

## Questions on Notice Supplementary Budget Estimates 2010-2011

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio  
Wednesday 20 October 2010

QON No.	Date Asked	Hansard page reference/ Written	Senator	Question
CFD 01	20/10/2010	20	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—...This is probably one you will have to take on notice for me. Can you provide me with a breakdown for the past four years of total DAFF appropriations and DAFF appropriations as a proportion or a percentage of total government appropriations? That is a question of the numbers.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—The overall portfolio or just the department?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—The overall portfolio.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—The overall portfolio.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Could you also extend that out, as it stands, for the forward estimates too, please? So what I am looking for is looking four years back and four years forward, please. I want a list of all the DAFF lapsing programs over the forward estimates, please.</p> <p><b>Dr Dickson</b>—Senator, can I just confirm whether that is lapsing or lapsing and terminating programs?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I had better have lapsing and terminating, please, and I would like them differentiated, please. There are some where the decision has been made to terminate already. I know that we will inevitably have some discussion over the definition of lapsing as time goes on and as we discuss these things further. But I am interested to know where that is all heading to.</p>
CFD 02	20/10/2010	39	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I did ask a question this morning. At the risk of being told that you do not want to answer again, the amount is budgeted to be spent this financial year. Is that the government’s intention?</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—Two issues really come in. MYEFO will settle that. But the commitment was to certainly provide it in a very short space of time this year.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—This year? Can I be bold enough to ask whether I am talking calendar or financial? I just do not want there to be any question. If you want to say one or the other, that is fine with me.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I will take it on notice to provide.</p>

<b>CFD 03</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you provide me with a breakdown for each of the past 4 years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Total DAFF appropriations</li> <li>▪ DAFF appropriations as a % of total government appropriations?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Can you provide me the breakdown requested above but for the each of the 4 years in the forward estimates?</li> <li>3. Can you provide me with the details of all DAFF programs lapsing/terminating over each of the 4 years in the forward estimates? (e.g. regional food producers program)</li> </ol>
<b>CFD 04</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total additional cost to the budget of Labor's election promises (over and above what was already in the budget)?</li> <li>2. Can you please provide a breakdown of each policy by cost and budget year?</li> </ol>
<b>CFD 05</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the department/agency paid its accounts to contractors/consultants etc in accordance with Government policy in terms of time for payment (i.e.within 30 days)? If not, why not, and what has been the timeframe for payment of accounts? Please provide a breakdown, average statistics etc as appropriate to give insight into how this issue is being approached.)</li> <li>2. For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency for the current financial year and the previous financial year?</li> <li>3. Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined?</li> </ol>
<b>CFD 06</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there any programs within your portfolio that are likely to exceed their current budget. If yes, please provide details (for example a demand driven program that has had higher than anticipated take up).</li> <li>2. Are there any programs within your portfolio that are likely to under spend their current budget. If yes, please provide details (for example a demand driven program that has had higher than anticipated take up).</li> </ol>
<b>CSD 01</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the department instituted any policies or protocols that restrict or deny staff the use of Youtube; online social media, such as Facebook, MySpace and Twitter; and access to online discussions forums and blogs? If yes, please explain what restrictions has been put in place. Why were these restrictions put in place?</li> <li>2. If not, why not?</li> <li>3. Are staff utilising these sites during work hours? If yes, how many hours are spent on these sites? What time are these sites most accessed (i.e. lunch time?).</li> <li>4. Will measures be introduced to restrict access to these sites?</li> </ol>

CSD 02	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total expenditure on staffing for the Department and for all portfolio agencies?</li> <li>2. What is the SES and non-SES breakdown?</li> <li>3. What are the current staffing levels for SES and non-SES officers?</li> <li>4. How many SES were employed in your Department and portfolio agencies on 10 May 2010?</li> <li>5. How many SES were employed in your Department and portfolio agencies as of today?</li> <li>6. What is the breakdown by each level (each SES band, each Executive Level band and each APS band)?</li> <li>7. What is the gender breakdown by each level (each SES band, each Executive Level band and each APS band)?</li> <li>8. What is the breakdown by location for each level (each SES band, each Executive Level band and each APS band)?</li> <li>9. What is the breakdown by each level of ongoing staff and non ongoing staff (each SES band, each Executive Level band and each APS band)?</li> <li>10. What has been the general staffing trend in your department and portfolio agencies since the 2007 election (for example SES numbers and recruitment has increased by X per cent because of Y).</li> <li>11. What have been the changes in staffing levels since Budget Estimates 2010? Why have these changes occurred? What have been the Budgetary implications? In the case of reductions in staff numbers, how have these reductions been absorbed by the Department? What functions these staff performed have been sacrificed and why?</li> <li>12. Are there expected changes to current staffing levels over the next 12 months? If yes, provide details including a breakdown of each level staff (each SES band, each Executive Level band and each APS band) detailing the changes. Will this be different to what was reported in the 2010-11 Budget?</li> <li>13. Has there been a target for staff reductions to achieve savings? What is that target and what strategy is being implemented to achieve this? Will staff reductions be used to achieve the Government's election commitment to maintain the 1.25 per cent efficiency dividend?</li> <li>14. Have any voluntary or involuntary redundancies been offered to staff? If so, how have staff been identified for such offers? Are there such plans for the future?</li> <li>15. How many permanent staff recruited since Budget Estimates 2010? What level are these staff? Where is their location?</li> <li>16. Since Budget Estimates 2010, how many employees have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?</li> </ol>
--------	-----	---------	---------	---

				<p>17. Have staffing numbers been reduced as a result of the current efficiency dividend and/or other budget cuts since Budget Estimate s2010? If so, where and at what level?</p> <p>18. Are there any plans for staff reduction? If so, please advise details i.e. reduction target, how this will be achieved, services/programs to be cut etc.</p> <p>19. If your Department/agency has been identified in the 2010 election as delivering efficiencies (savings), how will these be delivered? (for example, savings commitments included reducing program funding, rationalising grants etc how will these impact the department and staffing) .</p> <p>20. What changes are underway or planned for graduate recruitment, cadetships or similar programs? If reductions or increases are envisaged please explain including reasons, target numbers etc.</p>
<b>CSD 03</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. How much has the Department spent on consultancy services since Budget Estimates 2010? Please identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the contract, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc).</p> <p>2. How can the department justify this expenditure?</p> <p>3. How many consultancies have been undertaken or are underway since Budget Estimates 2010? Please identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the contract, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc). Please also include total value for all consultancies, including figures for total spending on consultancies and also value of contracts awarded? Provide total figures since Budget Estimates 2010 and a breakdown on these figures for FY 2008/09 and 2009/10 FYTD.</p> <p>4. Is the Department/agency up to date with its reporting requirements on the Government's tenders and contacts website? Are the figures available on that site correct?</p> <p>5. Has there been any changes in the consultancies are planned for this calendar year since Budget Estimates 2010? If yes, have these been published in your Annual Procurement Plan (APP) on the AusTender website and if not why not? In each case please identify the subject matter, duration, projected cost and method of procurement as above, and the name of the consultant if known.</p> <p>6. Could the Department provide a complete list of current consultancy services. For each consultancy, please indicate the rationale for the project and its intended use. For each consultancy, please indicate why the Department or its agencies could not have undertaken the work themselves.</p>
<b>CSD 04</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Has the department/agency ever employed Hawker Britton in any capacity or is it considering employing Hawker Britton? If yes, provide details.</p>

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Has the department/agency ever employed Shannon’s Way in any capacity or is it considering employing Shannon’s Way? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>3. Has the department/agency ever employed John Utting &amp; UMR Research Group in any capacity or is it considering employing John Utting &amp; UMR Research Group? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>4. Has the department/agency ever employed McCann-Erickson in any capacity or is it considering employing McCann-Erickson? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>5. Has the department/agency ever employed Cutting Edge in any capacity or is it considering employing Cutting Edge? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>6. Has the department/agency ever employed Ikon Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing Ikon Communications? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>7. Has the department/agency ever employed CMAX Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing CMAX Communications? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>8. Has the department/agency ever employed Boston Consulting Group in any capacity or is it considering employing Boston Consulting Group? If yes, provide details.</li> <li>9. Has the department/agency ever employed McKinsey &amp; Company in any capacity or is it considering employing McKinsey &amp; Company? If yes, provide details.</li> </ol>
<b>CSD 05</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could the Department provide a list of all discretionary grants, including ad hoc and one-off grants since Budget Estimates 2010? Please provide details of the recipients, the intended use of the grants and what locations have benefited from the grants.</li> <li>2. Has the Department complied with interim requirements relating to the publication of discretionary grants?</li> <li>3. Did the Minister approve each of these grants?</li> </ol>
<b>CSD 06</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the Department’s hospitality spend since Budget Estimates 2010? Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.</li> <li>2. For each Minister/Parl Sec’s office, please detail total hospitality spend FYTD. Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.</li> </ol>
<b>CSD 07</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the Department/agency received any advice from the Government or any other source on how to respond to FOI requests?</li> <li>2. How many FOI requests has the Department received?</li> <li>3. How many have been granted or denied?</li> <li>4. How many conclusive certificates have been issued in relation to FOI requests?</li> <li>5. Has the Department/agency received any FOI requests for its Incoming Government Brief (‘Red Book’)? If yes, when and will it be released?</li> <li>6. Has the Department/agency received any FOI requests for its Incoming Government Brief (‘Blue Book’)? If yes, when and will it be released?</li> </ol>

<b>CSD 08</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the total cost of shredding/removal of confidential (or similar) documents in DAFF for 2009/10 and so far for 2010/11?</li> <li>2. What was the total cost of shredding/removal of confidential (or similar) documents in the Minister/Parl Sec's offices for 2009/10 and so far for 2010/11?</li> </ol>
<b>CSD 09</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many permanent staff recruited since the previous estimates (May 2010)?</li> <li>2. What levels are these staff?</li> <li>3. How many temporary positions exist or have been created since additional estimates?</li> <li>4. Since the previous estimates, how many employees have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?</li> <li>5. Provide two detailed lists (covering 2 periods) of interstate travel incurred by departmental staff. Please provide details of each trip and include the reason for travel, the cost of the travel for each staff member, the number of staff involved in the travel and what level the staff were during last financial year (2009/10) and from Budget Estimates 2010 – 30 October 2010</li> <li>6. Provide two detailed lists (covering 2 periods) of what international travel was undertaken by departmental staff and the reason for the travel, cost of the travel for each staff member were at during last financial year (2009/10) and from Budget Estimates May 2010 – 30 October 2010</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 01</b>	20/10/2010	17	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Look, I understand that. Effectively, it is an increase in that context of three ministerial staff in the agency.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—No. There were, I think, 11—</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—Yes. Eleven ministerial staff in Minister Burke’s office.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—Yes. And there continue to be 11.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—In addition.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. That is right. So with the additional person come additional people. Okay, fine. Are all those positions filled?</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—I think they are currently being finalised, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I can take that on notice and get back to you. I know that they are not all filled at this point in time. But I cannot recall the exact number.</p>
<b>CPD 02</b>	20/10/2010	18-19	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Okay, fine. I want to go to approvals given by the former minister in the lead-up to caretaker. Can you advise me what approvals were made by the minister on the day before caretaker began?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I think we would have to take that on notice, Senator. We assume you mean things like grants appointments and those sorts of things?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. That is what I mean.</p>

				<p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—No. We would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I have a list here of something like 50 Caring for our Country grants that were signed off on the day before caretaker. I do not begrudge any of them getting their money. But, just in the context of the conversation that Senator Macdonald was having earlier, there were a large number of grant programs signed off on the day before caretaker, yet the issue of questions on notice, which I will skip over in my file now that we have done it, does demonstrate a bit of a contrast. It is easy to announce and sign off things that can make people happy and can be announced during an election campaign, but it is not necessarily easy to do questions on notice. Can you give me the total travel costs for the minister for 2009-10, please?</p> <p><b>Ms Bie</b>—Much of the travel for the minister is funded through the Department of Finance and Deregulation, Senator, so we would not be able to.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—We may be able to provide you with the total, so you could ask what DAFF provides. I am not sure when the department of finance is appearing, but you could ask them in respect of the—</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—It would have been easier for me to attend now that you have changed the dates. I will be back to talk to you about that later, because it was earlier in the week.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Can we get that on notice?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—We can ask that on notice anyway.</p>
<b>CPD 03</b>	20/10/2010	19-20	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Can you give us a quick travelogue, Minister, of your visits since your appointment? I know one place you have been.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Thanks, Minister. Perhaps you could provide on notice a list of those visits so far.</p>
<b>CPD 04</b>	20/10/2010	20-21	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Can you give us the cost of the communications media for DAFF in 2009-10 and the expected cost for this financial year?</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—Just to be clear, when you are saying media—I am not trying to be difficult, Senator—are you talking advertising, marketing or media monitoring?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I would like to know the total cost of communications/media, so I am trying to be as all-encompassing as I possibly can. If that means that you need to give me different categories, that means you need to give me different categories.</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—Okay. I will take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—And that would include the total budget for the corporate communications branch of those 51 people.</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—Yes. Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—And those figures for 2009-10 and 2010-11.</p>

				<b>Ms Freeman</b> —Certainly.
<b>CPD 05</b>	N/A	Written	Fielding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the department prepare a post-election brief for a returned Labor Government (the so-called 'Red Book')?</li> <li>2. Can the department provide the committee with a copy of this brief?</li> <li>3. If not, can the department outline its reasons for refusing to provide a copy of this brief?</li> <li>4. If the department will not provide a copy of this brief because it contains confidential or sensitive information, can the department provide a redacted copy of this brief as was done by the Treasury Department?</li> <li>5. Has the Minister given any instructions to the department regarding the release of this brief and if so, what were these instructions?</li>   <li>6. Did the department prepare a post-election brief for a newly elected Coalition Government (the 'Blue Book')?</li> <li>7. Can the department provide the committee with a copy of this brief?</li> <li>8. If not, can the department outline its reasons for refusing to provide a copy of this brief?</li> <li>9. If the department will not provide a copy of this brief because it contains confidential or sensitive information, can the department provide a redacted copy of this brief as was done by the Treasury Department?</li> <li>10. Has the Minister given any instructions to the department regarding the release of this brief and if so, what were these instructions?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 06</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What approvals were given by the Minister on day before the Caretaker period began?</li> <li>2. What approvals were made by the Minister during the Caretaker period, if any?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 07</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When were answers to questions on notice for May's Budget Estimates first prepared for the previous Minister? When were they first submitted to the Minister's office?</li> <li>2. What was the response from the Minister's office? From who? When?</li> <li>3. What communications were received from the Minister's office about the answers up to the caretaker period? Was there any written communication? What was the nature of this communication?</li> <li>4. What advice did the Department take on the release of the answers during the caretaker period? (<i>DEWHA released answers during the caretaker period</i>)</li> <li>5. How many answers have yet to be submitted to the Committee? Which ones? And are there any from any previous hearings still to be submitted?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 08</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the total cost of travel by the Minister in 2009-10?</li> <li>2. What was the total cost of travel by his staff in 2009-10?</li> </ol>

