

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 01

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Fertiliser

Hansard Page: 101 (08/02/2010)

Senator Williams asked: Fair enough. I want to take you to another issue, Mr Grant, which has been a concern of mine for many years, and that is the productivity of cereal crops and the condition of our soil and fertiliser. Two years ago we had exceptionally high fertiliser prices—I think MAP was around \$1,700 a tonne. I know we have one phosphate mine in Queensland but I think it exports every ounce it produces. Is it the situation that we import all of our fertiliser?

Answer:

No.

Source: Fertilizer Industry Federation of Australia Executive Manager Pers Comm 2010.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 02

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Wine Industry Tariffs

Hansard Page: 102 (08/02/2010)

Senator Williams asked:

Does China have a large import tariff on wine such as countries like Thailand have? I think Thailand has 370 per cent, or some outrageous level, of import tariff. Do you know if China has also got large barriers up as far as importing wine?

As I said, it was 370 per cent. I think that, under the free trade agreement with Thailand, it might have come down a bit, but a basic bottle of wine in Australia for \$10—you would pay A\$55 in Thailand. Of course it is nearly all import duty, which is holding the market back enormously, especially with their tourist industry. These are obviously barriers we have to try to get over.

Answer:

Chinese Government tariffs for wine imports are set at 20 per cent for bulk wine, and 14 per cent for bottled wine.

Under the Australia – Thailand Free Trade Agreement, Thailand is reducing its previous 64 per cent tariff on wine to zero by 2015.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 03

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Grown in Australia label election commitment

Hansard Page: 103 (08/02/2010)

Senator Nash asked - I am sure Minister, that I would be right if I were to say the government is still intending to honour all their election commitments.

Senator Sherry—It was an election commitment and we have three years, I would point out, to implement election commitments. I will take it on notice and see if there is anything further from the minister.

Senator NASH—All right. But, as with all of the election commitments, they will be fulfilled, as has been the government's view? Senator Conroy spends a lot of time in this room saying that you are going to fulfil all your election commitments.

Senator Sherry—The Prime Minister has made it very clear about election commitments. But as far as this specific issue is concerned I will, as I say, take it on notice and we will see if the minister can provide you with further detail.

Answer:

The Australian Government has been clear it intends to honour all its election commitments.

The *Trade Practices Amendment (Australian Consumer Law) Bill (No. 2) 2010*, introduced into Parliament by the government on 17 March 2010 includes a provision for a 'Grown In' claim to be made when products are not only made but also grown in the country claimed as origin. This will assist consumers to choose products that are not only made in Australia but also grown in Australia

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 04

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Research and development (R&D) levies reported in official statistics

Hansard Page: 107 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Where would that statutory levy investment come in then, in those figures?

Mr Grant—It comes into the Commonwealth investment. The matched funding and statutory levy moneys are within the Commonwealth money—

Senator COLBECK—So both amounts are in that \$349 million?

Mr Grant—Yes, they are in the \$349 million.

Senator COLBECK—Are you sure that is right? My recollection is that it was in excess of half a billion dollars in that time frame, 2006-07, and it is still more than that.

Mr Grant—That is true, yes. I would have to check those figures, wouldn't I, because the investment in—

Senator COLBECK—Because I think we cracked half a billion dollars during 2005-06.

Mr Grant—Yes, my apologies. I would have to check where the industry levy moneys go. So certainly the Commonwealth matching money would be in the \$349 million.

Senator COLBECK—Yes, I am happy to accept that.

Mr Grant—So \$200 million of that would be—but I would just have to check. Yes, and CSIRO is in there as well, so it is probably the total of those two.

Senator COLBECK—I would suggest there is very little chance of the—

Mr Grant—On balance, you may be right that the industry levy moneys may be in business investment, but I would have to confirm that with the data.

Mr Glyde—We should be able to provide the table and the sources of information after we have consulted with the ABS on that.

Senator COLBECK—So the total spend has gone from \$0.75 billion to \$1.67 billion—

Mr Grant—Yes.

