

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-2012, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	84
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Low Income Energy Efficiency Program		
Hansard Page EC:	EC44		

Senator BIRMINGHAM: My recollection, from participating in the joint select committee that looked at the package of Clean Energy Future legislation, is that organisations like Anglicare, UnitingCare, Wesley and those organisations that run nursing homes were anticipating that there would be some assistance beyond them either seeing indexation of their aged-care payments or having to separately lobby government for assistance during that process. But you are telling us there is nothing particular for those organisations that they can apply for, aside from their normal funding arrangements.

Mr Cahill: There is the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program, which is focussed on low-income households, where we are expecting organisations such as Anglicare and UnitingCare to be able to, again, in a consortia, apply for grants to be able to work out means and ways of being able to support low-income households with energy efficiency measures. That is one area we know they are very interested in and is also a program that opened today.

Mr Comley: Dr Kennedy, do you want to add anything?

Dr Kennedy: I do not profess to be an expert on this part. FaHCSIA would be much better placed to refer to this assistance. Some of the household assistance paid to residents of aged-care facilities will be distributed to their aged-care facilities, which pay for most of their residents' costs of living. Household assistance, in the case of aged-care residents, would be shared between aged-care providers and their residents in an approximate 55 to 45 split by increasing the percentage of the basic pension payable to the provider. Grandfathering arrangements will be established for around two percent of existing residents not in receipt of a pension or other income support and not holding a Commonwealth Seniors Health Card, so their fees do not increase as a result of the change in the fee structure. Aged-care facilities will be provided with additional funding to address the costs they incur in respect of their grandfathered residents. This is a program administered by FaHCSIA. I apologise for not having more detail with me at the moment but I would be happy to take it on notice and consult with that department to provide you with more information.

Answer:

The Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs is responsible for the household assistance payments under the Clean Energy Future package which includes some distribution for aged-care facilities.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	85
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Industry Assistance Grant Payments		
Hansard Page EC:	EC52		

Senator BIRMINGHAM: In terms of the industry assistance grants, how is it that 57 instances of wrongful industry assistance grant payments have been made? These are the grants, in my recollection, that were being made after the Home Insulation Program was brought to its abrupt closure and industry cried out for help. The package was put forward to assist, given the dramatic change in circumstances for the industry. This is what we might loosely describe as dodgy installers, that others have claimed grants they were not eligible for under the initial Home Insulation Program. What has transpired here to bring about these 57 instances of—

Mr Cahill: I will probably have to take that on notice. What I do have is the figures here at the moment. I am broadly aware that these are instances where we subsequently—through other information—understood that they were not eligible. Beyond that, I will have to take the question on notice.

[...]

Senator BIRMINGHAM: I note you have taken it on notice, Mr Cahill, but are you able to give me some example of the type of breach that would have occurred in that regard?

Mr Cahill: I am not in a position to do that. I just do not have the information with me. I have not been a part of that element of the program in detail.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Except that you are a new face at the table to answer these questions.

Mr Cahill: If I knew, I would give you the answer. I will take that on notice and get back to you as soon as practicable.

Answer:

There are four main reasons eligibility decisions were reversed under the Insulation Industry Assistance Package (IIAP):

- Systemic non-compliance with the Home Insulation Program Guidelines which may have been detected by inspections after the payment had been made.
- House fires and other safety concerns that constituted a serious safety issue as outlined in the IIAP Ministerial Guidelines and allowed the Commonwealth the right to recover under the agreement signed by the applicant.

- Post-payment compliance activity identified some applicants as having omitted information that rendered them ineligible under program guidelines, providing the ability for the Commonwealth to commence recovery action.
- Post-payment compliance visits were initiated to a number of applicants to verify and match information supplied in applications with visual inspections of purchase and sales records for stock; verification of business records to support applications (bank statements and other transactional information like bills of lading); and finally, visual verification of stock held at premises.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	86
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Home Insulation Program – Outstanding Debt		
Hansard Page EC:	EC53		

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Are you able to tell me what the largest outstanding debt is amongst those invoices that have been issued?

Ms Leo: I do not have that detail on hand. I will need to take that on notice.

Answer:

As at 29 February 2012, the largest outstanding debt was \$1,425,678.08

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	87
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Golden Boss Pty Ltd - Installations		
Hansard Page EC:	EC53		

Senator FISHER: Okay. Are you aware that, at least as far as reporting goes, the firm Golden Boss Pty Ltd admitted that four of the 10 installations done under the Home Insulation Program and the subject of the prosecution were not done according to the appropriate standards?