				3. Which places has the new Minister visited since his appointment? What was the cost of travel for these visits? Who accompanied him? What was the cost of travel for these staff?
<b>CPD 09</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the Government, Minister or his office return any documents to the Department once the caretaker conventions began?</li> <li>2. Did these documents include Ministerial submissions, briefs or notes?</li> <li>3. How many unread, unsigned or undealt with Ministerial submissions, briefs or notes were sent back?</li> <li>4. What was the date of the earliest such document that was sent back from the Minister's office and the date of the last?</li> <li>5. Did the Minister or his office request prior to the calling of the election that no more submissions, briefs or notes be sent?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 10</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What type of work did your portfolio engage in during the 2010 election campaign?</li> <li>2. Did you receive any requests for information from the Government, your portfolio Ministers or any other Ministers?</li> <li>3. Will the Department be releasing its Incoming Government Brief ('Red Book')? If yes, when and why? If no, why not?</li> <li>4. Will the Department be releasing its Incoming Government Brief ('Blue Book')? If yes, when and why? If no, why not?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 11</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many Reports have been commissioned by the Government in your portfolio since Budget Estimates 2010? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.</li> <li>2. How much did each report cost? How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?</li> <li>3. What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 12</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?</li> <li>2. What is the gender ratio of appointments made to boards since Budget Estimates 2010?</li> <li>3. Are you implementing the Government target of 40 per cent women appointed to Boards?</li> </ol>
<b>CPD 13</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the cost of Minister's travel and expenses for the Community Cabinet meetings held since Budget Estimates 2010?</li> <li>2. How many Ministerial Staff and Departmental officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meeting?</li> </ol>

				<p>3. What was the total cost of this travel?</p> <p>4. What was the total cost to the Department and the Minister's office?</p>
<b>CPD 14</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. How much time is spent preparing papers/submissions for Cabinet and Sub-Cabinet Committee meetings?</p> <p>2. How often must papers/submissions for Cabinet and Sub-Cabinet Committee Meetings be redrafted or relodged? Please provide example of why this would happen. (i.e. last minute policy changes or redate papers due to items not being discussed when initially scheduled).</p>
<b>CPD 15</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What is the total number of Reviews both completed and ongoing in the portfolio/agency or affecting the portfolio agency since Budget Estimates 2010?</p> <p>2. Please provide a breakdown of reviews completed since Budget Estimates 2010 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ when those reviews were provided to Government,</li> <li>▪ estimated cost of producing each review (and total cost) and</li> <li>▪ if the Government has responded to the review or information about when the Government has indicated it will/will not respond to the review.</li> </ul> <p>3. How many reviews are ongoing?</p> <p>4. How many reviews have been completed since additional estimates?</p> <p>5. What further reviews are planned in the portfolio/agency?</p> <p>6. Will any of these reviews cease due to the 2010 Election?</p>
<b>CPD 16</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What are the government (Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio (i.e. special type of paper, envelopes)?</p> <p>2. What are the cost of these items? Is the Department/portfolio agencies paying for these?</p>
<b>CPD 17</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. How many DAFF staff undertake communications/media advisory roles? How many are currently assigned to MDB consultations?</p> <p>2. What was the total cost of communications/media in DAFF in 2009-10? And the expected cost for this financial year?</p> <p>3. What is the total budget of the Corporate Communications branch of DAFF for 2010-2011? And what was the budget in 2009-10?</p> <p>4. What campaigns or other form of advertising are scheduled for 2010-2011?</p> <p>5. When will these run?</p> <p>6. What is the cost of each of these?</p>
<b>CPD 18</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Are there plans to publish a full suite of electoral reports on the Department's website? If not, why not? If so, when? What data will be included?</p>

				<p>2. Did the Department prepare electorate level reports for the Government Ministers for the 2010 election? What data is included in these reports? How often is this updated? Why is this material not publicly available? Please provide copy of latest reports.</p> <p>3. Has electoral specific data been used by the current Government in any grants scheme since November 2007?</p>
<b>CPD 19</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office in the 2009/10 financial year? Which agency or agencies provided these services.</p> <p>2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Department and its agencies in the 2009/10 financial year? Which agency or agencies provided these services.</p>
<b>CC 01</b>	20/10/2010	23	Back	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I want to put the Western Australia perspective and perhaps give some understanding. The minister was in WA a couple of weeks ago—and farmers were appreciative of that, Minister. In a normal year we would receive about 14 million to 16 million tonnes of wheat. This year, last Friday, Co-operative Bulk Handling's assessment upgraded was four million tonnes for the year. That is the level. As of two weeks ago, they announced they would not be opening 100 receiving points, so that figure has probably gone up since then. That is the first time in the history of the state. With regard to the program, there were agricultural advisers to the drought reform scheme; that is the term I will use. Is that a reasonable term, drought reform scheme?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—The drought reform pilot.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—My understanding is that agricultural advisers were effectively excluded in the planning program, as has been told to me by two of the largest ones. Is there any reason why they did not participate in the planning phase?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—There is no specific reason on that, Senator. The Commonwealth discussed the arrangements for the program with the WA state government and it was settled between the two governments with the support of the two agencies—the WA agricultural department and ours. As I understand it, WA agriculture developed a specific training scheme for this pilot, which is being delivered by Curtin University. So it was not specifically excluding advisers. Rather, it was developing a new set of modules to provide a comprehensive farm-planning and training scheme, which was to be a key part of the pilot. That is the way it was developed, as far as we understand.</p> <p><b>Dr O'Connell</b>—Senator, the farm-planning component is funded and delivered by the WA department. So this is a partnership where they deliver some components and fund some components and we do others. If you want further information, we can certainly get what we can.</p>

				<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I ask the question really on the basis that I would have thought since the farm management consultants or financial advisers to agriculture probably have the portfolio of the most successful farmers in the state, there would have been a lot of merit and wisdom in including those people who could have actually given some guidance to the planning for the program, and particularly the type of information that would be required by the people who are going to participate.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—I understand what you are saying, Senator. As I said earlier, this was designed as a new measure to test a new approach. That is why the modules were put together—to try to be comprehensive. How ag WA pulled that together and who they got advice from is not something I can speak about here and now. But I am happy to take that on notice, as Dr O’Connell suggested, and provide any further comment on that.</p>
CC 02	20/10/2010	25	Back	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Multi-peril crop insurance.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Look, Senator, there was a major study on that done a few years ago, which the department was engaged in. I think it was when Minister Truss was minister for the portfolio. It was done in conjunction with industry organisations and with the insurance industry. I think it has been provided and made public over time. That was a very significant analysis of multi-peril crop insurance which found that there are considerable problems with implementing multi-peril crop insurance in Australia. I suppose to cut to the chase, it found that there are a lot of problems and risks, particularly around data and the availability of data and what that might mean for farmers but also that the costing did not stack up in terms of a commercial proposition. The only way it could be expected that a multi-peril crop insurance scheme could operate in Australia would be with considerable government support. So, at the time, the government decided not to proceed with that. We have the study. I think it is still current. We draw on that material and analysis when need be.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I can perhaps advise you that industry at the moment is trying to finalise funding for a comprehensive feasibility study, with input from those most likely to be affected by continuing failure, including the banks, the bulk handling groups, the grain handlers et cetera. The average cost of putting in a crop in Western Australia now is about \$1 million. It is likely that up to 50 per cent of Western Australian grain growers next year will not be able to get the finance to put a crop in unless there is some degree of assistance. I will perhaps provide that for information rather than question. Whilst Minister Redman is certainly being canvassed, do I take it from here that there would not be capacity for support from your department to assist with that feasibility study? Again, remember that previous studies, Mr Mortimer, have been conducted based on profit of the crop whereas the current study is based on a cost of production recovery.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I think you were talking a little hypothetically in one sense. Before we took</p>

				<p>a definitive position, it would be something that I would want to discuss with the minister and brief the minister on. I think there is a fundamental issue with multi-peril crop insurance that is subsidised by government, and that is the degree to which it potentially creates perverse results in terms of risk management by the subsidised farmer. And that comes out regularly as one of the driving concerns. If you are clear that you will be subsidised essentially for the risk of your crop production, you may well take different risks. You have a different risk profile, essentially.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I concur with that, Dr O’Connell, except to say that there may be a case for support for a limited number of years—maybe three to five years—to establish a sufficient pool of farmers who can then carry that program on. I agree with you about it as a permanent arrangement. I am well aware of the circumstances in Canada and the United States, where you are correct. If a feasibility study were to support the assertion that premiums and a sufficient pool of farmers could keep it going without government support over time, I would urge that such consideration be given to support it by federal and state, for that matter, governments.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—We are happy to provide that study again, subject to any issues that the minister might have. I think it has been provided to senators previously. That will be helpful. It was a very thorough analysis. It sets out all the issues. It might be beneficial to both you and the farmers in WA, although my memory was that there was representation from WA farmers on the working group for that at the time. I cannot remember the exact names of the people.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Thank you.</p>
CC 03	20/10/2010	27	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Was there a qualification period from someone receiving previous payments coming on to the new program?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—For the building farm business grants, the up to \$60,000 grants, there is an eligibility criterion that a farm business cannot receive both a farm business grant and an exceptional circumstances interest rate subsidy in subsequent years. The payments under the building farm business program are provided over four years to the successful farm businesses.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—So what funding has been expended to date? Have we already done that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Yes. I think you have done it in terms of the number of farmers uptake, so that might answer that.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—So does number of farmers equate to a figure, does it, specifically?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—That quantum of expenditure?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes.</p>

				<p><b>Mr Noble</b>—Senator, we would need to take that on notice, if you would like expenditure figures to the end of September, for example. Is that the sort of figure?</p>
CC 04	20/10/2010	27-28	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I want to clarify something. I apologise if it has already been asked. What is the time period from the tick-off on the application to when the project has to be completed?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—The application for which element of the pilot are we talking about? Are we talking about the Building Farm Businesses grants?</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Yes. Those ones, yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—The activities that a farm business may apply for can occur over a period of four years. Once the application is received, the first payment will be paid this financial year. That is a prepayment. Payments in subsequent financial years are paid on a reimbursement basis.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Correct me if I am wrong, but is it the Stronger Rural Communities grants?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Are they the ones that are due to be completed by the middle of next year?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—Yes. The activities that are funded through that program need to be completed before the end of June 2011.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—So at what stage are those projects? Have they all been ticked off and are they underway?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—The applications for that program closed on 15 September, and the National Rural Advisory Council is meeting today to assess those applications. They will then recommend the projects to be funded to the minister. The minister will then make a decision about which projects to fund in that program.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Is that a fairly short time period, though, to have to have them completed by the end of June? What sort of projects are going to be in this? It seems like a pretty short time if the minister is only looking at them at the moment and it all has to be completed by 30 June next year. What sort of projects are going to be able to be completed in that short time frame?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—I will be able to provide you with advice on the detail of the projects.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—The projects tend to envisage expenditure on I suppose what you would call minor capital works—to buildings, fitting out of buildings and renovating buildings for different purposes, as well as expenditure on staff et cetera. So prima facie there is a reasonable expectation that the funding could be spent.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—If it turns out that there is a bit of a time lag, is there any capacity to push</p>

				<p>that date out, or are you going to stick hard and fast to that date?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Well, we will come to that if the issue arises. At this stage, it is too early to really come to that. But we will just keep a watch on it as it is rolled out.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I am just a little mindful that things tend to shut down over December and January.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—I understand that. Certainly the schedule has the minister announcing the decision well before Christmas.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—And when they are approved, would you provide for the committee a list of those projects?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Yes. Absolutely.</p>
<b>CC 05</b>	20/10/2010	29	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—There is rather unusual—I think first of its kind—exceptional circumstances funding for floods in the gulf country of north-west Queensland. Could someone just give me a quick update on where that is at?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—The declaration runs to June of next year and it will be reviewed by NRAC in the run-up to expire in the normal fashion.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Can you indicate to me how many land owners have taken advantage of the declaration and what in financial terms has been made available in whatever form?</p> <p><b>Mr McDonald</b>—There are currently 23 farm families in receipt of the income support payment and there are a further 10 farm businesses that have had their applications approved for the interest rate subsidy.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Are any of those 10 part of the 23, or are they the same people?</p> <p><b>Mr McDonald</b>—I could not say here. I can take that on notice.</p>
<b>CC 06</b>	20/10/2010	30	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Have there been any complaints that the boundaries are too constrained or too wide?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Not since the EC was declared, I have to say. I am pretty confident we have had no formal complaints. Certainly I am not aware of any grumbling about the boundaries.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Have there been applications that have not been successful?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—For people within the region?</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr McDonald</b>—I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—We would have to check with the state authorities in terms of interest rate subsidies and Centrelink in terms of the relief payment applications. Typically, there is a rejection rate in terms of not meeting the eligibility criteria, but we can take that on notice,</p>

				if you like, and get you some details.
<b>CC 07</b>	20/10/2010	39-40	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>— Can you give us a list of any meetings that you have had with industry or NGOs since the election—perhaps on notice; I understand you will not have that available straightaway—about these negotiations?</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—We will see what we can find. So I will take the question on notice and we will see what information we can provide.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Have you had any specific meetings with members of the Greens in relation to these negotiations?</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I will take that on notice and get back to you.</p>
<b>CC 08</b>	20/10/2010	41	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Well, does the government and the department have a view on the term ‘high conservation value forest’? How is that to be applied to the Australian forestry sector?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Are you asking the question in the context of the statement of principles?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—No. I am asking it in its own context.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I just want to be clear, then, that the context you are asking has no relevance to the statement of principles.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—It will have relevance because it is a term that is being used.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Then I would need to, I think, very sensibly refer to the term as it is understood.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Let us make it easy and let us take the question on notice.</p>
<b>CC 09</b>	20/10/2010	42	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Has the government made a submission to their calls for submissions on the definition of ‘high conservation value forest’?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I will take that on notice, but I think the answer is no.</p>
<b>CC 10</b>	20/10/2010	42	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I am not going to get any more out of the government, I do not think, on that. I want to ask some questions about the forest industry database. At last estimates, the department said the final version would be released in July. Can you advise why this has not occurred?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—The forest industry database is running late. We did some final testing probably about three weeks ago. We have recommended some changes, which are being done at the moment. We expect the database will be finalised at the end of the month and then it would, through the minister, go to the next Forest and Wood Products Council.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—So when is the next Forest and Wood Products Council meeting?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—That has still got to be determined, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—So will it be released before or after that meeting?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I will have to come back to you on that one.</p>

