony Jordan

Question: 39 (continued)

5. Board Members of AGWA are bound by the general duties of official set out in Divisions 3 of Part 2-2 of the *Public Performance and Accountability Act 2013 (PGPA Act)*. These general duties include a duty to disclose interests (section 29 PGPA Act). For the avoidance of doubt, section 19 of AGWA's enabling legislation, the *Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013*, sets out that, for the purposes of section 29 of the PGPA Act, a Director of AGWA who is a grape grower or a winemaker is not taken to have a material personal interest that relates to the affairs of AGWA by reason only of being a grape grower or a winemaker.

Furthermore, Section 14 of the Public Performance and Accountability Rule 2014 (PGPA Rule) sets out how and when Board members must disclose interests, and the consequences of having such interests.

These statutory obligations are reflected in AGWA's internal Board policy and in the various term of references relating to Committees of the Board. If a Board member suspects that they may have a material personal interest that relates to the affairs of AGWA they must disclose that interest either orally or in writing to each other Board member and to the CEO the details of the suspected interest detailing:

- the nature and extent of that interests; and
- how that interest relates to the affairs of AGWA.

The Board member must then make the disclosure at a meeting of the Board:

- as soon as practicable after the official becomes aware of the interest; and
- if there is a change in the nature or extent of the interest after the Board member has disclosed the interest, as soon as practicable after the Board member becomes aware of that change.

The Board member must ensure that the disclosure is recorded in the minutes of the meeting. Consequences of Board members having such interests are dealt with in accordance with section 15 of the PGPA Rule.

6. There have been no conflicts registered.
7. Allowances and entitlements are paid in accordance with the Remuneration Tribunal determination for part-time officers.
8. Attendance standards are covered in board policies.
9. Nil.
10. All board members have attended at least 51 per cent of meetings.

Question: 39 (continued)

11.

- Wine Australia Board meeting in June in Canberra cost \$263 for catering
- GWRDC Board meeting in June in Adelaide cost \$357 for catering
- AGWA Board meetings in Adelaide costed \$572 for catering

Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA)

APVMA itself is a statutory authority and not a Board hence there is no further information required to be provided.

Cotton Research and Development Corporation (CRDC)

1. The CRDC Board has met 17-18 June 2014 (Emerald), 17-18 Aug (Brisbane), 13-14 November 2014 (Narrabri)
2. The CRDC Board are provided with accommodation, meals and airfares or mileage for personal motor vehicle use.
3. The CRDC board attendance is 86 per cent.

4.

Board Member	Emerald	Brisbane	Narrabri
Bruce Finney	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mary Corbett	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cleave Rogan	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hamish Millar	Yes	Yes	N/A
Lorraine Stephenson	Yes	Yes	N/A
Richard Haire	Yes	No	N/A
Michael Robinson	No	Yes	No
Kathryn Adams	N/A	N/A	Yes
Liz Alexander	N/A	N/A	Yes
Greg Kauter	N/A	N/A	Yes

Question: 39 (continued)

5. The CRDC Board tables at each board meeting a list of directors' interest and any conflicts of interest arising from agenda items to be discussed at the board meeting.
6. None.
7. The CRDC Board members are remunerated in accordance with the Remunerations Tribunal Part Time Officers for the Cotton Research and Development Corporation.
8. The Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989 in section 73 provides for the Minister to terminate a director's appointment:

73 Termination of appointment

(1) The Minister may terminate the appointment of the Chairperson or a nominated director:

- (a) for misbehaviour or physical or mental incapacity; or
- (b) if the Chairperson or nominated director:
 - (i) becomes bankrupt; or
 - (ii) applies to take the benefit of a law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors; or
 - (iii) compounds with his or her creditors; or
 - (iv) makes an assignment of his or her remuneration for the benefit of such creditors; or
- (c) if the Chairperson or nominated director, without reasonable excuse, contravenes section 27F or 27J of the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997*.

(2) The Minister may terminate the appointment of the Chairperson if the Chairperson is absent, except with the leave of the Minister, from 3 consecutive meetings.

(3) The Minister may terminate the appointment of a nominated director of an R&D Corporation if the nominated director is absent, except with the leave of the Chairperson, from 3 consecutive meetings.

9. No.
10. Michael Robinson.

Question: 39 (continued)

11. The Catering costs for board meetings held during this period was \$6459 for the three board meetings. Alcohol is served at board dinners or functions.