Senator COLBECK—in that 10-year period. What is that in terms of real growth?

Mr Grant—I do not have that figure. I would have to check. I would have to take that on notice.

Senator COLBECK—I would be interested in that calculation to get a sense of where it has actually gone—and I understand that there are fluctuations, particularly in the matching funding, depending on—

Mr Grant—The timing of payments and drought and other—

Senator COLBECK—drought and other conditions within the markets.

Mr Grant—Yes.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 04 (continued)

Answer:

Mr Grant advised the committee of the amount spent by the Commonwealth on agricultural R&D as \$349 million.

The \$349 million figure represents spending by Commonwealth researchers themselves, not spending by researchers in other sectors funded by the Commonwealth. The figure therefore under represents total government funding of R&D directed towards the agriculture, fisheries, forestry and food sector. Industry R&D levies and matching government funds will also appear as R&D expenditure included under several research fields in addition to the field for agricultural, veterinary and environmental sciences. It is not possible therefore to accurately identify the source of funding (industry levies funds and matching Commonwealth funds) in ABS R&D expenditure statistics.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 05

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Fruit Logistica

Hansard Page: 110 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Do you have any response to criticisms from various industry groups with respect to our non-attendance at the Fruit Logistica trade fair?

Answer:

Fruit Logistica is an industry trade fair and not a government forum. Through Horticulture Australia Limited (HAL) the vegetable industry, the citrus industry and the Australian Horticultural Exporters Association allocated levy funds or voluntary contributions to support the attendance of their industry members at Fruit Logistica. HAL's export development portfolio and Australia Fresh campaign manager and a director of HAL attended and managed the Australia Fresh stand at Fruit Logistica, in conjunction with industry representatives.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 06

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Fruit Logistica

Hansard Page: 110 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Do you have any sense of the fair itself: who attends and its composition?

Answer:

Fruit Logistica is a trade fair for the fresh produce industry. According to the organisers of Fruit Logistica more than 2300 exhibitors from 71 countries attended in 2010. Exhibitors are drawn from the full length of the value chain including fruit and vegetable growers, wholesalers and retailers, importers and exporters, transport logistics companies and companies that supply equipment for produce handling, sorting, packing, packaging and storage.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 07

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Regional Food Producers Innovation and Productivity Program

Hansard Page: 111 (08/02/2010)

Senator COLBECK asked:

What proportion of the \$6.4 million in round 1 would be contracted?

Answer:

As at 24 February, nine funding agreements have been signed to a total of \$2.6 million.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 08

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity

Topic: VegVision 2020

Hansard Page: 112 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

But what about the work that was supposed to occur to explore social, economic and environmental impacts? We talked about this, I think, last time. There were some studies that were being done but have not seen the light of day yet.

Answer:

See answer to APD 12.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 09

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: VegVision 2020

Hansard Page: 113 (08/02/2010)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—According to you, when did your involvement cease?

Mr Grant—I cannot give you the exact date, but it was 2007-08 or early 2008-09. Again, I can take that on notice, but I am pretty sure the last payments that we made were around that time.

Senator COLBECK—So as far as you are concerned all VegVision actions that the government might have been responsible for are completed?

Mr Grant—We helped to fund the VegVision, which is sort of a forward-thinking strategy for the industry.

Senator COLBECK—I remember it very clearly. You do not have to remind me.

Mr Grant—I guess our involvement was to facilitate the funding and the conduct of the survey, not then to implement it.

Senator COLBECK—No, I understand that. But there are some reports, as I understand it, that have not seen the light of day which the department were involved with and that is what I am trying to get to the bottom of. That is all.

Dr O'Connell—It is probably best we take that on notice.