				<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Obviously, it is a decision for the minister. So it potentially will not occur until after the next unknown dated meeting?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—You would have to put a recommendation to the minister. The practice in the past has been that these things have gone through the Forest and Wood Products Council and they have been assessed by subcommittees of that council. So the practice to date has been that there would be tick-off at those councils.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—So you actually cannot answer the question, can you? All right. I will leave it at that. If you have any further advice and can give me that on notice, I would appreciate that....</p>
CC 11	20/10/2010	43	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Have you had a look at any of the other schemes that are currently operating in, say, the US and the EU? In particular, what identification and certification measures are being used to verify that timber is legally sourced?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—We have had a look at both the EU measures and the US measures. I guess the EU has used a due diligence system. The States are putting legislation in place. We have certainly had a look at that. We have also certainly had a look at the US and how its policy is applied.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—In those particular schemes, who pays the costs? Are they passed on to the importers or are they paid for by government?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I will take that question on notice. My understanding is that in the US case the practices they have had to introduce are certainly not government costs. They are levied along the supply chain, particularly at the importers. In the EU case, I think it is probably something similar. But I said I will take it on notice.</p>
CC 12	20/10/2010	43-44	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—No. I just want to ask about the products that are going to be captured under the proposal. My understanding is that the largest proportion of timber coming in that might be illegally logged comes in manufacturing products like particleboards and things of that nature, which are much harder to track. Can you give me a list of the products that are going to be affected by the measure?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—Final implementation decisions have to be made by government. But the government did, in I think in the 2007 election commitment, talk about—I will have to take it on notice and give you the exact words—wood and wood products and paper products too. In our draft RIS, when we were looking at this issue, we had a look at possible categories for regulation. We had category 1, which was solid timber and wood products and some paper products. Then we had category 2, which was partially processed timber and woods products. Then we had complex products, such as highly processed composite timber and wood products from multiple sources. Unfortunately, my copy of the draft RIS does not have page numbers. Then we also gave examples of each of those products underneath.</p>

				<p>There is still the implementation phase to go through, where we look again at this and what might be captured.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes, if you can give us that. So there is no finite list as such?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—There is a definitive list. But what we can certainly do is provide you with either the references to the draft RIS that went out or a copy of that.</p>
CC 13	20/10/2010	44	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—There was a report released in the last three or four months, I suppose, about a reduction in the amount of illegally logged timber coming into the country. Can you give us a sense of what scale that is at now?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I am trying to remember that report myself. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Do you have a comprehensive list of businesses that import timber products into Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I will take that one on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—If you do, could you provide it for us?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—The next one will have to be on notice. It is data on the level of employment across those businesses. I suppose you would be able to get the total financial value of timber, or I could probably find that anyway. I also want a breakdown country-by-country of quality, year and type of timber imported into the country over the last four years.</p>
CC 14	20/10/2010	44	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Can you give us a list of the interactions—this is on notice again—with the National Timber Council Taskforce, please? Do we provide any financial assistance? We do not?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I was just going to clarify. The National Timber Council Taskforce I am not familiar with.</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—It is not known to us, it seems.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Okay. I might have the name incorrect, but I will clarify that and I will put those questions on notice. ASIC recently put out a draft paper for modification of MIS. What discussions or input has the department had with ASIC on that paper?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—I will have to take that on notice. I do not think we have responded to it, but I will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Do you have any intentions of making a submission, if you have not been consulted?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—I will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—You have a proposal in Tasmania to transfer from native to plantation. That has obvious implications. There are real question marks about the future demand for timber products in Australia. I know that the industry is keen to get some data</p>

				<p>on that. Is the department doing any work on future timber products needs?</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I would have to take that on notice because ABARE may well be doing some work on that.</p>
<b>CC 15</b>	20/10/2010	45	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I just have one more question. I want to go back to the database for a second. Are the delays in the database delivery due to DAFF or the consultant that is being employed by DAFF? I have not named the consultant deliberately.</p> <p><b>Mr Talbot</b>—I think I will have to take that on notice and have a look at the time periods.</p>
<b>CC 16</b>	20/10/2010	46	Heffernan	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Hang on. Do not go away. Given the future of forestry and the building of a logic by the butcher and not the block of carbon crediting and trees, what are we going to do about the fact that the bulk of Queensland and the Northern Territory and the Indigenous communities do not have the capacity on their land to get a carbon credit because the government owns the title?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I do not think that is a forest issue.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—It most definitely is a forest issue. I am talking about forests.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—You may be looking more at a climate change issue.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Well, I am asking these fellas because this is part of their bailiwick.</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—We have established that the parliamentary secretary thinks it is in the wrong area, so we will move on to another question.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—No. It is a forest question.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Perhaps the department can take it on notice and come back to us.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—We will take it on notice and provide a response to the extent that we can answer it. Alternatively, the committee might want to refer it to—</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—Order! The minister is answering. There is harping on the left and the right. I cannot hear the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—To the extent that DAFF can provide a response within its portfolio responsibilities to the question, it will take that part of the question on notice. To the remainder that should be directed to the Department of Climate Change, I understand the committee usually has a process to be able to refer that question there.</p>
<b>CC 17</b>	20/10/10	130	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—You are still only running at almost 50 per cent. But let’s go through the reallocation, to make us all feel better.</p> <p><b>Mr Grant</b>—In 2008-09, \$3 million was allocated to the Promoting Australian Produce (Major Events) program, which was a new program committed to by the government in that year. \$3 million was unspent in 2008-09 and returned to the consolidated revenue.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—That is hardly a reallocation, but please continue anyway.</p>

				<p><b>Mr Grant</b>—In 2009-10, there was \$1.39 million allocated to the Promoting Australian Produce (Major Events) program and \$830,000 reallocated to the Climate Change Adjustment Program.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—What was that spent on?</p> <p><b>Mr Grant</b>—I do not have that information. I will have to take that on notice.</p>
<b>CC 18</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DAFF are yet to respond to detailed questions about funding for the trial – we actually asked for this to be supplied while Budget Estimates were occurring. Can you advise why Climate Change question on notice no.28 has not been answered?</li> <li>2. Can DAFF please advise on the status of the rollout of each of the aspect of the drought program trial in WA?</li> <li>3. Can you please provide a schedule for the future roll-out of each program?</li> <li>4. What funding has so far been expended? Can you please provide a breakdown per program?</li> <li>5. Considering the very dry or drought like conditions currently being faced in many agricultural parts of WA, have there been any requests from farmers organisations or the WA Government for additional drought support (over and above the trial)? If so, from who, when and for what?</li> <li>6. Have there been any requests to re-open EC assistance for WA farmers? From who?</li> <li>7. Have any farmers received the \$60k grants yet? If not, why not?</li> <li>8. Should the program be rolled out nationally, what is the time period a farmer must wait before applying for a new grant? Or will they only be able to receive the grant once?</li> <li>9. How many of the Stronger Rural Communities grants have been distributed? If not, why not? If they have, to who?</li> </ol>
<b>CC 19</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department failed to answer detailed questions on notice on Exceptional Circumstances – Climate Change No.29 Can the Department please provide a list of all regions currently under Exceptional Circumstances (EC) and the expiry date for each of these regions?</li> <li>2. Which EC regions is the Department and/or the National Rural Advisory Council (NRAC) currently reviewing to determine whether a region's EC status is renewed?</li> <li>3. What has NRAC's touring schedule been since 1 July 2010?</li> <li>4. What is NRAC's touring schedule up to the end of 2010-2011?</li> <li>5. How many completed NRAC EC reports are with the Department for advice to the Minister or are already in the Minister's office for decision?</li> <li>6. Can you please provide for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 periods a breakdown, by EC area application, of the time taken from when the relevant State Government submits</li> </ol>

				<p>the application to when a decision is made by the Minister. This list should include the Upper North Cropping District, Far West Eyre Peninsula and Eastern Eyre Peninsula, Bundarra (incl. buffer zones) regions among others within the two-year period. Can you please include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ when DAFF provided initial advice to the Minister on the application</li> <li>○ when NRAC was asked to conduct a tour</li> <li>○ when the tour was undertaken</li> <li>○ when NRAC provided its advice to DAFF</li> <li>○ when DAFF provided advice to the Minister on NRAC's recommendation</li> <li>○ when the Minister advised of his final decision.</li> </ul> <p>7. What has the Department budgeted for EC support to farmers and small businesses in 2010-11? Can you please provide a breakdown by program and EC region.</p> <p>8. What was the final underspend of EC funds for 2009-2010? What happened to these funds?</p> <p>9. What was the total EC budgeted funds in the May Budget over each of the forward estimates years? What is the current level of budgeted funds for each of these years? Please provide a breakdown by year and EC region (as well as any overarching costs).</p>
<b>CC 20</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What role is the Climate Change section playing in the Government's roundtables and the PM's Climate Change Committee?</p> <p>2. Did the Climate Change section provide advice to DPMC or the Department of Climate Change on who from Agriculture and related industries should be represented on the roundtables or the Committee?</p> <p>3. Did DAFF provide advice on whether the forestry industry should be represented on these forums?</p>
<b>CC 21</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. At last Estimates, DAFF said the final version of the database would be released in July. Can you advise on why this has not occurred?</p> <p>2. When will the database now be finalised?</p> <p>3. What was the total cost of this project?</p> <p>4. What was the original cost of the consultant? Have there been any additions to the original contract cost?</p> <p>5. What was the original timeframe for the engagement of the consultant (including date of providing final database)?</p>
<b>CC 22</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What role has or will DAFF play in the implementation of the Carbon Farming election policy?</p> <p>2. Will any DAFF resources be allocated to this program?</p>

				3. What analysis, if any, has DAFF conducted of this program and its future effectiveness?
<b>CC 23</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the Government's response to the statement of principles released yesterday regarding Tasmanian forests?</li> <li>2. Has the Government received the statement formally or informally?</li> <li>3. What actions will take place following receiving this statement? Will DAFF respond to the negotiation parties?</li> <li>4. Can the Minister provide a list of meetings he has had with industry or environmental organisations since the election about the Tasmanian forest negotiations?</li> <li>5. Has the Minister met with any members of the Greens regarding the negotiations or related issues?</li> <li>6. Has any proposal for assistance measures been received from the Tasmanian Government, industry organisations or environmental NGOs? If so, what is the status of these proposals?</li> <li>7. Has DAFF put forward advice to the Minister on possible assistance measures? If so, what were the options?</li> <li>8. Does DAFF have a view on term "high conservation value"? Is this a scientific term in forestry?</li> <li>9. How does DAFF see this term will be applied to Tasmanian forests?</li> </ol>
<b>CC 24</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What regular interaction does DAFF have with the National Timber Council Taskforce?</li> <li>2. Does DAFF provide any financial or in-kind assistance to the Taskforce? Has it ever provided any financial or in-kind assistance? When?</li> <li>3. Have there been any requests for assistance over the past year?</li> </ol>
<b>CC 25</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What measures is DAFF taking to encourage investment in hardwood production?</li> <li>2. Can DAFF advise on the level of hardwood resource available over the next 30 years? Please provide a breakdown by State/region.</li> <li>3. How does this compare with anticipated demand for hardwood timber products?</li> <li>4. Does DAFF foresee increased imports of hardwood products to meet domestic demand?</li> <li>5. What advice has DAFF provided to ASIC on new arrangement for Managed Investment Schemes in the lead up to and/or following the recent release of its consultation document?</li> <li>6. Will DAFF be providing a submission to this ASIC process?</li> <li>7. What measures, apart from MIS, does the Government currently offer to increase investment in the plantation sector?</li> </ol>

				8. Does the Department consider the level of investment in replanting and expanding the plantation estate to be adequate and what is the basis for this assessment?
<b>CC 26</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Could DAFF please advise on the number of Australian businesses, broken down by State and whether it hardwood or softwood timber, certified under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Australian Forestry Standard</li> <li>▪ Forest Stewardship Council</li> </ul> <p>2. I understand as a Standards Development Organisation under Standards Australia, Australian Forestry Standard Ltd is unable to earn income from its role as the owner and developer of the Australian Forest Standards. I am advised that AFSL is the only Standards Development Organisation (of five) not to receive ongoing Government financial support which impacts their ability to review the standard. Has DAFF received any request from AFSL for funding for the review? (AFSL want between \$1.4 and \$1.5 million and then funding between revision periods to continue operating)?</p>
<b>CC 27</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Can DAFF advise on the implementation of the Government's election promise to stop the sale of illegally logged wood being imported into Australia?</p> <p>2. What organisations will be consulted in designing the final program and its implementation?</p> <p>3. What will be the total cost of implementing this policy across the relevant organisations (DAFF and Customs)? Please provide a breakdown.</p> <p>4. What discussions has DAFF had with industry organisations since the election over this policy?</p> <p>5. What discussions has DAFF had with DFAT with respect to the trade issues connected to this policy?</p> <p>6. Has DAFF or other agencies received feedback from other countries on the decision to go ahead with the policy? What was the content of that feedback?</p> <p>7. What measures will be put in place to protect the domestic timber industry from any potential onerous or costly conditions which may be caused by World Trade Organisation (WTO) requirements?</p> <p>8. Does DAFF believe there will be additional cost to importers of timber products as a result of this policy? If so, what would the compliance costs involve?</p> <p>9. Will Customs be passing inspection costs on to importers?</p> <p>10. Can DAFF provide advice on the operation of the schemes in the USA and the EU? What identification/certification methods are being used?</p> <p>11. Are the costs of these schemes (or inspections) being passed on to importers?</p>