June 2014 Board Meeting in Emerald: \$3533

(Including industry representatives attending for a Swarm Robotics presentation)

August 2014 Board Meeting in Brisbane: \$1582

November 2014 Board Meeting in Narrabri: \$1344

Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC)

1. FRDC board and the Finance Audit and Risk Management committee (FARM) has met:

Note: FARM members are made up of board members forming a committee.

- 19 June FARM teleconference
- 25 June Board meeting
- 25 August FARM meeting
- 26 August Board strategic workshop
- 27 August Board meeting
- 10 November FARM meeting
- 11 November Board meeting
- 26 November Board teleconference

2. Cost of flights, taxis if applicable, and allowances are paid as per the remuneration tribunal 2013-16 Determination: Official Travel by Office Holders

3. During this period:

- Board – 80 per cent
- FARM – 75 per cent

Attendance was affected as one of the members had a serious illness and has since died.

Question: 39 (continued)

4. Member attendance

Board Meeting Dates	# Board Members	Attending Board Meeting
19 June FARM teleconference	3	2
24-25 June Board meeting	8	7
25 August FARM meeting	3	2
26 August Board strategic workshop	8	6
27 August Board meeting	8	6
10 November FARM meeting	3	2
11 November Board meeting	8	7
26 November Board teleconference	7	5

5. In accordance with statutory requirements as per the PGPA Act and the FRDC Board Governance policy – material personal interests. Refer website http://frdc.com.au/about_frdc/corporate-documents/Pages/corp_policies.aspx for Board Governance policy.

6. Material personal interests are declared and minuted at each board meeting, and reported in the Annual report.

7. As Remuneration is provided as per the 2014-08 Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Part-Time (current consolidation as at 17 Nov 2014).

8. FRDC board positions are by Ministerial appointment – in the event of a director not meeting attendance standards the FRDC chair would inform the Minister through the Department of Agriculture.

9. No.

10. During this period - one due to serious illness noting the member has since died.

11. Catering costs for board meetings (morning tea, lunch, afternoon tea) totalled \$1105 (ext gst)

Question: 39 (continued)

Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA)

1. Since June 2014 Budget Estimates the AFMA Commission has met twice.
2. Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2013/16: Official Travel by Office Holders (current consolidation as at 11 August 2014) details the provisions that apply to AFMA Commissioners when they travel for official business away from their office locality, or home base in respect of a part time office holder.
3. The AFMA Commission consists of seven members including the Chair. Since June 2014 Budget Estimates the average attendance at meetings is more than six.
4. Attendance details for each member are:

Member	September meeting	November meeting
The Hon Norman Moore	Yes	Yes
Mr Richard Stevens OAM	Yes	Yes
Mr Ian Cartwright	Yes	Yes
Ms Catherine Cooper	Yes	Yes
Mr David Hall	Yes	Yes
Professor Keith Sainsbury	Yes	No
Dr James Findlay	Yes	Yes

5. The *Fisheries Administration Act 1991 section 20 Disclosure of Interests*, details the requirements of AFMA Commissioners with regard to their duty to disclose interests. In addition the Commission has in place guidelines for Commissioners on the disclosure and management of material personal interests. These guidelines put in place a pro-disclosure regime for 'material personal interests' to ensure that interests are identified and managed in a rigorous and transparent way that promotes public confidence in the integrity, legitimacy, impartiality and fairness of AFMA's decision making.
6. Registered interests include state and commonwealth advisory bodies, company boards, and not for profit organisations that may have an interest or perceived interest in the management of Commonwealth Fisheries.
7. Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2014/08 Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Part-Time Public Office sets out the remuneration payable to AFMA Commissioners.

Question: 39 (continued)

8. Section 21 of the *Fisheries Administration Act 1991* sets out the basis for termination of appointment of AFMA Commissioners.

9. No.

10. Two Commission meetings have been held since June 2014 Budget Estimates. One commissioner (Professor Keith Sainsbury) was unable to attend one meeting.

11. Catering costs for the two Commission meetings held since Budget Estimates in June, 2014 are:

Lunches	\$598.28
Dinners	\$1163.60

Agricultural Industry Advisory Council

1. Since June 2014, the AIAC has met twice.

2. Total travel expenses incurred for AIAC since June 2014 are \$28 887. This includes flights, transport, accommodation and incidentals.

3. All AIAC members attended the Darwin meeting on 21-22 August and one member was absent from the Sydney meeting on 30-31 October 2014.