Answer:

All of the work commissioned by the Australian Vegetable Industry Development Group has been completed and publically released. The commissioning and release of other reports that align with VegVision 2020 is a matter for Horticulture Australia Limited.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 10

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Grown in Australia label election commitment

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Back asked:

I refer you to the Document 'Labor's Plan for Primary Industries', Election 2007; Page 19 which states;

'A Rudd Labor Government will simplify and strengthen food labelling laws. This will include;

A new 'Grown in Australia' label under the Trade Practices Act for products that are not only made in Australia, but also grown in Australia.

1. What work has been undertaken on developing a new 'Grown in Australia' label?
2. Who within the Department is undertaking the work?
3. What consultations and with whom have they been held in relation to the Grown in Australia label?
4. When will the label 'Grown in Australia' be introduced?
5. What products will the label apply to?
6. Will it be compulsory for all food retail and wholesale outlets to display the label?
7. What is the expected cost to food manufacturers?
8. Who within the Department has been talking to Treasury about amending the Trade Practices Act? When were these discussions held?

I refer you to the Document 'Labor's Plan for Primary Industries', Election 2007; Page 20 which states;

Consideration of amendments to the Food Standards Code to clarify country of origin labelling requirements.

9. What 'Consideration' has the department undertaken to clarify country of origin labelling requirements?
10. What are the current requirements for the country of origin labelling on fresh food and on processed food?
11. Is it currently possible of a consumer to find out where processed food which is labelled 'packaged in Australia from import products' comes from?
12. How would the consumers find out where the imported products came from?
13. Is it possible for the department to find out where the imported products came from?
14. Has the department undertaken any work or training exercises on being able to trace back and trace forward ingredients used in processed food?
15. Who within the Department has been talking to Treasury about amending the Trade Practices Act? When were these discussions held?

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 10 (continued)

I refer you to the Document 'Labor's Plan for Primary Industries', Election 2007; Page 20 which states;

'Strengthening compliance arrangements'

16. What work has the Department undertaken to strengthen food labelling compliance arrangements?
17. Has the department made any inspections of major retailers to ensure they are labelling country of origin the food properly?
18. Who within the Department has been talking to Treasury about amending the Trade Practices Act? When were these discussions held?

Answer:

1. The *Trade Practices Amendment (Australian Consumer Law) Bill (No. 2) 2010*, introduced into Parliament by the government on 17 March 2010 includes a provision for a 'Grown In' claim to be made when products are not only made but also grown in the country claimed as origin
2. The Agricultural Productivity Division
3. The Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (DIISR) has the lead on the introduction of a "Grown In" claim. There have been consultations between DIISR, the Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF), the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) and Treasury to develop a 'Grown in ...' safe harbour defence for food products in the *Trade Practices Act 1974 (TPA)*.
4. The *Trade Practices Amendment (Australian Consumer Law) Bill (No. 2) 2010* has been referred to the Senate Economics Committee. The Committee's report is due on 21 May 2010. Following the Committee report, the Bill will then be considered by the Senate.
5. The "Grown In" claim could be applied to any product that meets the requirements.
6. No.
7. Given that the safe harbour provisions in the TPA (or the proposed Australian Consumer Law (ACL) framework) do not mandate the use of a '*Grown in Australia*' label, any costs will be a matter for businesses to determine
8. Response to question 3 refers.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 10 (continued)

9. Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ), within the Health portfolio, has responsibility for the provisions of the Food Standards Code, including country of origin labelling.

The Parliamentary Secretary for Health, the Hon Mark Butler, has asked Food Standards Australia New Zealand to review the Country of Origin Labelling standard to ensure that consumers are fully informed of the origin of the fresh beef they are buying.