Mr Cahill: No, I am not, but I can take that on notice to check within the department.

Answer:

The Department has assisted Consumer and Business Services, South Australia, with the investigation into insulation installations undertaken by Golden Boss Pty Ltd under the Home Insulation Program (HIP). The Department is aware that Golden Boss Pty Ltd admitted during recent legal proceedings that four installations completed under the HIP were not carried out in accordance with appropriate standards.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	88
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Golden Boss Pty Ltd – Standard of Work		
Hansard Page EC:	EC53		

Senator FISHER: Can you answer on notice whether there has been any information provided to the department about the standard of the work done by this particular contractor in, at the very least, the instances that are the subject of the court case?

Answer:

The Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (the Department) has assisted Consumer and Business Services, South Australia, with their investigation into installations undertaken by insulation businesses working in South Australia under the Home Insulation Program (HIP). Throughout these investigations the Department and Consumer and Business Services, South Australia, have shared their findings, including information relating to any installation carried out under the HIP that did not comply with Australian Standards.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	89
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Golden Boss Pty Ltd – Recuperation of Monies		
Hansard Page EC:	EC53		

Senator FISHER: Mr Gleeson, I take your point in terms of licensing. In this case it was only South Australia that had a requirement anyway, but the standard of the work is the particular point I am trying to pursue with the department now. Given that the company itself admitted that four of the 10 jobs it did—the ones identified publicly—were substandard, will the department now be pursuing that company to recoup the moneys paid to that company for substandard work?

Mr Cahill: I think it is best I take it on notice and have a look at what information we have within the department as it relates to the case you have raised today.

Answer:

The Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (the Department) carries out compliance audits on installation businesses registered under the Home Insulation Program (HIP). In accordance with a compliance framework, the Department reviews all information that may indicate non-compliance with the Terms and Conditions of Registration and Program Guidelines, including reviewing installations to ensure that they comply with Australian Standards. Where the available information indicates that an installation is non-compliant, the Department notifies the installation business and provides them the opportunity to respond. Where an installation business is not able to demonstrate compliance, debt recovery action may begin.

The Department has engaged with Golden Boss Pty Ltd in relation to non-compliant installations. The appropriate actions have been taken in relation to these instances of non-compliance, consistent with the compliance framework.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	90
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Unlicensed Installers in South Australia		
Hansard Page EC:	EC54-55		

Senator FISHER: Yes, but it is still in the hundreds in South Australia. Is the department aware of any other companies who installed in South Australia being prosecuted for doing home insulation under the program without being licensed as required under the South Australian laws?

Mr Cahill: Not to my recollection. I could make some inquiries but, realistically, I would have to see what the department holds on prosecutions and such undertaken in the states and territories.

Senator FISHER: Would that not be a standard question that the department prudently would ask?

Mr Cahill: I think we do monitor most of the regulatory activities that happen in the jurisdictions as they relate to the Home Insulation Program. I will have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The Department assisted Consumer and Business Services, South Australia, with their investigation into installations carried out in South Australia by insulation businesses working under the Home Insulation Program (HIP). Consumer and Business Services, South Australia, is responsible for progressing legal action in relation to such matters.

As at 8 March 2012, the Department had not been advised of any further prosecutions for insulation businesses installing under the HIP without a South Australian license.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	91
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Raids on Financial Institutions in South Australia		
Hansard Page EC:	EC55		

Senator FISHER: My final question is not entirely on the same point. The chairman's favourite press reported on 26 December about financial institutions being raided by Federal Police investigating alleged fraud under the Home Insulation Program. I presume the report was relatively accurate. Were any financial institutions in South Australia raided?

Mr Cahill: I will have to take that on notice.

Senator FISHER: Thank you; and if so, how many?

Mr Cahill: Okay.

Answer:

As detailed in the newspaper article of 27 December 2011, the Australian Federal Police and the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency are working together to collect information from financial institutions across New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria as part of ongoing investigations into alleged fraud under the Home Insulation Program.

No financial institution in South Australia has been approached.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	92
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Home Insulation Program – Legal Proceedings against the Commonwealth		
Hansard Page EC:	EC57		

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Can I pose that same question in the home insulation space. Have any businesses associated with home insulation programs initiated proceedings against the Commonwealth?