				<p>12. What resources within DAFF will be used to implement this policy?</p> <p>13. Has DAFF agreed the costing of this policy with Customs (who would be required to implement parts of the policy)?</p> <p><b><u>Products under the Legislation</u></b></p> <p>14. Can the Department please confirm that the following imported products containing or made of timber/wood products will come under the proposed legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. flat-packed fit-outs</li> <li>b. kitchens</li> <li>c. windows</li> <li>d. doors</li> <li>e. joinery</li> <li>f. furniture and bedding</li> <li>g. components</li> <li>h. pre-cut panels</li> <li>i. wooden-blinds</li> <li>j. pre fabricated trusses and frames</li> <li>k. wood-plastic composites</li> <li>l. flooring – timber and laminated</li> <li>m. timber</li> <li>n. veneer</li> <li>o. panels, veneered panels, melamine and foil-faced panels</li> <li>p. paper and cardboard</li> <li>q. pulp</li> <li>r. logs and flitches</li> <li>s. Other products made of/containing wood/wood-products, such as (but not limited to) skateboards, boat/yacht decking and fit-outs and coffins?</li> </ul>
CC 28	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Can the Department please provide a list of businesses which imported timber products into Australia in 2009/10 (or 2009 calendar year, whichever is easiest for data purposes)?</p> <p>2. Does the Department have data on the level of employment across these businesses?</p> <p>3. Does the Department have data on the level of employment across businesses who import timber and/or manufacture imported timber?</p> <p>4. What is the total financial value of Australia's timber importing sector?</p> <p>5. Can you provide a breakdown, by country, quantity, year and type of timber, imports of</p>

				timber products into Australia over the past 4 years?
<b>CC 29</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the current status of the \$20 million for Tasmanian Forest Contractors?</li> <li>2. What meetings has DAFF had with industry groups over this policy since the election? When and with who?</li> <li>3. Will all of the funding be available for exit packages? If not, what other measures will be funded?</li> <li>4. Will only harvest and haulage contractors be eligible for funding?</li> <li>5. Will silviculture contractors be eligible for funding?</li> <li>6. Will all of the funding be rolled out this financial year?</li> <li>7. Is this the full amount of funding that will be available to forest contractors? Is DAFF aware that much more sizeable levels of funding may be required to properly restructure the sector?</li> <li>8. What will be the administrative costs of this program? Will they be taken out of the \$20 million or absorbed by the Department?</li> <li>9. What other agencies have been consulted over this policy?</li> </ol>
<b>CC 30</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can DAFF please provide the level of Centrelink ‘drought’ (rural service) officers over each of the past 5 years, broken down by State and by region?</li> <li>2. Can DAFF please provide the level of funding for these officers, broken down by State for each of the past 5 years?</li> </ol>
<b>ABARE-BRS 01</b>	20/10/2010	62 and 147	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I just have some very quick questions to finish up on. Is the referee report you said the MDBA did something available that the committee could look at?</p> <p><b>Mr Gooday</b>—I believe it is on their website.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—So are 1,200 other bits of technical information.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—Yes, if it would help, we could provide it to you.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That would be very useful, thank you.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—...Also, clarification for Senator Nash: we had said we understood that the peer review of the ABARE work was on the MDBA website. It is not. We will now see if we can get it provided to you.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—<b>Thank you.</b></p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 02</b>	20/10/2010	62-63	Nash/ Birmingham	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—And what are the population movements when the buybacks occur? Have you looked at that under the current buyback program that has already occurred? Has there been any work done on that?</p> <p><b>Mr Gooday</b>—No, we have not been able to look at that.</p>

				<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—And does the modelling assume that irrigators will actually stay in a community after that buyback program?</p> <p><b>Mr Gooday</b>—Yes, the modelling that we have done assumes that the payments for the water go to households in those regions.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Gooday</b>—And then they spend some of that money inside the region and some of the money outside the region, the same as every other household in the region.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I am very happy for you to take this on notice—can you just give us some more detail around what underpins that? I would like to see the evidence behind it because I only have it anecdotally, but I think a lot of the payment for that water is going straight to the bank to retire debt. So I would be very interested in your underpinning, I guess, and how you have arrived at that, given that the experience on the ground says something really entirely different. And could I just could ask, also on notice, a last question. Mr Glyde, you very kindly supplied for me an answer to a question on notice—very recently, Minister. It was question ABARE 05. If you could just take on notice: over the five years that you gave me the allocations against entitlement, could you break those allocations down further? What proportion of that was government allocation for environmental purposes?</p> <p><b>Mr Morris</b>—Yes. I will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM</b>—If I can just add, while you are taking some of the details on notice: if you could explain the mobility of people and your assumptions about their movements, and how that compares with mobility in metropolitan areas and what assumptions you have made within the modelling, I would be interested.</p> <p><b>Mr Morris</b>—Yes, I am happy to do that.</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 03</b>	20/10/10	127	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—In terms of the potential impact of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and any permanent removal or reduction in water, will Agricultural Productivity be doing any work on the impact that that might potentially have on the meat, dairy and wool industries? Has that been done at all or is that something you are likely to be tasked to do?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—The estimates of the impacts of that work have all been done by ABARE-BRS. It does not sit within the Agricultural Productivity Division.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—So it sits with ABARE and it has been done?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Is it publicly available?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—In terms of the impacts on the industry, yes. The documents that Mr Morris and Mr Gooday were referring to go through each of the sectors and describe the impact in each sector.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Great. I have not had a chance to get right through that yet. That is all</p>

				<p>contained in there?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Great. Does it also have impact on exports and what the likely outcome is going to be on the export industry, given the significant nature of Australian agricultural exports? Has any work been done on that?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—I am not sure, to be quite honest.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Could you come back to me on that?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—Sure.</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 04</b>	20/10/10	132	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I will move on. I will ask you to take this on notice. I want to get some figures on vegetable imports. For the 10 most imported vegetables, can you give me a breakdown of imports of vegetable commodities in 2009 by commodity and origin and a breakdown of exports of vegetable commodities in 2009 by commodity and origin?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Just to be clear, is this commodities you are talking about?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—By vegetable commodity, fresh and processed.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—There is a lot of complication with processed food imports in trying to work out the quantities.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—My problem is that some of these are inputs to processing.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Yes, I understand that.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I understand the complexities. I just want to get some relatively complete figures on the flows of vegetables in and out, bearing in mind the trend over recent years towards net import. I am going to need fresh and processed, I think. I am looking for as complete a picture as I can get.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—You are looking for things like frozen veg.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—And we can give you a commentary around it so that it is helpful, if you like.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. I specifically want to get some figures from New Zealand, and I need to get some production figures as well over, say, the last five years by state and product.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—You want to go back five years so you get a bit of a trend?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. I would like to get some trend flows and inflows and outflows so that I can just look at some general pictures of where that particular industry sector is moving.</p> <p><b>Mr Grant</b>—Just for imports from New Zealand?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—No.</p> <p><b>Mr Grant</b>—But that identify New Zealand especially?</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—In the case of New Zealand, are you looking for country of origin</p>

				<p>or—</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—No, Bill. I do not want to complicate it.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—A lot of them are Chinese products from New Zealand into Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—In a lot of circumstances it is not necessarily possible to identify that.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—So you are not interested in whether they—</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Once I get the numbers, I can then start to look at a breakdown.</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 05</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p><b>ABARE-BRS work</b></p> <p>I understand ABARE-BRS has undertaken some work for DEWHA (SEWPC now) on the social and economic impacts of the establishment of marine parks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you please advise when this work was requested?</li> <li>2. What was the terms of reference for the work?</li> <li>3. Were draft maps provided?</li> <li>4. Has it been completed in part or full?</li> <li>5. Has it been provided in part or full to DEWHA?</li> <li>6. What agencies or organisations were consulted?</li> <li>7. Were any consultants engaged? Who? When? How much? For what?</li> </ol> <p><b>Marine Bioregion Planning</b></p> <p>I understand ABARE-BRS has undertaken some work for DEWHA (SEWPC now) on the social and economic impacts of the establishment of marine parks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you please advise when this work was requested?</li> <li>2. What was the terms of reference for the work? Were draft maps provided?</li> <li>3. Has it been completed in part or full?</li> <li>4. Has it been provided in part or full to DEWHA?</li> <li>5. What agencies or organisations were consulted?</li> <li>6. Were any consultants engaged? Who? When? How much? For what?</li> </ol>
<b>ABARE-BRS 06</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When was ABARE first asked by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to undertake socioeconomic analysis of proposed SDLs?</li> <li>2. On September 1, the MDBA announced it was delaying the release of the Guide to the Basin Plan to undertake further "work to improve some of the social and economic elements of the Guide's contents." Was ABARE asked to undertake this work?</li> <li>3. If so, when were they contracted to do this?</li> <li>4. When were ABARE first asked to model the three scenarios of 3,000 GL, 3,500 GL and</li> </ol>

				<p>4,0000 GL?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The 800 jobs figure that the MDBA originally made much out of but is now backing aware from. Is that ABARE's figure? If so, how did you come up with this figure and what assumptions are it based on?</li> <li>6. Does it represent the amount of initial jobs lost or a long-run outcome? What is ABARE's estimate of the amount of people who will be displaced or lose their job?</li> <li>7. I presume that you assume that some who lose employment or their business, will find employment elsewhere. What sort of jobs will these be? In what industries will they find employment?</li> <li>8. Does you modelling assume that employment will actually increase in the Basin after the SDLs are in place and the Government Water for the future program is complete?</li> <li>9. ABARE states that modelling the effects on downstream industries (such as rice, cotton and dairy processing) is "difficult given the uncertainties involved" (p. 5) Does ABARE actually model these impacts?</li> <li>10. How many cotton gins or rice mills close under these cuts in your model?</li> <li>11. Can your model accurately predict the effects on downstream processing activities?</li> </ol>
<b>ABARE-BRS 07</b>			Heffernan/ Joyce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What work has the MDBA performed on "tipping points" which may occur in some communities if too much water is taken away? Most of the graphs in the report appear to be relatively linear, but wouldn't there come a point for many industries, that if too much water is taken away, it loses the support services (such as mills, gins and supplies) which threaten the whole industry?</li> <li>2. Does the ABARE model allow people to move from region to region? What happens to population movements when buybacks occur?</li> <li>3. Does your modelling assume that irrigators stay in a community after they see their water to the Government under its Restoring the Balance program?</li> <li>4. How to up to date is the data that ABARE use in its models?</li> <li>5. What are your assumptions over how easily farmers can substitute water for land and how do these compare to other studies? How do your assumptions compare with other studies?</li> <li>6. How does your modelling incorporate the variability of Australia's rainfall patterns into its analysis and how do these compare to other studies?</li> <li>7. How much money does ABARE assume is spent on improving infrastructure to save water in the Basin?</li> <li>8. If they say \$4.4 billion, ask what happened to \$5.8 billion? Isn't that the amount in the Sustainable Rural Water Use and Infrastructure Program?</li> <li>9. Has ABARE held any technical modelling workshops to review the economic modelling and test its assumptions? If not, why not?</li> </ol>

				<p>10. Has the MDBA sought the advice of modelling expertise elsewhere in government, including the Productivity Commission or Treasury?</p> <p>11. Has ABARE's modelling been refereed by anyone?</p> <p>12. If so, could ABARE please provide the Committee with their referee reports?</p> <p>13. Did ABARE have any farmers, irrigators or agribusiness experts review or referee its modelling or its assumptions used in these reports for the MDBA?</p> <p>14. On p. 3 of the "Environmentally sustainable diversion limits report" ABARE states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The modelled 3500 GL scenario involves a reduction in surface water use of 32 per cent relative to the baseline ...</i></li> </ul> <p>How has ABARE constructed this baseline? In particular, does it include or exclude savings made under the Living Murray Initiative and state water recovery programs?</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 08</b>	N/A	Written	Birmingham	<p>1. Expressed in unit and also percentage terms, what has been the change in average price for grapes, volumes crushed and hectares of vineyard plantings in the Murray-Darling Basin for each of the last ten years?</p> <p>2. Does ABARE-BRS believe its modelling undertaken for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority satisfactorily captures more recent changes in both market conditions and technological advances for the agricultural sectors modelled?</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 09</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>1. Is it correct that in April this year that a grant of \$104,651 was given to the West Australian Agricultural Authority <i>“to develop a standard operating procedure to ensure the humane, safe and efficient field immobilisation of feral donkeys and feral camels, and to develop and implement a training package for field operators.”</i></p> <p>2. Was it that procedure?</p> <p>3. What is deficient in the current procedure?</p> <p>4. Why do the field operators need a training package?</p> <p>5. What is the training package?</p>
<b>ABARE-BRS 10</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Can you please provide a breakdown of imports of vegetable commodities in the past 5 years by commodity and origin? (10 most imported vegetables only)</p> <p>2. Can you please provide a breakdown of exports of vegetable commodities in the past 5 years by commodity and destination? (10 most exported vegetables only)</p> <p>3. Can you please provide the level of imports from NZ of vegetables over the past 10 years by commodity and year?</p> <p>4. Can you please provide the level of production of vegetable commodities over the past 5 years by State and commodity?</p>