10. Standard 1.2.11 of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code requires all packaged food and unpackaged fresh or processed fruit, vegetables, seafood and pork to be labelled with country of origin.
11. Further information on specific details can be sought at the point of sale or from the food manufacturer or importer.
12. Response to question 11 refers.
13. The department would work with other relevant agencies such as Customs and potentially the importers themselves to determine where the imported products came from if the package is labelled as 'Packaged in Australia from imported products'.
14. No
15. Agricultural Productivity Division has been working with DIISR, as the lead agency, in discussions with other stakeholders including Treasury.
16. The department along with the Department of Health and Ageing participates as the Australian Government delegation to the Food Regulation Standing Committee and its Implementation Sub-Committee and encourages consistent implementation and enforcement of food standards, including food labelling by states and territories who are responsible for ensuring that all foods, whether imported or locally produced, comply with all requirements in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code.
17. Enforcement of food standards including labelling is the responsibility of relevant state and territory agencies.
18. Response to question 15 refers.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 11

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: State R&D Expenditure

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Colbeck asked:

1. What analysis has been conducted of the expenditure by State Governments on agriculture R&D?
2. What levels of spending are done by State Governments on agriculture R&D? How does this compare historically?
3. Has the Federal Government – through PIMC or other means requested additional spending from State Governments?
4. Is DAFF aware of the number of jobs lost in State Government agriculture R&D? And how many research stations/centres closed in recent years?
5. What is the historic trend in agriculture productivity? Is there a breakdown by State?

Answer:

1. Individual rural industry sectors collect data on capabilities and infrastructure in each state as part of the development of the National Primary Industries Research, Development and Extension Framework.
2. This question should be directed to relevant State Government agencies.
3. PIMC is working with the states and Northern Territory, rural R&D corporations, CSIRO, and universities to jointly develop the National Primary Industries Research, Development and Extension (RD&E) Framework to encourage coordination of investment of RD&E resources nationally.
4. No.
5. The historic trend in Australian agricultural productivity is reflected in the most recent ABARE figures for the broadacre sector 1977-78 to 2007-08 (see table below). Total factor productivity for the period 1977-78 to 2007-08 averages 1.39 per cent per year.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 11 (continued)

Broadacre industry productivity growth, 1977-78 to 2007-08

average annual growth

	Total factor productivity growth	Output growth	Input growth
	%	%	%
Total broadacre	1.4	0.8	-0.6
Cropping	1.9	2.1	0.2
Mixed crop-livestock	1.4	-0.1	-1.6
Beef	1.5	1.6	0.2
Sheep	0.3	-1.5	-1.7

Source: ABARE, Australian commodities March quarter 2010.

A breakdown of broadacre productivity growth for individual states over time is provided in the table below.

Broadacre productivity growth by state, 1977- 78 to 2007- 08

average annual growth

State	Input growth	Output growth	Productivity growth 1977-78 to 2007-08	Short-term productivity growth 1998-99 to 2007-08
	%	%	%	%
WA	-0.5	1.8	2.4	0.5
SA	-0.4	1.4	1.8	-3.6
NT (beef)*	-0.2	1.5	1.7	0.8
VIC	-0.6	0.7	1.3	-1.5
NSW	-0.7	0.3	1.0	-4.0
QLD	-0.1	0.6	0.8	-1.5
TAS	-2.8	-2.1	0.7	-1.1

*NT includes only beef specialists

Source: ABARE, Australian commodities March quarter 2010.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 12

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: VegVision 2020

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Colbeck asked:

As part of VegVision, specific studies to examine input costs, including climate change costs, were begun in 2007 and due by June 2009 (Veg Vision Action 2.4.1). They were suppose to also explore the social, economic and environmental impacts of vegetable production.

1. Can DAFF provide the status of these studies?
2. Can DAFF also provide the status of all other aspects of VegVision for which it had full or part responsibility?

Answer:

1. VegVision 2020's actions are being implemented by the vegetable industry, mainly through projects funded through Horticulture Australia Limited (HAL) with industry levies and Australian Government matching funding.

DAFF has contributed with ABARE undertaking surveys on behalf of HAL, which involved collecting comprehensive data on the physical, financial and socioeconomic characteristics of vegetable farms in 2007-08 and 2008-09.

These reports can be accessed via ABARE's website.

2.

*Strategy 1.2 Increasing the promotion and marketing of Australian vegetables.
Action 1.2.2 Decision made on the introduction of a promotion and marketing levy.*

The vegetable industry has not approached DAFF with a proposal for the introduction of a marketing levy.