Mr Cahill: Not to my knowledge. Again, I will take that on notice.

Mr Comley: Just to be clear, there have been organisations that have lodged under the claim for defective administration. The answer just provided referred to legal action.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: And the question was intended to be legal action. Thank you.

Answer:

Legal proceedings against the Commonwealth were commenced by a business connected with the Home Insulation Safety Plan. These proceedings were discontinued and no payment was made in relation to the claim.

Proceedings were also commenced by a business connected with the Home Insulation Program in relation to the Insulation Industry Assistance Package. The proceedings have been discontinued.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	93
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Safety Programs		
Hansard Page EC:	Written		

Senator Birmingham asked:

For each of the Home Insulation Safety Program (HISP) and Foil Insulation Safety Program (FISP):

1. What is the total budget?
2. How much of the budget has been spent?
3. Is this program currently within budget?
4. How many inspections have been carried out so far?
5. What has so far been the maximum cost of a single inspection?
6. What is the total travel budget?
7. How much of the travel budget has been spent so far?
8. What is the percentage of installations identified as faulty as a result of the inspections?
What, if any, other trends have been identified?
9. How many staff are currently employed in this program? What is the number of permanent and contracted staff?

Answer:

- 1-2. The Home Insulation Program (HIP) incorporates the Home Insulation Safety Program (HISP), the Foil Insulation Safety Program (FISP), Insulation Industry Assistance Package and all HIP Compliance activity. These individual elements are unable to be separated out of the appropriated budget.

The following table identifies the total HIP budget as appropriated over this financial year as well as how much of this budget has been spent (as at end of February 2012).

Budget Table: Whole of Home Insulation Program Review Office Programs Administered Budget and Actuals (\$ million) as provided in the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget Submission (PBS) and Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (PAES)

Budget (\$ million)		Actual (\$ million)	
2007-08	0	2007-08	0
2008-09	36.6	2008-09	64.8
2009-10*	1,964.7	2009-10*#	1,806.1
2010-11	318.3	2010-11#	59.8
2011-12	217.8	2011-12 (to 29 February 2012)	46.5
Life of Program	2,537.4	Life of Program	1,977.2

* Following the 8 March 2010 machinery of government changes, the Energy Efficiency functions were transferred from the former Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) to the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DCCEE). As a result, resourcing and actual expenses for 2009-10 are reflected under the DCCEE and the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. The 2009-10 budget shown above is the consolidated budget as reflected in the 2010-11 Portfolio Budget Statements for DCCEE (\$205.4 million) and former DEWHA (\$1,759.2 million) portfolios.

2011-12 PAES shows actual expenditure for 2010-11 as above, excluding expenses of \$147 million held against the 2009-10 provision and included under 2009-10 Actuals.

3. The Safety Inspection Programs are currently within budget and expected to be finalised within existing appropriation.
4. The total number of Safety Inspections completed, as at 29 February 2012, are for the FISP 46,882 and the HISP 196,455. This information is regularly updated on the Department's website.

5. The maximum cost of a single inspection undertaken under the Safety Inspection Programs to date is calculated as \$3,399.51 (including GST) – this was a Householder Requested Safety Inspection, for which the Service Provider was required to respond within 48 hours of the request. The Safety Inspection was completed by a two person Safety Inspection Team travelling from Brisbane to Mackay under HISP Phase 1 on 23 December 2010.

Householder safety is the priority of the Government with all householder requests actioned by the service provider within 48 hours of receipt of the request. Locations are not a factor used by the service provider when measuring the level of urgency or when prioritising requests.

6. The HISP and the FISP budget is a component of the HIP appropriation. Although the budget is internally allocated to operational functions for the purpose of management, accruals and forecasting, that is, inspection costs, travel and management costs, there is no dedicated budgets for these functions of the Safety Inspection Programs.

The following table provides a summary of estimated internal allocations in relation to all Inspection-related travel, please note:

- in previous financial years, the total amount of expenditure replaces any previous estimated internal allocations in that financial year; and
- for the current financial year, the estimated internal allocation is as detailed in the table.