SRM 01	20/10/2010	70-71	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Okay. One of the successes of the NHT Landcare program was the engagement of local and regional stakeholders in decision making and their increased commitment to funding leverage from non-Commonwealth sources. That was always one of the great benefits of it in the old days. Are you able to tell me what dollar funding or in-kind equivalent has been able to be leveraged from investors such as state and local governments, land owners and land managers, industry and community groups in providing Caring for our Country/Landcare funding over the last three years? Is that possible to get?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We would not be able to give you an overall figure for that because that is not something we collect on a regular basis. It would be something which—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—I have asked you this at practically every estimates though, and you have attempted to—</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We do have some of the amount of money that some other bodies have put in, but it is not a comprehensive analysis. Because we do not control other people’s budgets it can be a hard number to get a consistent number on, but the indications from the case studies we have looked at we get through from some of the ones in—in Victoria they have talked about a multiplier of between four-to-one and six-to-one, and I think there is about a two-to-one that we have got out of some of the Reef Rescue type investments.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—I am told, and would you agree with this, that the trend is clearly downwards from leverage from other sources—that is, these groups are more and more relying on the Commonwealth, less and less are they able to leverage funding. One of the reasons, they tell me, is they are competing with people they used to collaborate with. I am told that the trend is downward. Would you agree, disagree or do not know or take it on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We would have to take any sort of answer in that space on notice, but we have no comprehensive information to say whether it is upwards or downwards. We have heard anecdotally, and it has been observed—it is not a secret—that in some states some of the state expenditure has shifted from area to area.</p>
SRM 02	20/10/2010	71	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—You would be able to get the state government funding, because this is what I have asked for in previous years, and if you could update what I have asked previously, as to what is your latest information on contributions that the various state governments have contributed. Originally, when this all started with NHT it was supposed to be dollar for dollar as I recall. I am quite sure it is not that now, but I am just wondering if you can get for me the contributions by the state, appreciating that in many instances you will have to get that from the various state departments, and that is no easy task either. I accept that. But if you could—</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We can take that on notice. We will attempt to get what we can from the</p>

				states.
<b>SRM 03</b>	20/10/2010	74	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Perhaps you are not the right agency and Senator Ludwig will certainly tell me if that is the case. Would there be any difference in approval processes for such a proposal on Commonwealth versus state privately held land?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—I am not familiar enough with the relevant legislation relating to aquaculture to know.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I do not think it is necessarily an aquaculture thing. I think it is a Commonwealth planning-type approval thing and, perhaps, even in transport tomorrow we might get—</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—We could take that on notice, but I think the short answer probably is that there would be a difference between state land and Commonwealth land.</p>
<b>SRM 04</b>	20/10/10	77	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—While the change of staff is happening, could you, perhaps, Mr Thompson, on notice just indicate how many Environment staff can identifiably be allocated to Caring for our Country. Is that possible?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—That is possible. We will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—I am really after you going back a couple of years so that I can see whether you are increasing your involvement or decreasing it, and whether Environment is doing the opposite, or whatever.</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We can give you those numbers.</p>
<b>SRM 05</b>	20/10/10	99-100	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—What is the proposal for the recreational conference?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—All of these projects are being worked on with the Fisheries R&amp;D Corporation. The proposal there is to hold a national conference to bring relevant recreational fishing people together to discuss issues of importance. Each of these areas of activity were ones that were high priority activities identified in the discussion paper and the feedback to date. And for each of those activities, with ourselves and FRDC, we are looking to work with relevant leaders from the recreational fishing sector. And some meetings were held last week with various people from the recreational fishing sector to develop the detail of those proposals and what sort of outcomes would meet both our objectives and their objectives. The conference would be the speakers, the programs and the outcomes—that sort of thing.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Why weren’t all these decisions made public?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—Some of them have been made public. I do not think there is any secret about them. The recreational fishing sector is certainly aware of them all.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I have had a number of conversations with them about what is going on, and not all of them are aware of it.</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—That could be—for instance, I was at a meeting with them last week where we were talking about how we might do these, and they seemed to be—</p>

				<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—When was the announcement made? When were they made public? We have looked for this information because, at the last estimates, we agreed that there was \$1.3 million remaining. When did the minister sign off on all this?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—I would have to take the exact date on notice, but I believe it was in June or July. I do not have with me the timing of what announcements about these were made.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Where will I go for public information—on a DAFF website or an FRDC website? Where would I find this information if I was looking for it?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—I am not sure whether they are on the website. Normally, these get listed on the website when contracts are finalised. They are not there yet. We will follow up.</p>
<b>SRM 06</b>	20/10/10	100	Colbeck	<p>I have some questions on consultations with NHMRC on the national diet proposals that they had. We did talk about it at the last estimates. Have we had any discussions with them about that? Have they been to—sorry to mention ABARE-BRS again—for a copy of the fish stocks report, for example, to give them a demonstration of the sustainability of our fisheries? Have we posted them a copy?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—I believe there were some consultations with them about the status of Australian fish stocks, and material of that sort was made available. I am not aware of any more detailed discussions.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Was it made directly to NHMRC or their consultants that are doing the work?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—I am not sure what the nature of the further discussions or information provision were.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Could you investigate that for me and, perhaps, provide me that information on notice as to what your communications have been with NHMRC since the last estimates and whether they have been provided a copy of what is a very good document and provides some very encouraging news about the state of our fish stocks?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—Yes, Senator.</p>
<b>SRM 07</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many staff currently work in the Fisheries Policy Unit?</li> <li>2. How has this changed since 2007?</li> <li>3. What is the budget for this unit? How has this changed?</li> <li>4. Since the last Estimates, Mr Pittar has left. Has he taken up a position elsewhere in DAFF, Government or somewhere else?</li> <li>5. How many Fisheries staff have resigned during this calendar year?</li> </ol>
<b>SRM 08</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you give me a rundown of DAFF's involvement over the past few months with the Marine Bioregion Planning process being run by DEWHA?</li> <li>2. Has DAFF provided any data since Budget Estimates to DEWHA on fish stocks or similar data?</li> </ol>

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. What feedback is DAFF receiving from the fishing sector – commercial and recreational – on the process?</li> <li>4. DEWHA has been using the term "low impact" on fisheries/marine areas. What does DAFF understand this term to mean?</li> </ol>
<b>SRM 09</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On June 22, the previous Minister promised to the rec fishing sector a Ministerial roundtable. I note the Government didn't provide this commitment in its election policy. Will it still occur as Minister Burke promised on June 22?</li> <li>2. Who was invited?</li> <li>3. Who attended?</li> <li>4. Which Departmental officials/Ministerial advisers attended?</li> <li>5. Which organisations had their costs paid for?</li> <li>6. What was the total cost of the Roundtable?</li> <li>7. What was the agenda for the meeting?</li> <li>8. What outcomes were decided? What action has been taken on these?</li> <li>9. Will Ministers be attending the Ministerial Roundtable?</li> <li>10. What date is set for the next meeting?</li> </ol>
<b>SRM 10</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you please advise on the status of the Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee? Does it still exist? Does it have an expiry date?</li> <li>2. What is the status of the \$500k initiative announced by the Minister when releasing the draft discussion paper of the group relating to the collection of recreational fishing data?</li> <li>3. What is the finalised terms of reference? Who will be consulted?</li> <li>4. When will the project be completed?</li> <li>5. Will the data be made public?</li> <li>6. At the last Estimates, I asked for advice from DAFF about the Minister's request to the States and Territories seeking co-investment for the project. I didn't receive an answer (question transcript below). Can you provide me an answer about what has been the response?   <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—You provide a beautiful segue. Has the minister mentioned a request to the state and territories for co-investment in the project? What has the response been to date?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><b>Mr Pittar</b>—As you say, the minister has written asking for that information from the states and territories. I would have to check on the status of how complete the response is from the states and territories.</p> </li> <li>7. What is the status of the draft discussion paper of RFAC? Is it awaiting government</li> </ol>

				<p>consideration? Or is it still with the Committee for consideration?</p> <p>8. Can you advise on the funds remaining from the \$2 million made available to this strategy? At the last Estimates, it was agreed \$1.3 million was still remaining.</p> <p>9. I understand the Minister approved for all or most of this funding to be transferred to FRDC. Is this correct? If so, when was that approval made (why was that decision not made public)? What will FRDC be doing with those funds?</p>
<b>SRM 11</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. At the last Estimates, I asked about whether or not DAFF provided any advice to the NHMRC's 'A new food guidance system for Australia – Foundation and Total Diets'. DAFF advised they knew nothing! As did DEWHA in later hearings.</p> <p>2. Is DAFF now aware of the concerns of the seafood industry about the draft guidelines which recommend Australians eat seafood just once a week?</p> <p><i>Text from draft report:</i>  <i>"Aim at one serve fish a week. Combine all categories. Some varieties more environmentally sustainable than others."</i></p> <p>3. Has DAFF now consulted with the NHMRC about the references its draft report makes to the 'sustainability of stocks' which has apparently been used to influence the draft dietary guidelines? When did DAFF first make contact with NHMRC about this matter? Did DAFF or NHMRC initiate this contact?</p> <p>4. Has DAFF provided the NHMRC with the latest Fishery Status Report which showed an ongoing improvement in the level of healthy fish stocks? What other advice has been provided?</p>
<b>SRM 12</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. What advice has DAFF provided to the Environment Minister on either export permits for OR the listing under the EPBC Act of Southern Bluefin Tuna? When was the latest advice provided?</p> <p>2. Has DEWHA been provided with the results of the latest aerial survey which showed very promising stock recovery levels?</p>
<b>SRM 13</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. There was a meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna in Taipei this week.</p> <p>2. Which officials attended on behalf of the Australian Government?</p> <p>3. Which NGO representatives attended from Australia?</p> <p>4. Can you advise on the outcomes of this meeting and their impact on the Australian industry?</p>
<b>SRM 14</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. In 2005-2007, as you would be aware, there was a significant \$150 million Commercial fisheries buyback across various fisheries.</p> <p>2. I understand there is some concern from those in the Bass Strait Central Zone Scallop Fishery that their fishery was not a significant recipient of assistance through this buyback</p>

				<p>as the effort was reduced by a relatively small level (approximately 14% or 22 concessions)? Is DAFF aware of this concern?</p> <p>3. Is there any consideration of further reducing effort in that fishery and providing structural adjustment assistance for those affected?</p>
<b>SRM 15</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Given that the Australian Government has an obligation under Commonwealth Law to consider recreational catches and resource sharing in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery Management Plan 2005 (below), what efforts are being made to address sector concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of data on recreational catches of tuna and billfish?</li> <li>○ A resource sharing agreement?</li> </ul>
<b>SRM 16</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>1. What is the definition of 'sustainable'?</p> <p>2. What is the definition of agriculture practices which aren't sustainable?</p>
<b>AFMA 01</b>	20/10/10	78	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—What has the staff turnover rate been in that division over the last 12 months?</p> <p><b>Mr Veitch</b>—We have had people move from the branch and people come back into the branch, so in broad terms we are probably in a situation now where we consider it reasonably stable. There have been people taking up other positions elsewhere, just the normal process of career advancement moving on to other things.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes, but what would be the turnover rate?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We would have to take that on notice. We do not have a calculation ready to hand on what the turnover rate is, and as Simon Veitch just said, there have been some people who left the division to broaden their experience in one year, and then having had that experience elsewhere, have come back 12 months later. Some go to the Fisheries R&amp;D Corporation, some to AFMA, some to other departments, and then they return to Fisheries, so we can take that on notice.</p>
<b>AFMA 02</b>	20/10/10	87-88	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Can you also on notice just update the licences, boats and the tonnages caught in that section of the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery that relates to the Coral Sea? Is that you or AFMA?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—That is us—we are AFMA.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—You are AFMA?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—We are happy to do that. We have provided that in the past and we are happy to do that again.</p>
<b>AFMA 03</b>	20/10/10	89	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Senator Boswell is right; there has been a significant reduction in the number of fishers. There are 150 to 180 operators' licences left at the moment.</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—We are looking at about 360 boats.</p>

				<p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Down from what?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—We can get you those details.</p>
<b>AFMA 04</b>	20/10/10	92	Boswell	<p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Dr Findlay revealed something that I think. Dr Findlay, the costs of monitoring this fishing—I have another one here; I could table this one too if you like. I will just read this one out, too. This one is also from the fact sheet, <i>Marine bioregional planning—the process</i>. I have not read this so I will just read it out:  The network of new marine reserves will be designed to provide for a balance between multiple use and highly protected areas. It is exactly the same as the one I read. I am just getting it from a different source, so the source is the same. Let us get back to Dr Findlay. Dr Findlay, I am concerned that some environmental people that want information from your department are inflicting a higher cost on the fishing industry so they can get their information. You have said Pew have asked for information. Have any other environmental groups asked for information that has incurred a cost?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—We provide information on request to any number of groups.  <b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—I am very glad you do and I think that is your role as public servants and in fish management, but what I am asking is what groups have asked, which has incurred a cost to the fishing industry?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—I would probably need to come back to you in terms of which groups have asked and, as I said, we get any number of requests each year, but I do not have those—  <b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—I would appreciate that being taken on notice.  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—Yes. Happy to take it on notice.</p>
<b>AFMA 05</b>	20/10/10	96	Boswell	<p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Doctor, you told the committee that you had to take a special look at the Coral Sea.  They might not have been your exact words. Is that correct?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—We have seen more activity in terms of management practices in the last few years, yes.  <b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—When did you start to apply the new activity? When did you start to monitor the Coral Sea?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—We have always been monitoring the Coral Sea. What I have said is that we have seen an increase in the level of monitoring going on in that fishery in the last few years. That is varied by fishery. I would have to get you details on the exact—  <b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—When did the increased monitoring take place?  <b>Dr Findlay</b>—I would have to take that on notice in terms of which activities.</p>
<b>AFMA 06</b>	20/10/10	97-98	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I want to ask about the recreational fishing ministerial roundtable. Your predecessor, Minister, agreed to the establishment of the recreational fishing roundtable. There was a meeting organised for 19 July, but, unfortunately, Minister Burke and Minister</p>

				<p>Garrett found themselves unavoidably detained on that day and did not turn up. Is it your intention to continue with the recreational fishing ministerial roundtable, and is Mr Burke, in his new guise, prepared to involve himself in that too?</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I am not sure I have turned my mind to it at this point in time, but I will get back to you on it.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Well, I am only too pleased to help.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I will take it on notice and get back to you. The recreational fishers do play an important part in the fishing industry. More broadly, I have spoken to a range of groups—the Fishing Industry Alliance, if I have their name correct, and in the West I spoke to fishing industry persons. I want to take it on notice because Mike Kelly is responsible for fisheries; I want to ensure what his intentions are in respect of this— rather than commit him to something.</p>
<b>AFMA 07</b>	20/10/10	100	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I want to go on to the Sea Lion Management plan that is proposed in South Australia. Can you give us some update on the current status of that?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—The Sea Lion Management Strategy was implemented on 30 June. We had a number of actions underneath that strategy including: significant increases in observer coverage; 6,700 square kilometres of area closures in areas of high risk of interaction with sea lions; and the implementation of a number of gear trials to look at ways to reduce the likelihood of interactions between seals and the gear. We have been reasonably encouraged by progress to date. We have had only one sea lion mortality reported. We have exceeded our observer coverage target of 11 per cent. We actually delivered 15 per cent observer coverage over this first quarter. The fishery people, while not happy about the implementation of the strategy, understand the need for it and are moving along with us in a cooperative way.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—My understanding is that it has displaced about 30 per cent of the fishing effort. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—The closures did have a significant impact on where fishers used to fish. They have moved their fishing effort outside those areas, so it is not that that fishing effort is gone. It has now moved away from areas immediately adjacent to sea lion colonies.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Was there any socioeconomic modelling or cost impacts done on the proposal?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—We did look at the amount of catch taken in the areas proposed to be closed. I cannot remember that figure off the top of my head, but that was essentially the limit of the socioeconomic impact assessment.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Which would be, effectively, the displaced fishing effort?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—That is right.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—The figure I have is 30 per cent.</p>