4. Details of each member's attendance at meetings are provided in the table below:

Name	AIAC member	Darwin 21-22 August 2014	Sydney 30-31 October 2014	% of meetings attended
The Hon. Barnaby Joyce MP	Chair	x	x	100%
Luke Bowen	Member	x	x	100%
Eliza Brown	Member	x	x	100%
David Moon	Member	x	x	100%
Rob de Fegely	Member	x	x	100%
Kevin Sorgiovanni	Member	x	-	50%
Susan Bower	Rural banking member	x	x	100%

Lenore Johnstone	Member	x	x	100%
Hamish McLaren	Member	x	x	100%
Stuart Richey	Member	x	x	100%
Dean Wormald	Member	x	x	100%
Andrew Inglis	Member	x	x	100%

5. The AIAC deals with conflict of interest through a declaration of interests at the start of each meeting. Personal interest declaration forms were also completed as part of the appointment process.
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered.
7. No remuneration has been paid to council members.
8. It is the discretion of the chair to dismiss a council member.
9. No requests have been made to dismiss council members.
10. Kevin Sorgiovanni is the only council member to have attended less than 51 per cent of AIAC meetings since June 2014.
11. Catering costs for both meetings are provided in the table below. These figures include costs for representatives from the Department of Agriculture:

Type of catering costs	Darwin 21-22 August 2014	Sydney 30-31 October 2014
Meals	\$2130	\$2564
Alcohol	\$912	\$1291
Catering for meeting	\$324	\$789
Total	\$3366	\$4644

Question: 39 (continued)

Australian Grape and Wine Authority Selection Committee

1. The AGWA Selection Committee has not met since June 2014.
2. Nil travel expenses have been incurred since June 2014.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. The AGWA Selection Committee deals with conflict of interest in accordance with the *Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013* (AGWA Act).
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.
7. No remuneration has been paid to the selection committee members since June 2014.
8. Under the AGWA Act, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member if they are absent from three consecutive meetings without a leave of absence.
9. No requests have been made to dismiss AGWA Selection Committee members.
10. There have been no meetings of the AGWA Selection Committee since June 2014.
11. There have been no catering costs for the AGWA Selection Committee since June 2014.

Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority Advisory Board

1. The APVMA Advisory Board met on 25 August 2014 and 5 November 2014.
2. Travel expenses of \$20 738.29 have been incurred for the APVMA Advisory Board.
3. The average attendance at APVMA Advisory Board meetings is 13.5 people. The APVMA Advisory Board has nine members. Meetings are also attended by the CEO and other senior executives of the APVMA, a representative of the Department of Agriculture and secretariat staff from the APVMA.
4. Each member's attendance at APVMA Advisory Board meetings is as follows:

Member	Meeting 25 August 2014	Meeting 5 November 2014
Lyn Fragar	Attended	Attended
Gordon Reidy	Attended	Attended
Roger Toffolon	Attended	Attended

Sandra Baxendell	Attended	Attended
Lisa Wade	Attended	Attended
John Hassell	Attended	Attended
Selwyn Snell	Attended	Attended
Bronwyn Capanna	Attended	Attended
David Lawson	Attended	Attended

5. Section 23 of the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Administration) Act 1992* provides that members must give written notice to the Minister for Agriculture of any direct or indirect financial interest that could conflict with the proper performance of the Advisory Board's function. The Terms of Reference for the Advisory Board also require members to sign conflict of interest declarations and then raise any potential conflicts of interest that may be identified through particular agenda items at meetings with the Chair and the APVMA CEO. Conflict of interest declarations are obtained for each meeting and considered prior to the start of the meeting.

6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since Senate Budget Estimates in June, 2014.

7. Remuneration of \$47 695.14 has been provided to APVMA Advisory Board members.

8. Section 24 of the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Administration) Act 1992* provides that the Minister for Agriculture may terminate the appointment of a Board member.

9. The APVMA is not aware of any requests being made to ministers to dismiss Advisory Board members.

10. No APVMA Advisory Board members have attended less than 51 per cent of meetings.

11. The catering cost for the APVMA Advisory Board's 25 August 2014 meeting was \$884.00 and there were no catering costs for the Advisory Board's 5 November 2014 meeting.

Cotton Research and Development Corporation Selection Committee

1. The CRDC Selection Committee has met four times since June 2014, including three days of interviews and related deliberations.