Home Insulation Program (Administered) Internal Budget – Inspection-related Travel

Program Element	2010-11	2011-12 (as at end Feb 2012)
HISP Phase 1	\$3,433,082	Not Applicable
FISP	Nil (Included in inspection costs)	Not Applicable
HISP Phase 2	Nil	\$17,940,000
TOTAL (excl GST)	\$3,433,082	\$17,940,000
		\$21,373,082

7. The total expenditure on travel for the program as a whole is detailed in the following table:

Home Insulation Program (Administered) Expenditure – Inspection-related Travel

Program Element	2010-11	2011-12 (as at end Feb 2012)
HISP Phase 1	\$3,433,082	Not Applicable
FISP	Included in inspection costs	Not Applicable
HISP Phase 2	Nil	Nil invoiced to date
TOTAL (excl GST)	\$3,433,082	\$0

8. The percentage of HIP related safety issues (predominantly electrical) identified at the time of a Safety Inspection, for non-foil households, has ranged from 20 – 22 per cent. All foil households were offered a Safety Inspection and provided with treatment options regardless of whether there was a safety issue identified. The householder could choose from the following treatment options: ‘no action’, ‘foil removed’ or ‘safety switches installed’. As a result the percentage of safety issues identified in foil households cannot to be accurately determined.
9. The Safety Inspection Programs currently employ, at 29 February 2012, a total of 70 staff: 59 ongoing, 10 non-ongoing, and one external contractor.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	94
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Safety Programs – Inspector Travel		
Hansard Page EC:	Written		

Senator Birmingham asked:

For inspectors operating under the HISP and FISP, what is the total cost of travel paid including vehicle cost reimbursements?

For any travel since 1 June 2011, please provide detail every instance where inspectors took approved flights funded under the program, including the total cost for each trip, the number of days travelling involved, dates of travel, numbers of people travelling, number of inspections undertaken whilst in each destination. For each destination, what was the level of urgency of each inspection undertaken and were there trained or accredited inspectors located at or near the inspection locations?

Answer:

Total travel costs and breakdowns have not changed since the Department's response to Supplementary Budget Estimates 2011 Question on Notice 204. However, the breakdown of these costs are provided for the period October 2010 and 30 June 2011 at [Attachment A](#).

Home Insulation Safety Program Phase 1

- There have been 74 occasions, totalling approximately 2,005 inspections, where the Department has pre-approved travel for inspectors. This travel occurred between October 2010 and 30 June 2011.
- The total pre-approved travel cost for inspections is approximately \$562,866 (inclusive of GST). Of this, approximately \$56,749 (inclusive of GST) has been for flights.
- Approximately 14,764 completed inspections had a travel component with an approximate cost of \$2,870,216 (inclusive of GST). This travel was paid in accordance with the contract and the Taxation Determination (TD 2010/19), with no pre-approval required.
- The Department has pre-approved all travel costs, as per contract arrangements, where inspection teams have been required to establish and travel to a Super Region to conduct a safety inspection.

- Although there were costs relating to inspector travel, which were not pre-approved, the Department scrutinises all invoices/claims prior to payment, to ensure costs are legitimate, in line with contractual arrangements and reflect the Taxation Determination (TD 2010/19).

Foil Insulation Safety Program

- With regard to the Foil Insulation Safety Program travel costs were a component of the total safety inspection fee, as the total number and location of these households was known in advance.

Home Insulation Safety Program Phase 2

- As at 29 February 2012, Transfield Services have not claimed inspector travel costs and there have been no inspector travel costs paid under the Department's contract with Transfield Services.
- Travel costs for Inspection Services delivered by Transfield Services are anticipated and allowed for in current budget forecasts.

The Department has contracted with service delivery providers to deliver the safety inspection programs. As a result, it does not engage on the day-to-day business planning for the safety inspection contractors. Generally, inspectors would not travel to an area where accredited inspectors were already present except to complement those teams where additional work was required.

Householder safety is the priority with all householder requests actioned by the service provider within 48 hours of receipt of the request. Location is not a factor used by the service provider when measuring the level of urgency in prioritising requests.

The amount of work in any area is determined by the number of targeted inspections as well as householder requests. It is not economical to train and accredit inspectors in areas of low inspection numbers. Further, given the rigorous qualification and training requirements for inspectors under the Safety Programs, the companies contracted to undertake inspections generally found it to be more cost effective to redeploy a small team rather than recruit and train a new team of suitably qualified personnel in all locations.