				<b>Dr Findlay</b> —I cannot remember it off the top of my head, from the analysis. I can certainly take it on notice.
<b>AFMA 08</b>	20/10/10	101	Boswell	<p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—I am told that the number of Torres Strait licences has gone down and the cost is now being passed onto the few remaining people that are there and the cost has gone up.</p> <p><b>Mr Perrott</b>—Could we take that on notice, because that was prepared under a different regulation?</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—We will put it on notice. I thought this was a comprehensive list that was given to us. Now I have asked one question and I am told that it is not included in this list. How many other fisheries that have gone up are not included on this list?</p> <p><b>Mr Perrott</b>—The Torres Strait prawn fishery is the only fishery missing from that list.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Have you got the figures there?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—Just a correction: none of the Torres Strait fisheries appear on that list.</p> <p><b>Mr Perrott</b>—That is right. Torres Strait prawn fishery is the only fishery where the costs are accounted for.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—How much has that gone up?</p> <p><b>Mr Perrott</b>—In the 2009-10 financial year the cost actually went down by 23 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—That is good news. So the cost of those licences has been reduced by 23 per cent.</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—That is the total levy collection from the Torres Strait Prawn Fishery has gone down by 23 per cent. We have agreed to take on notice the impact on individual holdings, because as you say some fishers may have left the fishery and so some may have seen an increase. But the total—it is down 23 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—It is down because there is no-one up there fishing—or very few people up there fishing.</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—If it is down in the fishery there certainly has been a reduction in the monitoring costs.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—The effort is down in the fishery. But what I am asking is how much have the individual licences increased?</p> <p><b>Dr Findlay</b>—We have said we will take that on notice and come back to you. We have not got that information with us.</p>
<b>AFMA 09</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I have received serious representations from the fishing sector about the AFMA's sealion management plan. Can you advise on the current status of this plan?</li> <li>2. I am advised the plan from June 2010 would result in a displaced fishing effort of up to 30%. Is this correct?</li> <li>3. Has DAFF/AFMA conducted any socio-economic impact analysis?</li> </ol>

				4. Will any assistance be given to displaced businesses or their employees?
<b>TMA 01</b>	20/10/2010	107	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Gentlemen, how many people are actually working in the area of trade and market access in the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—What we might be able to do is give you the number of people that work in the Trade and Market Access Division. There is a number of people in the biosecurity services group that are also fundamentally involved in trade issues—</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That would be useful, thank you.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—which would might take us a little bit longer to get, but we can start with—</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Does somebody want to just have a bit of a dig around and see if we can do that.</p>
<b>TMA 01</b>	20/10/2010	107	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Gentlemen, how many people are actually working in the area of trade and market access in the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—What we might be able to do is give you the number of people that work in the Trade and Market Access Division. There is a number of people in the biosecurity services group that are also fundamentally involved in trade issues—</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That would be useful, thank you.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—which would might take us a little bit longer to get, but we can start with—</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Does somebody want to just have a bit of a dig around and see if we can do that.</p>
<b>TMA 02</b>	20/10/10	107-108	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Okay. So what sort of areas of trade policy were discussed?</p> <p><b>Ms Anderson</b>—As far as I understand, there was a discussion of a potential treaty-level arrangement with the European Union on a range of areas. We have currently a framework partnership with Europe that covers some agricultural actions as well, so just cooperation generally on a number of areas.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—I think it is probably best if we leave it to the PM&amp;C to answer those questions about the specifics of it.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I love watching that pass down the table. I could have put you out of your misery, but I just thought I would let it go and see what actually stopped. It was a bit like a Chinese whisper.</p> <p><b>Mr Glyde</b>—It is about being complete because we see part of the request. We see part of it. We do not see all of it, and I would hate to mislead you in relation to the nature of the discussion.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I am sure.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Quite specifically, you are asking about what arose as a result of the Prime Minister’s visit. Now, what we certainly do know about it is the kind of conversations that</p>

				<p>happened beforehand in terms of preparing for a visit, and that is normal sort of business that happens. I could not tell you what the specific representations were that were made. That would be something that you would have to talk with the Prime Minister's department or, potentially, the foreign minister's department.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—No, I understand all that, and thank you very much.</p> <p><b>Dr O'Connell</b>—Otherwise, we could potentially mislead you.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—No, I understand that completely. Thanks, Dr O'Connell. But surely, there would have been some correspondence back to you, having been involved in all that preparation before the Prime Minister went—surely there would be some communication back to you afterwards as a result of any meetings that took place. Wouldn't you need to know?</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—It has only just occurred and, of course, the EU is one of our most significant trading blocs and it is very important to us. But if there matters that were to be communicated back, I am not sure at this point in time we would be discussing them here.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That is perfectly understandable. Thank you very much, Minister. Perhaps, Dr O'Connell, if there is a point at which the committee could be informed of what was discussed and reported back to you at that meeting, that would be quite useful, I think, for the committee to have.</p> <p><b>Senator Ludwig</b>—I will take it on notice. And if there are matters that we can report back to the committee then I will undertake to do so by the relevant date.</p>
<b>TMA 03</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Treasury provided commentary in the incoming government brief on Free Trade Agreements which said:  <i>"Current approaches to preferential free trade agreements are not meeting Australia's needs."</i>  AND  <i>"Australia is negotiating seven FTAs, including some with our most important trading partners and regional allies. The PC has found that the potential benefits of the FTAs under negotiation have been oversold and the negatives largely ignored."</i></p> <p>Does DAFF agree with this statement?</p>
<b>TMA 04</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<p>1. Can DAFF please provide the current status including current schedule for the following FTA bi-lateral discussions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. China</li> <li>b. Japan</li> <li>c. Malaysia</li> <li>d. GCC</li> </ol>

				<p>e. South Korea  f. Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement  g. Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations</p> <p>2. Can you please provide commentary, if possible, on the agricultural and horticultural aspects of each of these negotiations including potential trade gains and possible difficulties arising?</p>
<b>BSG 01 (Food)</b>	20/10/2010	106	Back	<p><b>Mr Schipp</b>—Although we did have some hospitality trade in sheep meat to India, we do not have an open trade due to the health requirements on the attestations for the health certificates to India. They require us to certify for a number of diseases that are present both in India and Australia, and we are not able to issue that attestation.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Can you tell me what those diseases are, by any chance?</p> <p><b>Mr Schipp</b>—Black leg and a number of common endemic diseases in both Australia and India. I could, on notice, give you that list. Off the top of my head there were a number of diseases that we routinely vaccinate against in Australia, and we do not have a farm freedom program so would not be able to issue those certifications.</p>
<b>BSG 02 (Plant)</b>	20/10/10	114-115	Heffernan	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—So with respect to the stuff that the United States is not in a position to provide, could you provide to this committee all that correspondence on the issues that you are raising and that it cannot provide? We would like to know what the direction is. I have to say that I have not changed my mind and I am very grateful that Japan had an outbreak of foot-and-mouth because they were, on the basis of their BSE status, an applicant in the pipeline to Australia. It just shows, for the Australian producers and the Australian farmers, that erring on the side of bloody caution is pretty important. So could we have all the correspondence that you have raised with the USA, through whatever agency, so that we know where you are going and where they see the roadblocks and exactly where we are up to with this, instead of being ambushed.</p> <p><b>Dr Grant</b>—I cannot see any reason, but I will take it on notice, if I may, to provide you with that correspondence, from the point of view of the Department of Agriculture.</p>
<b>BSG 03 (Plant)</b>	20/10/10	117	Heffernan	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Fair enough. In that process, will you take industry representatives to foresee the human error—side of it, rather than the science side of it? As you know, there are a lot of likeable rogues in the beef industry. In fact, there are a lot of stolen cattle going out on ships, live shipments, that belonged to the investors of an MIS scheme. They are just slipping through our system like that, because they do not have to be tagged if they are from property of origin if they go live on a ship out of Darwin—and I can assure you that this a police matter. In much the same way, are you going to insist, by way of principle, that if it is good enough for us to have national livestock identification, birth to death traceability, given the</p>

				<p>open border system with Canada, given the open border system with Mexico—and, fair enough, people that know nothing about the bush and our beef industry complying with a free trade agreement with the US—that if they do not shut the Canadian and US border traffic of beef they will have lifetime traceability in any beef from cattle that are proposed to be imported into Australia? As a principle, would you agree with that?</p> <p><b>Dr Grant</b>—I will refer to the answer I gave at the inquiry. I think we are a bit ahead of ourselves because we have not been over to the United States or to Canada to investigate the situation.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—To go back to my original question, will you be providing the opportunity for industry representatives to be part of that delegation?</p> <p><b>Dr Grant</b>—I will take that on notice.</p>
<b>BSG 04 (Plant)</b>	20/10/10	117	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I have just been asked to find some information—in fact, I do not know how far it goes back. I understand that there are a number of protocols for using methyl bromide for both fumigation and unloading or opening of containers, but it has been passed on to me by another member to ask some questions about that particular notice. I am sorry, I cannot give you a date on it. G2010/06, so I presume it is from this year.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I think we would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—It may have been prompted by the circumstance that occurred out of Burnie this year, where there were some real problems with an export shipment of some logs, and the department may have put out—</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—This was the timber?</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. That was the timber: 5 May 2010.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—Yes. We may have to take that on notice, if that is okay?</p>
<b>BSG 05 (Strategic Projects)</b>	20/10/10	122 and 123	Nash	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—You gave me a very comprehensive briefing about 12 weeks ago and I think there were some seasonal issues around the likelihood of an outbreak at that period of time. Are any of those outbreaks more recent?</p> <p><b>Ms Ransom</b>—We have been recording infected properties since we were notified of the disease in late April. We thought that the cooler conditions in winter would slow the infection down and we believe that has happened. We did think that under the cooler conditions it would be more difficult to find the disease—that the rust would not show up as it would under warmer conditions—but we have been picking up infection through winter. There is nothing to indicate at this stage that the amount of infection is increasing exponentially or at a great rate. Most of the infection has been found through tracing activities, particularly with a focus on nurseries. Where plants have been moving between nurseries and we have found an infected site, there has</p>

				<p>been tracing back to the origin or forward beyond that to see if we can find infected material.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Perhaps you might take on notice giving the committee a time line of each of the determinations of the outbreaks and where they were.</p> <p><b>Ms Ransom</b>—Yes.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I asked you for a time line of where the observations all occurred. Can you give me a whole time line of everything that has been done from the beginning to now in terms of the decisions that have been made, why they have been made and what has happened? Are there alarm bells going off all over the place about this?</p>
<b>BSG 06 (Food)</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to each of the industry sectors, can you provide an update on the progress and whether or not each of the taskforces will meet all of their targets within the stipulated time?</li> <li>2. Will all of the taskforces be able to complete their work within their respective budgets as originally set?</li> <li>3. Will each of the taskforces achieve their targets with respect to costed efficiencies as originally set?</li> <li>4. What are the costs to AQIS of each of the taskforces? Can you please provide a breakdown of the various costs (e.g. staff costs)?</li> <li>5. Are these costs being recovered from each of the taskforces' budgets?</li> <li>6. What stage is the Ernst &amp; Young report into the costs of government at? You said in May the report was with the taskforce for 30 days comment and would then be provided to the Minister? Will this report be released publicly?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 07 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What industry consultative process was used to determine the "practicalities " of these new fumigation protocols?</li> <li>2. Has there been any investigation of the financial impost on industry to meet the "new standards" being introduced?</li> <li>3. Fans for "aeration". Why is this regulation required now and has not been prior?</li> <li>4. Within the text of the advice, what is the determination of a "live pest"? (there needs to be clearer clarification on what constitutes a "live pest" as there has been considerable cost to industry when there has been ambiguity over wording and/or interpretation of certain clauses within the Act previously)</li> <li>5. Can all the "other reasons" for rejection be detailed or where can someone find a list of "other reasons"? (it is too ambiguous to leave it open ended – there should at least be a reference to where registered premises can find the list of other reasons)</li> <li>6. How does the work of AQIS in developing these new protocols for fumigating with</li> </ol>