2. Total travel expenses incurred for CRDC Selection Committee since June 2014 is \$12 259.

Question: 39 (continued)

3. The average attendance at CRDC Selection Committee meeting was five members – the presiding member and the other four selection committee members.

4. Details of each member's attendance at meetings are provided in the table below:

Name	Selection committee position	20 June 2014	24 June 2014	25 June 2014	26 June 2014	% of meetings attended
Mr Joe Robinson	Presiding member	x	x	x	x	100%
Mr David Anthony	Other member	x	x	x	x	100%
Ms Sandra Dean	Other member	x	x	x	x	100%
Mr Lyndon Mulligan	Other member	x	x	x	x	100%
Ms Ruth Wade	Other member	x	x	x	x	100%

5. The CRDC Selection Committee deals with conflict of interest in accordance with the *Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989* (PIRD Act).

6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.

7. No remuneration has been paid to selection committee members since June 2014.

8. Under the PIRD Act, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member if they are absent from three consecutive meetings without a leave of absence.

9. No requests have been made to dismiss CRDC Selection Committee members.

10. All selection committee members have attended all meetings since June 2014.

11. There have been no catering costs for the CRDC Selection Committee since June 2014

Fisheries Research and Development Corporation Selection Committee

1. The FRDC Selection Committee has not met since June 2014.

2. Nil travel expenses have been incurred since June 2014.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

Question: 39 (continued)

5. The FRDC Selection Committee deals with conflict of interest in accordance with the *Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989* (PIRD Act).
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.
7. No remuneration has been paid to the selection committee members since June 2014.
8. Under the PIRD Act, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member if they are absent from three consecutive meetings without a leave of absence.
9. No requests have been made to dismiss FRDC Selection Committee members.
10. There have been no meetings of the FRDC Selection Committee since June 2014.
11. There have been no catering costs for the FRDC Selection Committee since June 2014.

Forest and Wood Products Council

1. One meeting of the Forest and Wood Products Council (FWPC) was held between the Budget Estimates held in June 2014 and 31 October 2014. This meeting occurred on 9 October 2014.
2. The travel expenses incurred for members and observers to attend the meeting on 9 October 2014 was \$4189.
3. The average attendance for the FWPC meeting on 9 October 2014 was 86 per cent.
4. Details of each member's attendance at meetings is shown in the table below:

Person	Attendance
Rob de Fegely (Co- chairperson)	Attended
Karina Coombes (Member)	Attended
Ron Adams (Member)	Attended
Michelle Freeman (Member)	Attended
Ian Dickenson (Member)	Attended
Vince Hurley (Member)	Attended
Andrew Hurford (Member)	Attended
Linda Sewell (Member)	Did not attend
Nils Koren (Member)	Did not attend

Andrew Leighton (Member)	Attended
Ross Hampton (Observer)	Attended
Gavin Butcher (Observer)	Attended
Ric Sinclair (Observer)	Attended
Michael Hartman (Observer)	Attended

5. As part of the appointment process, council members and observers were asked to declare any conflicts of interest and provide advice on how these conflicts of interest would be managed. In addition, members and observers sign a code of conduct which requires they disclose, and take reasonable steps to avoid, any conflict of interest (real or apparent) in connection with the council.

6. A number of council members have declared conflicts of interest in relation to the commercial roles they hold within the forestry industry.

7. The Commonwealth is not providing remuneration in any form to members and observers for their participation on the FWPC.

8. There is an expectation that members and observers will attend all meetings of the council, noting that there may be competing obligations and extenuating circumstances that result in some members and observers being unavailable. The terms of engagement signed by each member and observer includes a provision that the Minister for Agriculture may terminate the member or observer's position on the council, in writing, at any time.

9. No.

10. Two members of the council have attended less than 51 per cent of meetings held between the Budget Estimates in June 2014 and 31 October 2014. These members were Ms Linda Sewell and Mr Nils Koren.