*Strategy 1.3 Partnering with Australian health and food education initiatives
Action 1.3.1 Collaborate with the Australian Government's Department of Health and Ageing in the Better Health Initiative.*

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 12 (continued)

Status-Complete. The Department of Health and Aging advises that the Australian Better Health Initiative ends on 30 June 2010.

Action 1.3.2 Support the Australian and state governments in continuing and strengthening the Go for 2 and 5, and other food education campaigns

Status-Ongoing. The Go for 2 and 5 campaign is supported by State and Territories and Horticulture Australia Limited.

Strategy 2.1 Building competitive advantage for domestic and export markets
Action 2.1.7 Actively engage with the government to pursue opportunities for increasing export markets through cohesive and constructive policy advice in bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations.

Status-Ongoing. The department consults with the horticulture industry on identifying market access priorities through the recently established Office of Horticulture Market Access, which has replaced the Horticulture Market Access Committee, as the primary consultation forum for this purpose.

Action 2.2.1 Following current HAL projects, examine the feasibility of an Australian quality assurance framework that validates successful systems and practices for domestic and export market requirements.

Action 2.2.2 Implement the framework in 2.2.1 if this is found to be feasible and a positive business case exists (i.e., it adds value to current quality assurance systems)

The vegetable industry has not approached DAFF for assistance with this feasibility study.

Action 2.4.1 Undertake specific studies to support industry policies on a range of issues relating to current and likely market expectations on the economic, environmental and social impacts of vegetable production and marketing. This should include energy, greenhouse, climate change, biotechnology etc.

Status-Ongoing. See response to Question 1.

Strategy 3.5 Establish an effective whole-of-supply chain R&D system.
Action 3.5.1 Review and restructure arrangements for advice and decision making on R&D funded through statutory levies and matching Government contributions, to ensure R&D investments become more responsive to whole-of-supply chain opportunities for industry growth.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates February 2010
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 12 (continued)

Status-Complete. The HAL vegetable industry IAC was restructured to reflect the VegVision 2020 strategy.

Action 3.5.2 Align industry R&D plans and investment to the vision, strategic imperatives and strategies outlined in this Plan.

Status-Complete: HAL has advised DAFF that the vegetable IAC is taking into account the VegVision 2020 strategy in assessing and recommending projects to HAL for funding.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 13

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Food Labelling Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Colbeck asked:

1. What role is DAFF playing in the COAG food labelling law and policy review?
2. What advice is DAFF providing to Dept of Health & Ageing on this review?
3. Does DAFF have any concerns that food industry matters may not get the hearing they deserve? I understand this may have been the case in past food reviews where DOHA has responsibility.

Answer:

1. DAFF, along with the Department of Health and Ageing and state and territory governments is jointly funding the labelling law and policy review.
2. DAFF, the Department of Health and Ageing and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission are meeting with the Labelling Review panel in April to jointly provide advice to the panel.
3. Industry has had the opportunity to provide a written submission to the review and will shortly be able to attend public consultation sessions in all capital cities in both Australia and New Zealand to provide further input.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 14

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Fruit Logistica

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Colbeck asked:

1. Why is it Australia could send over 100 officials to Copenhagen and DAFF could spend \$26,000 on sending 2 of its own officials, but we couldn't have support the hort industry to have representation at the Fruitz Logistica Trade Fair in Berlin, one of the most important hort industry events on an annual basis? (Feb 3-5)
2. Is DAFF aware of key trading competitors having significant presence at the Fair?
3. Do you believe there were lost opportunities from not supporting industry to attend the event?
4. Have DAFF officials ever attended this event in previous years?