				Methyl Bromide fit with that of NSW WorkCover which undertakes licensing and auditing of registered fumigators using Methyl Bromide alongside the state protocol?
<b>BSG 08 (Animal)</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I have had a representation from a constituent in Western Australia who has an out of pocket claim against AQIS.</li> <li>2. The claim results from AQIS refusing to allow two separate consignments of semen straws to be exported in the same flask resulting in additional cost of approx \$3000 for the smaller consignment which was only worth that much.</li> <li>3. Can AQIS explain why the two consignments were not allowed to be exported in the same flask?</li> <li>4. When was the claim made to AQIS?</li> <li>5. Has AQIS responded to the client? When?</li> <li>6. Does AQIS intend on meeting the additional costs of the client (in part or full)?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 09 (Strategic Project)</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could DAFF advise what is the current status of myrtle rust?</li> <li>2. What work has been undertaken to assess the risk posed to the Australian forest industry by the outbreak of Myrtle Rust in NSW?</li> <li>3. What work is being undertaken to contain and eradicate myrtle rust?</li> <li>4. For how long does DAFF anticipate work will need to be undertaken at a national level to monitor the disease?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 10 (Animal with input from APD)</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Australian Standards for Live Animal Export are enforced at a Commonwealth level by AQIS. Are there state-based authorities capable of undertaking this enforcement?</li> <li>2. What percentage of shipments does AQIS check to ensure they are conforming to the ASLAEs?</li> <li>3. Are the ASLAEs legally enforceable? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What penalties are in place for breaches of the ASLAEs?</li> <li>b. Since the introduction of the ASLAEs, how many shipments have been penalised for not meeting the standards?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Were the ASLAEs drawn up with input from animal welfare agencies?</li> <li>5. When are the ASLAEs due to be reviewed?</li> <li>6. Do the ASLAE take into account variations such as the length of the journey the animals will be undertaking, what weather they are likely to experience and so on, or are they generic standards applied to all cases?</li> <li>7. How does AQIS ensure that the ASLAEs are adhered to once the animals have left Australia?</li> </ol>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are they monitored during the journey?</li> <li>b. Are conditions at their destination taken into account and monitored?</li> </ul> <p>8. What standards to countries importing live animals from Australia have to meet in terms of animal welfare?</p> <p>9. What studies have been done into how much of the live animal export trade could be replaced with a chilled meat trade?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What do these studies conclude?</li> </ul>
<b>BSG 11 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the Spotted Winged Drosophila (SWD or <i>Drosophila suzukii</i>) Pest Risk Analysis (known as PRA) been released?</li> <li>2. If not, why not?</li> <li>3. If not, with such an unknown, why is the IRA on Chinese apples not halted?</li> <li>4. Is this an appropriate Level of Protection?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 12 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will consignments of Chinese apples be homogenous?</li> <li>2. If not, doesn't that mean the science used for inspection will not be appropriate?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 13 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How can yo be sure that the Chinese apples will be from specific provinces?</li> <li>2. What are the protocols to ensure this?</li> <li>3. How will these protocols be policed/monitored?</li> <li>4. Is forgery of certificates a problem in China?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 14 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does China import nursery stock from Fire Blight affected countries, without it being placed in quarantine?</li> <li>2. Does Australia import nursery stock from Fire Blight affected countries, without being placed in quarantine?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 15 (Animal)</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>2007 Equine Influenza outbreak cost in excess of \$100m, and multiple Hendravirus disease outbreaks in Australia, there are remaining concerns about Australia's ability to detect and contain exotic plant and livestock disease incursions or manage outbreaks amongst, especially in at-risk rural and regional areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DAFF maintains 'sentinel' livestock herds in regional Australia to test for incursions of exotic livestock diseases. Are these sufficient and sufficiently tested to adequately detect exotic disease incursions?</li> <li>2. Is the single remaining diagnostic laboratory operational in Australia, the CSIRO</li> </ol>

				<p>Australian Animal Health Laboratory (AAHL), capable of diagnosing exotic and zoonotic disease incursions before they develop into outbreaks, given the long asymptomatic periods of incubation of some of these diseases?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. What is the approximate latency between detection of potential diseases in these sentinel herds or privately owned livestock to diagnosis of suspected diseased livestock samples at AAHL, and is this sufficient to prevent outbreaks?</li> <li>4. Is AQIS capable of containing incursions of dangerous exotic zoonotic diseases (such as Hendravirus) or diseases with material cost to food-producing livestock (such as foot and mouth disease, footrot, Johne's disease, etc) before they develop into outbreaks?</li> <li>5. What internal quarantine procedures have been implemented since the 2007 EI outbreak to prevent the spread of infection through livestock once an incursion has been detected?</li> <li>6. Are there any plans to fund and reopen defunct regional veterinary and horticultural diagnostic laboratories to reduce the time lag for diagnosing exotic disease incursions?</li> <li>7. In the context of the approximate cost of an exotic disease outbreak, what was the financial outlay of maintaining these now-defunct regional veterinary and horticultural diagnostic laboratories?</li> <li>8. What support, financial or institutional, is being provided to encourage newly trained veterinarians to work in large animal practices in regional and rural agricultural areas?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG 16 (Food)</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What progress is being made to resume kangaroo export agreements with Russia? How soon do you expect exports to Russia to resume?</li> <li>2. What is the timeframe for a review of Australian export-standard kangaroo processing plants by a Russian audit team, as indicated by AQIS at the last Estimates session on the 25<sup>th</sup> May 2010?</li> <li>3. What was the total Government funding to assist with compliance by the kangaroo industry to the new requirements?</li> <li>4. Kangaroo harvesters are required to undergo re-training under the new requirements to be accredited in 2011. Was this re-training included in any financial support provided by the Government?</li> <li>5. The new requirements are specified by AQIS as additional requirements for wild game meat intended for export only. Are kangaroo harvesters for the local market (i.e. non-export only) supported by Government funding for this re-training?</li> <li>6. Are kangaroo processing establishments that handle stock for both local and export markets required to comply with the new processing requirements across all stock or just the stock meant for export – if not, are there sufficient controls in place to prevent cross-handling of stock?</li> </ol>

				<p>7. Are kangaroo harvesters and establishments for product intended for local consumption exempt from the new processing requirements, which include refinement of hygienic procedures to prevent contamination and maintain wholesomeness of the carcasses – if so, why?</p> <p>8. The new requirements place an emphasis on micro-reporting and recording at every stage of the supply chain. What safeguards are in place to prevent tampering with records at any point in the supply chain to ensure compliance with the new requirements?</p> <p>9. Is the auditing process capable of ensuring the ability of chillers operated by field depots to adequately refrigerate carcasses within the time specified in all conditions?</p> <p><i>Hygiene standards for processing local and export stock</i></p> <p>10. Why are there discrepancies between maximum time to refrigeration, and therefore the time between chilling the carcase to a safe temperature, for wild game harvested at day or night, and between wild game and non-game carcasses?</p> <p><i>Current Australian Standards:</i></p> <p>11. Non-game carcasses are refrigerated dressed, i.e. bled, skinned and eviscerated post-inspection. Wild game carcasses are field dressed at harvesting site, with much of the viscera (including the lungs, liver, heart and kidneys which are unfit for human consumption) retained in the carcase for inspection. What measures are taken to prevent contamination of edible material in the carcase by inedible material (i.e. viscera) over the period of time that may elapse from harvesting to inspection, and why is there a discrepancy between the requirements for wild game and non-game carcasses given the hygiene concerns?</p> <p>12. At what stage during the meat inspection process is meat sampled for contamination or microbial infection that may otherwise be undetectable by the standard physical examination?</p> <p>13. Why are hygiene standards lower for wild game meat in comparison to other red meat protein sources?</p>
<b>BSG 17 (Plant)</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Dr Colin Grant, in an open letter published in The Land (NSW) on 26 August 2010, stated:</p> <p><i>“For a variety of reasons, which have all been explained by Australian and US government authorities, US export figures will include shipments that may be proposed for export to</i></p>

				<p><i>Australia but do not enter Australia or where products have been mis-coded by the US exporter. “</i></p> <p>What exactly are the "reasons" Dr Grant refers to in this statement?</p>
<b>BSG 18 (Plant/ Food)</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What proposals does AQIS have to reduce the inspection costs on small businesses who undertake small export orders, particularly in the horticulture and grains sectors?</li> <li>2. Has AQIS consulted with such businesses to determine how they can be assisted in reducing red tape and costs through reforms made under the Export Certification Reform Package?</li> <li>3. Has or is AQIS considering the formation of benchmarks for inspection times so as to provide greater consistency and certainty for small business operators who undertake small export orders?</li> <li>4. What interaction has taken place between AQIS and the State Governments to ensure the reduction of red tape and regulatory costs with respect to small export orders? In particular, what consultation has been conducted with quarantine and inspection authorities in the Tasmania Government? What were the outcomes of these consultations?</li> </ol>
<b>BSG/ APLC 01 (Plant/APL C)</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you give me an update on the current outlook for locusts, their likely impact in rural and regional Australia and any Nationally coordinated measures to manage any outbreak?</li> <li>2. How is the department involved in the programme to eradicate locusts spreading all the way down to Victoria?</li> <li>3. Has funding been provided to states/territories to assist them in eradicating locusts?</li> <li>4. What programmes have been implemented (either by state or commonwealth depts) to control the spread of the locusts?</li> <li>5. What is the current advice in relation to the spread of locusts?</li> <li>6. What advice has the Department received in relation to the potential area spread of the locusts?</li> <li>7. Has the department undertaken any work to determine the potential damage to our Agriculture sector as a result of the locusts?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 01</b>	20/10/10	110	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I will open up another can of worms. The issue is the importation of agricultural products into New Zealand for processing in New Zealand and then sending to Australia labelled as ‘made in New Zealand’. I should say it comes from third-party nations, it is imported into New Zealand and then it comes here as New Zealand product. Do we have any way of measuring that, or how we can potentially manage that? I know that it is a function of the bilateral arrangement that we have with New Zealand—I understand that—but we are</p>

				<p>seeing a number of our food processors move into New Zealand. McCains made a decision in April to move all their vegetable processing to New Zealand, so effectively McCains do not grow a pea in Australia—or will not after this season. Potentially, the peas could come from anywhere and be labelled as coming from New Zealand.</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I think we will have to take that on notice. I understand the issue you are raising but we just might have to take on notice the degree to which we can be specific about—</p>
<b>APD 02</b>	N/A	Written	Siewert	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Commonwealth budget for research and development into Genetically Manipulated (GM) crops, plants and micro-organisms in each of the past 20 years?</li> <li>2. What is the value of commercial benefits from this publicly-funded GM research over the past 20 years?</li> <li>3. What share of these commercial benefits accrued to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the government;</li> <li>b. farmers; and</li> <li>c. other commercial entities?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. What was the Commonwealth research and development budget for organic and sustainable farming systems in each of the past 20 years?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 03</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can DAFF advise on what are now the remaining funds over this and the next financial years for the program?</li> <li>2. When will the next round of funding be announced? What will be the level of funds available for this round?</li> <li>3. How much of this will be for seafood (Labor promised \$10 million over 5 years for seafood specifically)?</li> <li>4. Can you please advise on any reductions to this fund since the original \$35 million commitment? What was the level of each reduction and to which program was it diverted?</li> <li>5. What promotion of the program has DAFF undertaken with respect to the seafood industry? What organisation or businesses have been corresponded with relating to the possibility of applying for the program?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 04</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you provide a rundown of DAFF's involvement since Budget Estimates in the inter-governmental labelling law and policy review chaired by Neal Blewett?</li> <li>2. Has the review panel drafted its report and recommendations? Has DAFF been privy to this draft?</li> </ol>

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. According to the review's website, the final report of the Review Committee will be provided to the Government through the Australia and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council in December 2010 and to COAG in early 2011. Will this still occur?</li> <li>4. At Budget Estimates, Mr Souness said DAFF is working with the States through a subcommittee of the Food Regulation Standing Committee to encourage greater enforcement of country of origin labelling. Can you please advise on the status of this work?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 05</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Agricultural Productivity section contain a taskforce, unit or group of employees who are working specifically on the Murray Darling Basin issue?</li> <li>2. How many personnel does this unit contain? When was it formed? When will it disband?</li> <li>3. Are personnel attending the MDBA consultation meetings? What other activities are they undertaking?</li> <li>4. What type of advice are they providing to DAFF, the Minister, the MDBA or other agencies?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 06</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the Department provide advice on the requirements of products from NZ to have country of origin labelling, particularly horticulture products?</li> <li>2. Is the Department aware of NZ food manufacturers, including vegetable manufacturers, importing product from China (or other 3<sup>rd</sup> party nations) and then packaging it up as 'Made in NZ' or similar?</li> <li>3. What level of bulk wine is exported into Australia from NZ?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 07</b>	N/A	Written	Colbeck	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What resources has DAFF assigned to the MDB Plan (&amp; consultations) in 2009-10 and in 2010-11?</li> <li>2. What is the total cost of DAFF's contribution to the Plan (&amp; consultations) in 2009-10 and in 2010-11?</li> <li>3. How many staff are assigned to the current round of meetings (or attended any of the meetings? What are their positions?</li> <li>4. What is the budget for their travel and accommodation for these meetings? What is the budget for other hospitality expenses incurred?</li> <li>5. Does the Minister and/or his staff intend on attending any of the meetings? If so, when? If not, why not?</li> </ol>
<b>APD 08</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Farmers have had to really drive hard agricultural productivity during the drought to stay afloat.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has there been any research on the increase in debt levels on farms during the drought to maximise productivity?</li> </ol>

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Has there been any research on the impacts of further cuts to production under a basin plan and whether farmers can financially withstand another financial hit</li> <li>3. Has the Department geared up its productivity area to meet the new challenges imposed under cuts in irrigation due to the Basin Plan./</li> <li>4. Does your Agricultural productivity area have a strategy to deal with the water cuts under the Basin Plan.</li> <li>5. Has the the department and specifically the productivity area meet with the MDBA, or the department of sustainability, Environment Water Population and Communities or the Department responsible for of regional Australia under Minister Crean to discuss the impacts of water cuts on agricultural production</li> <li>6. Are you aware of any cross port foli committee charged with overseeing the impacts on water cuts on regional Australia</li> <li>7. Have they done any modelling on the impact of fresh fruit and vegetables prices due to the cuts in water in the MDB</li> </ol>
<b>APD 09</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the department conducted any work on the return on Investment on the funding for R&amp;D? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If yes, has the work shown that funding provides a good return on investment and that increases in funding be beneficial?</li> <li>b. What feedback has the department had from the sector in relation to future R&amp;D requirements?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. What are the priority areas for R&amp;D in the short term/medium term? (eg. next 12 months/24 months)</li> </ol>
<b>APD 10</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	When will the Government respond to recommendations made by the Senate Select Committee on Agriculture in its report on Food production in Australia (tabled on 23 August 2010), especially the response to Recommendation 1 regarding foreign investment in agricultural land and water?
<b>APD 11</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>The live export industry is worth \$996m in livestock sales and almost \$1 billion in wages pa, employs more than 13,000 Australians.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the current position and policy by the Department in relation to live exports?</li> <li>2. Is the current policy undergoing any changes?</li> </ol>
<b>APVMA 01</b>	20/10/10	121	Colbeck	<b>Senator COLBECK</b> —I am looking to get some revised protocols that have been listed by AQIS in particular and, I think, perhaps brought on by the events earlier this year in Tasmania,