11. The catering costs for the meeting on 9 October 2014 were as follows:

Item	Cost (inc GST)
Table hire	\$40
Morning tea	\$76.50
Sandwiches	\$117.30
Fruit	\$39.20

Tea / coffee / juice	\$138
Cutlery	\$51
TOTAL	\$462

Grains Research and Development Corporation Selection Committee

1. The GRDC Selection Committee has met three times since June 2014, including two days of interviews and related deliberations.
2. Total travel expenses incurred for GRDC Selection Committee since June 2014 is \$19 761.
3. The average attendance at GRDC Selection Committee meetings is five members – the presiding member and the other four selection committee members.
4. Details of each member's attendance at meetings are provided in the table below:

Name	Selection committee position	30 June 2014	09 July 2014	10 July 2014	% of meetings attended
Ms Joanne Grainger	Presiding member	X	X	X	100%
Mr Andrew Earle	Other member	X	X	X	100%
Ms Alexandra Gartmann	Other member	X	X	X	100%
Emeritus Professor Alistar Robertson	Other member	X	X	X	100%
Ms Fiona Simson	Other member	X	X	X	100%

5. The GRDC Selection Committee deals with conflict of interest in accordance with the *Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989* (PIRD Act).
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.
7. Since June 2014, remuneration paid to the presiding member is \$13 589.
8. Under the PIRD Act, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member if they are absent from three consecutive meetings without a leave of absence.
9. No requests have been made to dismiss GRDC Selection Committee members.

Question: 39 (continued)

10. All selection committee members have attended all meetings since June 2014.
11. Catering costs for GRDC Selection Committee since June 2014 were \$1076.

Indonesia-Australia Red Meat and Cattle Partnership

1. Since June 2014, the Indonesia-Australia Partnership on Food Security in the Red Meat and Cattle Sector (Partnership) met once on 7 August 2014.
2. Travel costs paid for by the Department of Agriculture to support the one day meeting totalled \$8547.69.

This included costs for return airfares (domestic and international) for the Australian government and non-government members and secretariat (\$5422.56). International flights were for an Australian member based in Indonesia. Other expenses included accommodation (\$1811) and other costs (\$1314.13) including airport transfer costs (i.e. taxi), driving expenses to and from the airport as well as airport parking fees, and incidental travel allowance rates for one day.

Travel costs for Australian officials not in the Department of Agriculture were paid for by their own department.

3. One member was not able to attend the Partnership meeting on 7 August 2014.
4. The 7 August 2014 Partnership meeting attendee and apologies list:

Attendees

- Simon Murnane (co-chair) – Assistant Secretary, Trade and Market Access Division, Department of Agriculture
- David Binns – Assistant Secretary, South East Asia Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- Kym Hewett – Minister (Commercial) & Senior Trade Commissioner, Austrade
- Chris Barnes, Managing Director, PT ICON International Communications Indonesia
- Catherine Marriott, Managing Director, Influential Women
- Terry Nolan, Director, Nolan Meats PTY LTD
- Gary Stark, Managing Director, Stark Engineering Pty Ltd & Warwick Cattle Crush Company

Question: 39 (continued)

Apologies

- Ken Warriner, AM Chairman, GRM International

Members are required to declare to the Partnership's Australian Co-Chair and secretariat, all known actual or potential conflicts of interest as soon as they become aware of the conflict.

5. Where a conflict or potential conflict of interest is declared, the Australian Co-Chair decides on the course of action taking into account the particular circumstances of the conflict of interest.
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.
7. No remuneration is paid to members of the Partnership. The secretariat organises travel and accommodation for Australian non-government members and reimburses for out of pocket expenses (i.e. taxi and parking fares on a receipt basis).
8. The Commonwealth (represented through the Australian Co-Chair) may terminate or suspend appointment of Australian non-government members at any time in whole or part, by giving written notice.
9. No requests have been made to ministers to dismiss board members.
10. Ken Warriner was unable to attend the second Partnership meeting on 7 August 2014 however attended pre-briefing teleconferences, provided comment and input to the draft agenda and items for discussion, and other substantial out of session work as requested by the Australian Co-Chair.
11. The second Partnership meeting on 7 August 2014 was held at the Hilton Hotel in Brisbane. The catering costs were through the Hilton's 'Day Delegate Package' at \$69 per person totalling \$4830. There were 70 attendees, including Indonesian Partnership representation and a number of invited observers.

National Landcare Advisory Committee

1. The Committee has not yet met
2. Flight costs - \$5533.11

Travel Allowance paid to members for meeting scheduled on 27 November 2014 - \$1828.00

Accommodation - \$2316.37

These costs will be split 50:50 between the Department of the Environment and the Department of Agriculture.

Question: 39 (continued)

3. n/a

4. n/a

5. All members complete a Conflicts of Interest form upon appointment. These interests are registered on an excel spreadsheet which is maintained by the Committee Secretariat. Conflicts of interest is included as a standing agenda item at each meeting and a new Conflicts of Interest form is included in meeting papers and at the commencement of each meeting all members are reminded to review and re-sign a new form advising of any additional conflicts. Members are also reminded that during the course of the meeting/teleconference they must declare any conflicts and remove themselves from the discussion. These are then added to the register.