ATTACHMENT A

Travel Departure	Travel Destination	How Many (Two Person) Teams	Date From	Date To	Days	Estimate HH attended	Flights Amount (Return)	Car Mileage \$	Other: hr rate, accom, equipment etc \$	Total Cost \$
Sydney	Broken Hill	1	27/02/11	5/03/11	6	13	\$1,197.26	N/A	\$3,349.18	\$4,546.44
Gold Coast	Melbourne	1	7/02/11	7/02/11	1	2	\$327.00	N/A	\$693.21	
Melbourne	Mildura	1	8/02/11	8/02/11	1	3	\$484.00	N/A	\$599.46	
Mildura	Broken Hill	1	8/02/11	8/02/11	1	2	N/A	\$217.00	\$849.46	
Broken Hill	Mildura	1	11/02/11	11/02/11	1	2	N/A	\$217.00	\$849.46	
Mildura	Melbourne	1	11/02/11	11/02/11	1	2	\$334.83	N/A	\$599.46	
Melbourne	Gold Coast	1	11/02/11	11/02/11	1	2	\$360.00	N/A	\$693.23	\$6,224.11
Brisbane	Cairns	1	21/02/11	26/02/11	5	27	\$819.00	N/A	\$3,783.65	\$4,602.65
Perth	Lane Cove West	1	20/03/11	25/03/11	5	24	\$630.48	N/A	\$3,049.92	\$3,680.40
Adelaide	Perth via Kalgoorlie	1	27/02/11	17/03/11	20	39	\$959.00	N/A		
Perth	Adelaide	1	17/03/11	17/03/11	1	40	\$1,618.00	N/A	\$12,157.11	\$14,734.11
Adelaide	Perth	1	27/02/11	5/03/11	6	27	\$993.00	N/A	\$2,281.64	
Perth	Adelaide	1	5/03/11	5/03/11	1	2	\$424.00	N/A	\$2,219.13	\$5,917.77
Brisbane	Cairns	1	30/01/11	30/01/11	1	1	\$367.00	N/A	\$2,238.90	
Cairns	Brisbane	1	5/02/11	5/02/11	1	1	\$270.00	N/A	\$2,238.90	
Cairns	Brisbane	1	12/02/11	12/02/11	1	13	\$165.00	N/A	\$1,801.40	\$7,081.20
Brisbane	Cairns	1	30/01/11	30/01/11	1	5	\$387.00	N/A	\$2,127.52	
Cairns	Brisbane	1	2/02/11	2/02/11	1	5	\$365.00	N/A	\$2,127.52	
Cairns	Brisbane	1	12/02/11	12/02/11	1	5	\$270.00	N/A	\$1,690.01	\$6,967.05
Brisbane	Townsville	1	31/01/11	19/02/11	20	36	\$577.00	N/A	\$9,484.16	\$10,061.16
Sydney	Melbourne		27/03/11	29/03/11	3	1	\$357.00	N/A	\$766.72	
Brisbane	Melbourne		27/03/11	27/03/11	1		\$151.00	N/A	\$891.72	
Melbourne	King Island	1	27/03/11	29/03/11	3	1	\$782.38	N/A	\$954.21	\$3,903.03
Brisbane	Rockhampton	1	7/04/11	7/04/11	1	2	\$812.00	N/A	\$1,669.59	\$2,481.59
Brisbane	Cairns	1	14/02/11	19/02/11	6	19	\$747.00	N/A	\$4,191.55	\$4,938.55