				<p>where there was an issue with the fumigation of a log ship out of Burnie. I understand that there have been requirements for a period of time, based on some work that the APVMA have done, for ventilation of containers and recapture of methyl bromide in the fumigation process and a process for opening containers that have been fumigated overseas with methyl bromide. I just want to get some clarification on that.</p> <p><b>Dr Bennet-Jenkins</b>—The APVMA’s involvement in recent times has been that we reviewed methyl bromide for the environmental effects, particularly the ozone depletion effects, to make sure that the use pattern and the label instructions complied with the Montreal protocol requirements. So it was largely an environmental review that we conducted. As part of that, we did consider the use of recapture technology.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—There were some health effects from the product too, though, from my recollection.</p> <p><b>Dr Bennet-Jenkins</b>—That review, though, was principally the Montreal protocol review. At that time those health effects were not specifically raised with us as requiring a review. We did look at recapture technology, but again that was mostly in terms of environmental effects, and at that stage we did not mandate that people use recapture technology because not all businesses were able to do that. My recollection is that the issues we responded to a few months ago were in relation to providing advice in terms of the label instructions that carry instructions on how people should be using methyl bromide and what precautions they should observe. In addition to that, the fumigation industry, as well as the Maritime Safety Authority, have protocols that they follow and it is really a matter for the state authorities as to how they enforce those particular protocols and how they enforce their label instructions.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—My recollection was that there were different protocols in each state and I think that at that stage Tasmania had had a mandatory recapture process, particularly for containerised fumigation, since about 2006.</p> <p><b>Dr Bennet-Jenkins</b>—There is going to be a meeting on 5 November between the states and territories. The APVMA is hosting that meeting and it is going to be looking at some of those issues. I do not have the details of that meeting with me, but we could provide you with some information on the agenda for that meeting and what is going to be discussed, and I think that at that stage we will look at some of those issues.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—If you could take it on notice, that would be fantastic, and perhaps it is possible to provide us with some information on the outcomes of that meeting. I recognise that that may be beyond a certain date that we have discussed a couple of times here today, but I certainly would appreciate getting some feedback on that.</p> <p><b>Dr Bennet-Jenkins</b>—Certainly.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>APVMA 02</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why does the APVMA continue to narrow the options for farmers for cost effective chemical options in managing the production because of risk assessment for example on endosulfan look at the impacts of poor management. Farmers in Australia are highly regulated in chemical use, all have to undertake extensive training and having to abide by onerous storage and usage requirements. Yet APVMA continue to look at the worst case scenarios. Does APVMA do any economic impacts assessments on the decisions taken by your agency</li> <li>2. APVMA is working on amines by enforcing buffer zones that make it impossible to control the weeds and pests the chemicals are designed for. Do you look at the alternative options when imposing over zealous controls?</li> <li>3.</li> </ol>
<b>APVMA 03</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Authority have any idea what the costs of the proposed zones for the chemical 24-D are likely to cost firstly, the chemical industry and then farmers who will have their spraying programs severely compromised by the regulations?</li> <li>2. Can you inform the committee how old the data used to calculate the impact of spray droplets is?</li> <li>3. Do the proposed regulations take into account the great advances made in spraying technologies?</li> <li>4. Is there ant mechanism for the Authority to take into account economic and practical concerns when setting new guidelines”?</li> </ol>
<b>MLA 01</b>	N/A	Written	Williams	Since the MLA has been formed an estimated \$100 million in levies has been taken out of the New England region. Can the MLA quantify what the region’s producers have received in return?
<b>MLA 02</b>	N/A	Written	Williams	With the restrictions on the type of beef Indonesia will now import, what marketing plan does the MLA have in place for cow beef in the domestic and export markets?
<b>MLA 03</b>	N/A	Written	Williams	Why have the MLA called for a full disclosure of signatures on a document originating in Tasmania calling for the wind-up of the MLA?
<b>MLA 04</b>	N/A	Written	Williams	If this information is obtained, how will the MLA use it, and will there be ramifications for those who have signed it?
<b>MLA 05</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	The Senate RATT Committee Inquiry into the meat industry structure in 2002 made eight recommendations for change. Nos 7 and 8 were –

				<p><b>Recommendation 7:</b> <i>The Committee recommends that the selection committee for the (R&amp;D) contracts include an independent probity auditor and a representative of AFFA.</i></p> <p><b>Recommendation 8:</b> <i>The Committee recommends that the size and recipient of these contracts, and outcomes delivered, be placed on the advisory body's web site, and reported by AFFA to the Minister.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why, after 8 years does MLA R&amp;D have 30% of the work under “ Commercial and in Confidence” and unavailable to those who fund the programs?</li> <li>2. Why does MLA continue to claim success for levy payers’ promotion dollars with higher prices to consumers when we all know that the increase prices lie in supermarket mark ups? Why won’t you publish the producer share of the consumer dollar that is done in USA, NZ and UK?</li> <li>3. MLA is meant to be a delivery company and not to be involved in politics. Why were you heavily involved in the beef from BSE affected countries debacle?</li> </ol>
<b>MLA 06</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the MLA looked at the impacts of reduced allocations in the MDB Plan on the meat and livestock industry?</li> <li>2. Could the C'tee have a copy of your studies and findings?</li> </ol>
<b>AWBC 01</b>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has Australian Wine and Brandy Corp. looked at the impacts of reduced allocations in the MDB on the wine industry.</li> <li>2. If so, can the C'tee have a copy of your studies and findings?</li> </ol>
<b>AWI 01</b>	20/10/2010	144	Back	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—No. I was going to ask what expenditure was on research but perhaps I can put that on notice and get some idea from you as to the expenditure and the projects into which AWI expended funds on wool research, but with time constrained I would be happy for you to provide it on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr McCullough</b>—Okay.</p>
<b>GRDC 01</b>	20/10/10	145	Nash	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That would seem to be a very good reason to retain GRDC as they are, I would think. Anyway, I am obviously terribly worried, Dr O’Connell, seeing some of this funding just disappear out the door. Can you perhaps provide to the committee—I know you say about 70 per cent of the work—information on the work that you are doing on that water use efficiency, or certainly direct us to where it is obviously publicly available? If you could</p>

			<p>just alert the committee to that, because that is probably one of the key areas at the moment that we really need to look at—where the work is being done, where we can increase the productivity through water use efficiency, which we have been saying for some time now is the most appropriate way of doing it.</p> <p><b>Mr Reading</b>—We are happy to do that and also, as we have mentioned in previous discussions, the advances that have already been made—and the one we always quote is Western Australia. If you look at figures in 1969, the average in-season rainfall was 152 millimetres per season and the average yield was 400 kilos, and track that fast to 2006 and the average in-season rainfall has declined to 110 millimetres and the average yield now is over 990 kilos there. This has been ongoing for a long time and it is absolutely critical. The things that have contributed to that have been farming practices, in terms of minimum and reduced tillage et cetera, and now increasingly genetics are starting to play a role.</p>
--	--	--	---

Questions on notice taken at Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings on Wednesday 20 October 2010 – and answered later in the hearing

QON No.	Date Asked	Hansard page reference/ Written	Senator	Question
<p><b>CPD</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7</b> <b>-Q1</b></p>	20/10/2010	10	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—But tell me, Dr O’Connell, what day did the Senate set for the answers to be delivered?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I will have to pass that over.</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—I think, Senator, obviously as the minister has indicated with the new government—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—No. Can you answer the question, please? We will get along a lot faster if you answer the question rather than make excuses for the minister.</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—It was 21 July 2010.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Okay, 21 July. In all cases, we have heard the election as the excuse. This was a month before the election. Dr O’Connell, how many of the answers did you send up by the required date?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—I would have to take that on notice, I am afraid, and provide you with a—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Well, was it most of them?</p> <p><b>Dr O’Connell</b>—We could probably provide you with the answer later today.</p> <p><b>Ms Freeman</b>—Yes, we can provide that to you today.</p>
<p><b>CC</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7</b> <b>-Q3</b></p>	20/10/2010	14	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—With the costings on the illegal logging policy, what resources within DAFF will be used to implement the policy?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—Senator, essentially those resources will be staff resources and potentially the purchase of relevant services for the implementation of that policy. I think it is going to be profiled over three years.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—What is the budget for staff versus services?</p> <p><b>Mr Mortimer</b>—I will have to take that on notice, Senator. I do not have that level of detail with me, I am afraid.</p>
<p><b>CPD</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p>	20/10/2010	18	Colbeck	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—With respect to ministerial officers outside the parliament, what additional resources are being provided to the minister and the parliamentary secretary in their electorate regions?</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Has any additional space been allocated as a result of his</p>

<p><b>Tabled doc 7 -Q2</b></p>				<p>appointment to the portfolio, do you know?  <b>Ms Bi</b>—I would have to get back to you and take that on notice.  <b>Senator COLBECK</b>—If you take that on notice, that is fine.</p>
<p><b>CC (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</b></p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7 -Q4</b></p>	<p>20/10/2010</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>Siewert</p>	<p><b>Mr Noble</b>—Progress on the drought pilot to date has been fairly strong. If the committee would like, I can run through measure by measure to give a sense of the level of take-up of the different measures.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—That would be good.  <b>Mr Noble</b>—For the farm-planning measure, which is the program providing the training to farm businesses, the Department of Agriculture and Food in Western Australia advice to 30 September 2010 is that there have been 341 farm business applications approved and over 375 applications received. For that program, 11 of the training groups are actually underway—those are groups of 10 to 15 farm businesses running through the program and—25 participants have completed the training. That represents 10 farm businesses. So that is the farm-planning program. With the Building Farm Businesses grants, the first applications for that particular program are expected in October as the farm businesses complete the prerequisite farm-planning program. I think our advice earlier in the week from the Department of Agriculture and Food in Western Australia was that so far they have received three applications for that. Clearly, it is very early days for that program. The Farm Family Support Program—the income support program delivered by Centrelink in the region—to 1 October 2010, Centrelink advised that they had received 169 applications for that program. The Stronger Rural Communities Program—  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—They have received those applications. Have they all been approved?  <b>Mr Noble</b>—To date, 21 claims have been granted and 90 are being assessed.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—So 21 granted?  <b>Mr Noble</b>—Yes.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—And 19 assessed?  <b>Mr Noble</b>—And 90 are being assessed.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—So there is still 50-odd, or a bit under 50-odd, that have not been dealt with?  <b>Mr Noble</b>—They have either been dealt with or rejected. We are advised by Centrelink that the rejection rate is equivalent to similar rural programs delivered by Centrelink.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—How many of those remaining have been rejected and how many have not been dealt with?  <b>Mr Noble</b>—I think approximately 50 of the applications received have been rejected.  <b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—And why would they have been rejected?</p>

				<p><b>Mr Noble</b>—There is a range of reasons. I can take on notice, if you would like, a breakdown.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—That would be good.</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—For example, it is things such as farmers not meeting the eligibility criteria or the insufficient provision of information and so forth.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—If you could take that on notice, that would be good. Thank you.</p>
<p><b>CC</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7 -Q4</b></p>	20/10/2010	22	Siewert	<p><b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—I am going to flip back to the farming families support process. In terms of the pilot area, have there been applications received from outside the pilot area?</p> <p><b>Mr Noble</b>—I am not aware. Again, I can double-check whether one of the rejection reasons has been because the applicants were outside the pilot region. I would think that is a very low number. Centrelink provides a range of other services to people outside of the pilot region as well.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT</b>—Thank you.</p>
<p><b>SRM</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7 -Q6</b></p>	20/10/2010	66 (Also mentioned on 69 and 70)	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Perhaps you should give me the same figures across the open call process and what is the other one called? Closed call process, is it—Landcare projects.</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—Yes, we can do that.</p> <p><b>Ms Lauder</b>—So the open call—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—No, all three together, do you have that?</p> <p><b>Ms Lauder</b>—No, I am sorry.</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We have them all as separate numbers. We will have to get back to you on adding them together. We can do that. We should be able to do that today.</p>
<p><b>SRM</b> (tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</p> <p><b>Tabled doc 7 -Q7</b></p>	20/10/2010	72	Macdonald	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—There is a review and reform supposedly of arrangements for the NRM, which you mentioned before, and there is to be a mid-term review of Caring for our Country. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—Yes, that is what we have spoken to stakeholders about.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Who is going to undertake that review?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—The planning for that review is at quite an early stage and so those detailed arrangements are under consideration, but we would envisage something that involved some quite solid evidence-based work and a lot of engagement, consultation and input from the whole range of Natural Resource Management stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—So when do you hope/plan/estimate that this review will take place?</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—We expect to start the review shortly, in the next month or so. We would like to report next year. We have scheduled a stakeholder discussion on 11 November with a whole range of people. That is the sort of discussion that would contribute to the mid-</p>

				<p>term review. We will also be getting feedback on this year's business plan and any other comments they might have on the program in general. It is one of those regular type meetings we have.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Will you be getting an independent consultant to do the review or is it going to be people from your department or people from the state departments or—</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—As I said, it is still quite early days in designing the review. We have not decided that yet.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—So that is not certain. Can you, on notice, give me a list of the stakeholders you will be consulting, if that has been done yet, even in broad terms, for example, 'All Landcare groups in New South Wales'.</p> <p><b>Mr Thompson</b>—In broad terms we would be consulting with as many people as possible who have an interest in this space. We can sort of give you that broad categorisation, but we do some of these reviews now by saying, 'Put your comment on the web page', type thing, so we would be quite keen for people who are not necessarily on our mailing lists to identify themselves and make a contribution. We are after the broadest range of input as possible.</p>
<p><b>AFMA</b> <b>(tabled at hearing on 20/10/10)</b></p> <p><b>Tabled doc 5</b></p>	20/10/2010	82	Boswell/Colbeck	<p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Well, whose area is it in? The question is relatively simple. I have given you some instances in the Coral Sea where the fisheries have gone well above the CPI. Now, I am asking you: have you got any other instances where the CPI has been exceeded?</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Is there a chart or something that you could provide to us so that we could see this, rather than—I mean, it would be valuable information for us to be able to sit down and have a look at, at some point in time. So if you were able to provide that, I would appreciate it. I do not know whether Senator Boswell is after it, but it was something I was going to come to later. I would appreciate that.</p> <p><b>Mr Perrott</b>—I do have the detailed calculations that show all the different movements and the costs between the two financial years.</p> <p><b>Senator BOSWELL</b>—Thank you for that.</p>