6. Members have registered the following possible or perceived conflicts:

- participation in previous Landcare projects and contracts
- Committee recommendations or advice related to Landcare Australia Limited's funding
- employment by a body that receives funding from the National Landcare Programme
- previously provided advice on organisations that should or should not be eligible for National Landcare Programme funding
- recommendations or advice related to future investment by the Government into cotton or dairy research and development.

7. None.

8. The Natural Heritage Ministerial Board may terminate a member's appointment to the Committee at any time by giving written notice in writing to the member.

9. No

10. n/a

11. n/a

Question: 39 (continued)

National Rural Advisory Council

1. The National Rural Council (NRAC) met four times between 1 June 2014 and 31 October 2014. NRAC sub-committees met a further two times as part of a stakeholder consultation process for its review of the Rural Financial Counselling Service program.
2. For the period 1 June – 31 October 2014, NRAC travel expenses, which included four meetings plus two stakeholder consultations, totalled \$63 787.69.

Travelling Allowance: \$16 783.74

Flights: \$35 370.44

Accommodation: \$11 633.51

3. NRAC comprises eight members. Of the four meetings held between 1 June 2014 and 31 October 2014, member attendance consisted of:

- Meeting 1: all members
- Meeting 2: 7 members
- Meeting 3: 7 members
- Meeting 4: 6 members
- The two stakeholder consultation meetings were attended by predetermined sub-committees of three NRAC members.

4. Member Attendance between 1 June 2014 and 31 October 2014:

- Mr Michael Keogh, Chair – 4 meetings
- Dr Regina Fogarty, State representative – 4 meetings
- Ms Julie Gaglia – Commonwealth representative – 4 meetings
- Mr Mark King – National Farmers' Federation representative – 4 meetings
- Mr Kerry O'Brien – 4 meetings
- Mr Andrew Locke – 3 meetings
- Ms Alexandra Gartmann – 3 meetings
- Dr Susan Brumby – 2 meetings.

Question: 39 (continued)

5. As per Section 16, **Disclosure of interests** of the *Rural Adjustment Act 1992*:

the member must, as soon as practicable after the relevant facts have come to the member's knowledge, disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Council.

(1) If:

(a) a member has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter being considered, or about to be considered, by the Council; and

(b) the interest could conflict with the proper performance of the member's duties in relation to the consideration of the matter;

the member must, as soon as practicable after the relevant facts have come to the member's knowledge, disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Council.

(2) A disclosure under subsection (1) must be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

6. Nil.

7. As per Section 11, **Remuneration and allowances** of the *Rural Adjustment Act 1992*:

(1) A member is to be paid such remuneration as is determined by the Remuneration Tribunal but, if no determination is in operation, the member is to be paid such remuneration as is prescribed.

(2) A member is to be paid such allowances as are prescribed.

(3) This section has effect subject to the *Remuneration Tribunal Act 1973*.

(4) This section does not apply to a Commonwealth member.

Annual fees for specified offices – fees and travel tier – 2014-08 Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Part-Time Public Office

Date Effective	Office/Authority	Chair \$	Member \$	Travel Tier
1 March 2014	National Rural Advisory Council	56 320	30 980	1

Question: 39 (continued)

For the period 1 June – 31 October 2014, NRAC remuneration consisted of:

Description	Value \$
Employee Superannuation	4666.56
Productivity Superannuation	10 883.36
Salaries	101 223.47

8. As per Section 17, **Termination of appointment**, of the *Rural Adjustment Act 1992*,

(1) The Minister may terminate the appointment of a member for:

(a) misbehaviour or physical or mental incapacity; or

(b) inefficiency or incompetence.

(2) If:

(a) a member becomes bankrupt, applies to take the benefit of any law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors, compounds with his or her creditors or makes an assignment of his or her remuneration for their benefit; or

(b) a member, without reasonable excuse, contravenes section 16; or

(c) the Chairperson is absent, except with the leave of the Minister, from 3 consecutive meetings of the Council; or

(d) a member is absent, except with the leave of the Chairperson, from 3 consecutive meetings of the Council;

the Minister may terminate the appointment of the member.