Brisbane	Mackay	1	13/02/11	19/02/11	7	31	N/A	N/A	\$5,652.59	
Brisbane	Mackay	1	13/02/11	25/02/11	13	31	\$2,411.80	N/A	\$5,569.26	\$13,633.65
Brisbane	Mackay	2	13/02/11	20/02/11	8	48	\$2,632.00	N/A	\$8,958.40	\$11,590.40
Brisbane	Townsville return	1	28/02/11	9/03/11	10	10	\$1,364.00	\$1,719.20	\$9,901.08	\$12,984.28
Brisbane	Cairns	1	28/02/11	12/03/11	13	60	\$827.40	\$172.90	\$7,879.75	\$8,880.05
Brisbane	Melbourne	4	13/02/11	4/03/11	19	249	\$3,441.75	N/A		
Brisbane	Melbourne	4	6/03/11	26/03/11	20	250	\$1,846.75	N/A	\$74,194.63	\$79,483.13
Brisbane	Melbourne	3	13/02/11	5/03/11	20	216	\$3,588.00	N/A	\$43,831.47	\$47,419.47
Sydney	Albury	2	20/12/10	23/12/10	4	29	\$991.18	N/A	\$3,543.20	\$4,534.38
Brisbane	Mackay	1	23/12/10	23/12/10	1	1	\$2,063.00	N/A	\$341.01	\$2,404.01
Adelaide	Alice Springs	1	30/01/11	5/02/11	6	14	\$800.00	N/A	\$4,127.85	\$4,927.85
Adelaide	Darwin	1	30/01/11	13/02/11	14	28	\$720.00	N/A	\$8,535.75	\$9,255.75
Adelaide	Port Lincoln	1	31/01/11	4/02/11	5	19	\$460.00	N/A	\$2,915.90	\$3,375.90
Brisbane	Proserpine	1	13/02/11	18/02/11	6	15	\$512.00	N/A	\$2,329.00	\$2,841.00
Brisbane	Melbourne	3	14/02/11	5/03/11	19	211	\$3,820.20	N/A	\$26,923.09	\$30,743.29
Brisbane	Mackay	1	27/02/11	6/03/11	8	25	\$1,032.94	\$509.11	\$4,877.25	\$6,419.30
Brisbane	Perth	1	13/03/11	19/03/11	7	22	\$1,314.94	N/A	\$5,098.29	\$6,413.23
Adelaide	Port Lincoln	1	7/03/11	9/03/11	3	6	\$590.00	N/A	\$1,754.24	\$2,344.24
Brisbane	Perth	1	13/03/11	19/03/11	7	19	\$1,104.00	N/A	\$5,136.99	\$6,240.99
Brisbane	Perth	1	13/03/11	19/03/11	7	20	\$1,104.00	N/A	\$4,210.99	\$5,314.99
Brisbane	Perth	1	12/03/11	26/03/11	15	43	\$1,002.00	N/A	\$10,228.11	\$11,230.11
Brisbane	Townsville	1	31/01/11	12/02/11	13	10	\$654.00	N/A	\$6,798.39	\$7,452.39
Tinbeerwah	Liverpool	3	11/02/11	29/03/11	41	394	N/A	\$6,636.00	\$76,092.00	\$82,728.00
Brisbane	Melbourne	2	6/03/11	25/03/11	31	71	N/A	N/A	\$21,259.68	\$21,259.68
Brisbane	Cairns	1	25/10/10	29/10/10	5	12	\$1,037.41	N/A	\$4,099.80	\$5,137.21
Brisbane	Cairns	1	2/11/10	5/11/10	4	9	\$833.90	N/A	\$4,016.58	\$4,850.48
Brisbane	Cairns	1	8/11/10	12/11/10	5	12	\$873.90	N/A	\$4,009.38	\$4,883.28

Brisbane	Cairns	1	15/11/10	19/11/10	5	12	\$693.90	N/A	\$3,995.12	\$4,689.02
Brisbane	Cairns	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	4	12	\$733.90	N/A	\$3,953.30	\$4,687.20
Brisbane	Cairns	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	4	12	\$693.90	N/A	\$3,803.63	\$4,497.53
Brisbane	Maryborough/ Hervey Bay	1	2/11/10	5/11/10	3	9	N/A	\$403.20	\$3,068.00	\$3,471.20
Brisbane	Maryborough/ Hervey Bay	1	8/11/10	12/11/10	4	12	N/A	\$403.20	\$3,238.00	\$3,641.20
Brisbane	Maryborough/ Hervey Bay	1	15/11/10	19/11/10	4	12	N/A	\$403.20	\$3,224.00	\$3,627.20
Brisbane	Maryborough/ Hervey Bay	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	4	12	N/A	\$403.20	\$3,224.00	\$3,627.20
Brisbane	Maryborough/ Hervey Bay	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	4	12	N/A	\$403.20	\$3,227.50	\$3,630.70
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	25/10/10	29/10/10	4	12	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,196.00	\$3,704.20
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	2/11/10	5/11/10	3	9	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,196.00	\$3,704.20
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	8/11/10	13/11/10	5	15	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,526.00	\$4,034.20
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	15/11/10	20/11/10	5	15	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,525.00	\$4,033.20
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	22/11/10	27/11/10	5	15	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,565.00	\$4,073.20
Brisbane	Bundaberg	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	5	12	N/A	\$508.20	\$3,196.00	\$3,704.20
Brisbane	Mackay	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	5	12	\$1,013.90	N/A	\$4,003.14	\$5,017.04
Brisbane	Mackay	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	5	12	\$783.90	N/A	\$4,082.14	\$4,866.04
Brisbane	Nanango	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	5	12	N/A	\$283.00	\$3,280.00	\$3,563.00
Brisbane	Nanango	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	5	12	N/A	\$283.00	\$3,280.00	\$3,563.00
Brisbane	Townsville	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	5	12	\$1,153.40	N/A	\$4,094.17	\$5,247.57
Brisbane	Townsville	1	29/11/10	29/11/10	1	3	\$950.80	N/A	\$1,827.83	\$2,778.63
Brisbane	Rockhampton	1	22/11/10	26/11/10	5	12	\$1,249.40	N/A	\$4,458.84	\$5,708.24
Brisbane	Rockhampton	1	29/11/10	3/12/10	5	12	\$1,053.40	N/A	\$4,459.78	\$5,513.18
TOTALS		87			459	2005	\$56,748.62	\$15,102.41	\$491,015.24	\$562,866.27