Answer:

1. See answers to APD 05 and 06.
2. See answers to APD 05 and 06.
3. See answer to APD 05.
4. DAFF officials have not attended Fruit Logistica for at least the last five years.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 15

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Genetic Modification

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

1. How much has the Commonwealth Government spent in each of the past twenty years on all research and development projects into genetically modified:
 - a) crops; b) foods; c) food additives and processing aids?
2. What demonstrable economic and social benefits (both commercial and public good) has this research and development expenditure produced?
3. Who reaped these economic and social rewards - government or industry partners?
4. Will the government in future monitor and regularly report on the Commonwealth's expenditures on, and benefits from, research and development into genetically modified: a) crops; b) foods; c) food additives and processing aids?
5. Since the last federal election, which business, science or other non-government organisations have made representations to Commonwealth Ministers on any aspect of genetically modified crops and foods?
6. To which Ministers did each of those organisations make representations?
7. Please supply copies of: a) those written representations; b) the Ministerial responses to each of those representations; and c) the notes and minutes from all meetings at which Ministers and/or their advisors met with organisations about genetically modified crops and foods.

Answer:

1. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry only keeps records for its portfolio.

2-4. Refer to Answer 1.

5-7. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry is unable to answer for all Commonwealth Ministers.

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 16

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Australian Standards for the Export of Livestock

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

1. The livestock export industry is required to comply with the Australian Standards for the Export of Livestock. The ASEL is referenced under Commonwealth Law and can only be enforced once the animals are shipside by the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS). As the States and Territories have not referenced the ASEL in their legislation their agencies cannot enforce the ASEL. Given this, can the Government outline how the ASEL are being enforced?
2. Despite the existence of Memoranda of Understanding with a large number of Middle Eastern importing countries, Australian animals continue to be transported, handled and slaughtered in an unacceptable way and no sanctions are implemented. What mechanisms will the Government put in place to prevent Australian animals from being sent to countries that breach those MOU that they have signed with Australia?

Answer:

1. Livestock as defined under the *Australian Meat and Livestock Industry Act 1997* (AMLI Act) cannot be exported unless the exporter has been issued with a current export licence. Licensed exporters are also subject to compliance with orders, directions and regulations issued under the AMLI Act and the *Export Control Act 1982*.

The *Australian Meat and Livestock Industry (Standards) Order 2005* (orders) require compliance with the *Australian Standards for the Export of Livestock* (the standards). The standards are also referenced in the *Australian Meat and Livestock Industry (Export Licensing) Regulations 1998* and the *Export Control (Animals) Order 2004* (Animals Order). Compliance with the orders is a condition of the export licence. In addition, under the Animals Order, one of the criteria for approval of an exporter's Notice of Intention to Export Livestock and the associated Consignment Risk Management Plan is that the export complies with the standards.

There are a number of additional mechanisms to support compliance with the standards. Under the Animals Order, the export of livestock is prohibited unless the livestock and related documents are inspected before the livestock leave the registered

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2010

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: APD 16 (continued)

premises, and the exporter obtains a permission to leave for loading. The Animals Order also requires the exporter to make a declaration that any requirements under any law of a state or territory that the exporter has become obliged to comply with has been complied with. The AQIS authorised officer cannot grant permission for export livestock to leave for loading unless he or she is satisfied all relevant requirements under the standards have been met.

The standards require that in sourcing livestock for export, exporters must also meet all requirements under relevant state and territory legislation, including animal welfare and transportation to the registered or approved assembly depot where the animals are then prepared for export. State and territory governments are responsible for ensuring that these jurisdictional requirements are met under respective state and territory legislation.

2. The memoranda of understanding (MoUs) on trade in live animals that Australia has signed with a number of countries provide assurances that Australian livestock will be unloaded by the importing country regardless of the health status of the animals, and make provision for humane slaughter of these animals in case of an animal health emergency. The government undertakes assessment of post arrival facilities for live animals to ensure they provide adequate handling and welfare outcomes for the animals consistent with the OIE standards.

Australia's trading partners in the Middle East are members of the OIE and as such have an obligation to meet the OIE animal welfare standards relating to handling and welfare during transportation and slaughter of animals. The Australian Government and the live export industry are providing assistance to these countries in implementing the OIE standards.