9. No.

10. Dr Susan Brumby – 2 meetings or 50 per cent.

11. Business catering costs for the four meetings held between 1 June 2014 and 31 October 2014 totals \$965.59.

Question: 39 (continued)

Statutory Fishing Rights Allocation Review Panel

In answer for Statutory Fishing Rights Allocation Review Panel - the Panel has not met since June 2011.

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation Selection Committee

1. The RIRDC Selection Committee has met twice since June 2014.
2. Total travel expenses incurred for RIRDC Selection Committee since June 2014 is \$12 301.
3. The average attendance at RIRDC Selection Committee meetings is five members – the presiding member and the other four selection committee members.
4. Details of each member's attendance at meetings are provided in the table below:

Name	Selection committee position	30 July 2014	21 August 2014	% of meetings attended
Mr Robert Granger	Presiding member	x	x	100%
Ms Christine Hawkins	Other member	x	x	100%
Mr Gary Sansom AM	Other member	x	x	100%
Ms Robbie Sefton	Other member	x	x	100%
Mr Alan Wilson	Other member	x	x	100%

5. The RIRDC Selection Committee deals with conflict of interest in accordance with the *Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989* (PIRD Act).
6. No conflicts of interest have been registered since June 2014.
7. Remuneration paid to the presiding member since June 2014 is \$6795. Remuneration paid to the independent selection committee member since June 2014 is \$5407.
8. Under the PIRD Act, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member if they are absent from three consecutive meetings without a leave of absence.
9. No requests have been made to dismiss RIRDC Selection Committee members.

Question: 39 (continued)

10. No selection committee members have attended less than 51 per cent of meetings since June 2014.

11. Catering costs for the RIRDC Selection Committee since June 2014 were \$375.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 40

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Australian Animal Welfare Strategy

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator RHIANNON asked:

1. The Australian Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (AusAWAC) I understand made recommendations on animal welfare projects to be funded under the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy (AAWS). Could I have a list of those animal welfare projects in the 2013-14 financial year, prior to the disbanding of this committee and the suspension of the AAWS funding process?
2. Could you detail the subsequent distribution of remaining AAWS funds held by the Department for the 2013-14 financial year in terms of the activities and projects funded, amounts allocated and the organisations responsible for delivering any external projects?
3. Is it correct that Australian Live Export Council received AAWS funding for live export projects? What were these projects and how much did each project receive, and on what date?
4. Is it correct that when AAWS was wound up there were 8 projects that had been approved for funding but that were not funded?

Question: 40 (continued)

Answer:

1. The following table lists AusAWAC approved projects for the 2013-14 financial year, before the disbandment of the committee on 8 November 2013.

Project title	AAWS contribution (GST excl) 2013-14
The Australian Working Dog Industry Action Plan Implementation: Year 2	\$25 000
Australian Horse Welfare & Wellbeing Action Plan	\$30 000
Zoo visitor impact on Arboreal Primates <i>Who's looking at who in the zoo?</i>	\$17 728
Tackling the problem of inherited disorders	\$30 000
National Microchip Registry Taskforce	\$20 000
What do pets need and what do they get? An audit of pet-keeping practices in Australia	\$26 842
The potential impacts of male-only commercial kangaroo harvest	\$26 000
Develop welfare standards for ornamental fish in the retail environment	\$38 192
	Total \$213 762

Question: 40 (continued)

2. Subsequent to the cessation of the AusAWAC on 8 November 2013, the table below identifies remaining AAWS expenditure in 2013-14 and external organisations responsible for delivery where relevant.

Projects and activities using remaining AAWS expenditure 2013-14	
Consultancies – Monitoring and Evaluation (Tanner James), Communications Scoping Study, Enhancing Collaboration (Dee Dee Woodside and Keith Adams) and National AW RD&E Strategy (Australian Pork Limited and University of Queensland)	\$26 616.83
Per Diem - AUSAWAC Members (sitting fees)	\$50 688.00
Conference Costs - AAWS 7th Workshop and AUSAWAC Meetings	\$35 370.25
AAWS Website Hosting	\$1268.00
Domestic Travel - AAWS 7th Workshop Stakeholders	\$45 884.83
Overseas Travel - AAWS 7th Workshop International Speaker - Abdul Rahman	\$4614.06
Total	\$164 407.43

3. Yes. In June 2013 the Australian Live Export Council was provided \$69 300 (GST incl) in funding under the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy to undertake one project for introducing the livestock community to a 'Social Licence to Operate' (SLO) and educate the community on requirements for industry to maintain an SLO. The project title was 'Social Licence to Operate Workshops'.