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome: 1 **Question No:** 95
Program: 1.2
Division/Agency: ESPD
Topic: Home Insulation Program -
Expenditure
Hansard Page EC: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

Please itemise, by financial year, all expenditure to date on the Home Insulation Program (since its inception) and all associated safety and inspection programs, including total amounts expended and any amounts still budgeted. Please detail in a chart showing all programs, all years and totals to date plus totals still allocated.

Answer:

The Home Insulation Program (HIP) incorporates the Home Insulation Safety Program (HISP), the Foil Insulation Safety Program (FISP) and all HIP Compliance activity.

Budget Table:

Whole of Home Insulation Program Review Office Programs Administered Budget and Actuals (\$ million) as provided in the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget Submission (PBS) and Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (PAES)

Budget (\$ million)		Actual (\$ million)	
2007-08	0	2007-08	0
2008-09	36.6	2008-09	64.8
2009-10*	1,964.7	2009-10*#	1,806.1
2010-11	318.3	2010-11#	59.8
2011-12	217.8	2011-12 (to 29 February 2012)	46.5
Life of Program	2,537.4	Life of Program	1,977.2

Note:

1. The budgets and actuals above are for the whole of the HIP. This is how the HIP activities are presented in the PBS and PAES.
 2. Financial year to date actuals for 2011-12 are provided to 29 February 2012.
- * Following the 8 March 2010 machinery of government changes, the Energy Efficiency functions were transferred from the former Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) to the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DCCEE). As a result, resourcing and actual expenses for 2009-10 are reflected under the DCCEE and the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. The 2009-10 budget shown above is the consolidated budget as reflected in the 2010-11 Portfolio Budget Statements for DCCEE (\$205.4 million) and former DEWHA (\$1,759.2 million) portfolios.
- # 2011-12 PAES shows actual expenditure for 2010-11 as above, excluding expenses of \$147 million held against the 2009-10 provision and included under 2009-10 actuals.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	96
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	LSB		
Topic:	Green Loans Program – Legal Proceedings against the Commonwealth		
Hansard Page EC:	EC56		

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Have any organisations related to the Green Loans program, including any of these 30, initiated any proceedings against the Commonwealth?

Mr Cahill: Not to my knowledge, but I will take that on notice.

Answer:

Two individual Green Loans Program assessors jointly commenced legal proceedings against the Commonwealth in relation to a decision that they were not eligible for assistance under the Financial Assistance Scheme for uncontracted Green Loans Assessors. The assessors discontinued the proceedings as they were able to provide additional evidence to the Department which verified their eligibility for assistance under the Scheme.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications
Legislation Committee**

Additional Estimates 2011-12, 13 February 2012

Answers to Questions on Notice

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio

Outcome:	1	Question No:	97
Program:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	ESPD		
Topic:	Green Loans Claims		
Hansard Page EC:	Written		

Senator Birmingham asked:

Have all claims relating to the Green Loans Program been finalised? If yes, when? If no, when are they expected to be finalised and what amounts are involved?

Answer:

As at 29 February 2012, claims for payment with a total approximate value of \$409,000 relating to 15 Assessors / Assessor Organisations were 'pended' subject to compliance action. The Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency is working towards finalising 'pended' payments (either advising Assessors / Assessor Organisations that funds will be permanently withheld, or releasing funds, dependant on the outcome of compliance reviews) by 30 June 2012.