Question: 40 (continued)

4. Yes. At its meeting on 2 August 2013, AusAWAC endorsed eight of the nine projects submitted to it for endorsement – but these were not funded at the time of the abolition of AusAWAC.

Projects not funded
Working Dogs (Australian Working Dog Alliance Inc)
Horse welfare action plan
Zoo visitor impact on Arboreal Primates
Inherited disorders
National Microchip Registry Taskforce
What do pets need? Perceptions of ideal pet-keeping practices for birds, cats, dogs, and rabbits
Potential impact of male only kangaroo harvesting
Ornamental fish in retail environment

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 41

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: GM Food

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator EDWARDS asked:

1. Noting your answer to Question 6 on Notice by Senator Lines (Proof Hansard 29/5/14 pp-42-43), "The Department of Agriculture understands that the overwhelming majority of scientific evidence world-wide has not identified any safety concerns associated with GM crops and foods", does the APD possess any survey or poll data show changes, if any, to the perception of GM food products in Australia?
2. Given the response to Senator Lines' question, has there been any work done to improve perception to GM foods?
3. The South Australian Agriculture Minister has publicly stated that the GM free South Australia enjoys a price premium in the market. Do you have any evidence of this?
4. If no, how would the Agriculture minister establish this to ensure his statements are not misleading?
5. Is there any quantitative evidence to support the South Australian Agriculture minister's position that "Our GM-free status gives primary producers and food and wine manufacturers a competitive edge in the global marketplace"?

Answer:

1. No. The Department of Agriculture is aware of studies on changing perceptions to GM foods in the community conducted by the then Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. Further questions should be directed to the Department of Industry.
2. Improving perceptions of GM foods is the primarily the responsibility of the technology developers and of the farmers using the technology. The Australian Government works to ensure the regulatory regime for the approval of GM crops and foods appropriately manages risks to human health and the environment. Consistent with this, the Department of Agriculture promotes policies which provide farmers with access to the broadest range of safe and effective agricultural technologies (including gene technologies) available to run productive and profitable businesses. Decisions on whether to allow production of

Question: 41 (continued)

3. approved GM crops in a state or territory are a matter for that jurisdiction. Where production is allowed, containment, coexistence and segregation are managed through state-specific requirements and industry protocols.

4. The department understands that non-GM canola receives a price premium in several states, including South Australia. The department is not aware of evidence that the price premium received for non-GM canola in South Australia differs significantly from that received in states where GM canola is grown and notes that segregation arrangements provide for GM and non-GM canola to be differentiated and sold into separate markets. The department notes that factors other than the GM status of a state, such as export destination, location and local growing conditions, also influence differences between prices. Production of GM canola in states where farmers have the choice between GM and non-GM canola varieties, suggests that for many farmers, the benefits outweigh the costs, including any price discount.

5. This question is best directed to the South Australian Minister for Agriculture.

6. This question is best directed to the South Australian Minister for Agriculture.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates November 2014

Agriculture

Question: 42

Division/Agency: Agricultural Policy Division

Topic: Agricultural Competitiveness White Paper

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator WHISH-WILSON asked:

1. How does the Agricultural Competitiveness white paper process interact with the Harper Review?
2. Are there meetings between the white paper taskforce and competition policy review secretariat? Can you provide the dates of these meetings and who attended?
3. What involvement does the Department of Agriculture have in the in process? Has Agriculture staff been seconded to the Prime Minister's Department to work on the white paper? If yes for how long and what APS level are the staff?
4. Were any of the submissions to the Competition Policy Review considered in the writing of the green paper?

Answer:

1&2. This question is a matter for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C) and should be directed to that department as PM&C have responsibility for the White Paper Task Force.

3. The Department of Agriculture is closely involved with the development of the Agricultural Competitiveness White Paper. This includes providing information, attending regular meetings and any other activity that assists the taskforce in the White Paper development process.

Eight staff have been seconded from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to work on the White Paper. Additional staff from the Department of Agriculture have also been used to back fill positions in the taskforce due to absences, such as leave, on a case by case basis. The details of the seconded staff are below:

Question: 42 (continued)

Level	Date Commenced	Level	Date Commenced
SESB2	03/10/2013	EL1	11/11/2013
SESB1	13/01/2014	APS6	11/11/2013
EL2	10/10/2013	APS6	16/12/2013
EL2	18/11/2013	APS5	10/10/2013

4. This is a matter for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. This question should be directed to that department.