

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 17

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Naming of Australian Grape and Wine Authority

Proof Hansard page: 25-26

Senator EDWARDS asked:

Senator EDWARDS: You are to be known as the AGWA. What research process was undertaken to establish the new agency's name? Was it market tested in our international markets? The Australian Grape and Wine Authority—pretty sexy, not. You are a marketing organisation. Was it tested? Was anybody asked how the branding of this would be perceived in China, America, Sweden, the UK or India?

Dr Grimes: I cannot answer that question at the moment. I do not know whether there are any officers who can. I do not know whether we can add any—

Senator EDWARDS: So nobody knows how we came about this name?

Dr Grimes: Otherwise, we would have to take it on notice. Mr Ottesen will see if he can give us any further information on that specific question.

Mr Ottesen: There was no market testing of the name. It is the name of a statutory body and it has a number of—

Senator EDWARDS: Which carries out marketing functions all over the world.

Mr Ottesen: One would assume that it would develop marketing programs with marketing messages attached to those.

Senator EDWARDS: The marketing and branding may be quite different to the name of an authority.

CHAIR: You are talking in dream talk. Put it on notice.

Answer:

The name, the Australian Grape and Wine Authority (AGWA), was determined after consultation with the Wine Industry Chief Executive Officers' Transition Committee (the Committee), which was formed to assist the transition to AGWA. The name was chosen to reflect the broad range of functions it would undertake across the supply chain as a statutory

Question 17 (continued)

authority, including research and development, marketing and export regulation. The name was not market tested.

The Committee includes the chief executives of the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation, the Wine Australia Corporation, the Winemakers' Federation of Australia and Wine Grape Growers Australia, as well as representatives from the Department of Agriculture.

Use of "Wine Australia" as a brand in international markets will be a matter for the board of the AGWA.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 18

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Certification process for organic products and produce, including GMO-free

Proof Hansard page: 35-36

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Senator SIEWERT: It would be appreciated if you could. I want to follow up on the issue of certification. Does the department have any involvement in the certification process? The heart of the previous question went to the certification process for organic produce and products. I thought that was up to the industry responsible for it. Do you have any involvement there at all?

Mr Koval: The Organic Industry Standards and Certification Council is made up of organic certification bodies and the organics industry. We provide the secretariat and assist in that because it is quite often the standard that we use for the export of organics. It is managed by the organics industry.

Senator SIEWERT: Is there any federal legislation around that process?

Mr Koval: I am not aware. I will have to take it on notice.

Senator SIEWERT: I did not think there was. I would be interested to know if there was.

Mr Aldred: We do certify GMO-free for some export markets. I will take the detail of that on notice, along with Mr Koval, and come back to you.

Senator SIEWERT: That would be appreciated. That links to what is the standard for those. Could you take on notice what particular produce is certified in that process?

Mr Aldred: Yes, we can do that.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture approves organisations to certify primary production and processing systems as organic or biodynamic for export. The legal basis of this certifier approval resides under the Export Control (Organic Produce Certification) Orders, while organic or biodynamic certification of farmers and manufacturers is based on compliance with the National Standard for Organic and Biodynamic Produce or importing country requirements. The Department of Agriculture owns the intellectual property of the National Standard for Organic and Biodynamic Produce. Under a written signed agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Organic Industry Standards and Certification Council, maintenance of this standard is overseen by this organic certifier peak body.

Question: 18 (continued)

As noted in response to Question on Notice 36, dealings with genetically modified organisms in Australia in contravention of the *Gene Technology Act 2000* are prohibited. Where the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator provides a statement that there are no approvals for commercial release or field trials of a particular genetically modified crop, the Declaration and Certificate as to Condition will, where required by the importing country, include a statement to this effect. The Declaration and Certificate as to Condition may accompany any product for which it is requested, including a product certified organic for export.

Agriculture

Question: 19

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Partnerships between workers and trainees for East Timor and North-Western Australian Communities

Proof Hansard page: 9

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Senator RHIANNON: In recent years there have been partnerships between workers and trainees for East Timor and north-western Australian communities. We have received some representation about this. I am interested to know about any efforts to extend these partnerships to grow the domestic abattoirs in the north-west and to meet the need for Labor in that industry. Have there been any discussions to advance these proposals? Are you aware of them?

Dr Grimes: I am personally not aware of any. That does not mean that there have not been discussions. We may have to take that on notice unless there is an officer here who can provide further assistance to you now.

Mr Glyde: I am not familiar with those partnerships. You are saying that they were between East Timor and northern Australian beef interests?

Senator RHIANNON: Yes—around the abattoirs and finding Labor for the industry in north-west Australia.

Mr Glyde: I will confirm this, but as far as I am aware we have not been involved in those partnership discussions.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture is not aware of discussions about developing domestic abattoirs using workers from East Timor.

Through the meat industry template labour agreement, abattoirs are able to access skilled overseas meat workers, including those from East Timor. This is the only pathway for an employer to sponsor skilled meat workers from overseas on a temporary or permanent basis.

Labour agreements are negotiated between the Australian Government, represented by the Department of Immigration and Border Protection, and employers. As at 14 March 2014, 21 companies had a meat industry labour agreement in effect, two had been approved waiting for final signature and a further nine agreements were under negotiation.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 20

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Community Food Grants

Proof Hansard page: 13

Senator FARRELL asked:

Senator FARRELL: What advice did you provide the minister on the closure of this program?

Dr Grimes: That goes to a policy question. The officer would not be in a position to provide any assistance on that this morning.

Senator FARRELL: I am simply asking, Dr Grimes, what advice the department provided to the minister.

Dr Grimes: The department would advise the minister but, as to the details, that is a policy question.

Senator FARRELL: So the minister sought the advice of the department in respect of this matter?

Dr Grimes: Departmental advice was provided in relation to this matter.

Senator FARRELL: When was that advice sought, Dr Grimes?

Dr Grimes: I would have to take those details on notice.

Senator FARRELL: Mr Koval, you do not know when that advice was sought?

Mr Koval: Off the top of my head, I do not; I will have to take it on notice.

Senator FARRELL: Can we work back a little bit? You advised the potential applicants on 31 January. Do you think it was this year or last year that—

Dr Grimes: Senator, these were matters considered as part of the proper budget process, so they would have been considered as part of the budget processes at the end of last year. As to precise timing, we would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The department provided advice to the Minister on the Community Food Grants programme on 7 November 2013 and 16 December 2013.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 21

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Community Food Grants

Proof Hansard page: 14

Senator FARRELL asked:

Senator FARRELL: So you sent out a letter on the 31st of January to all of these 364 people?

Mr Koval: That is correct.

Senator FARRELL: Has there been any response from any of those applicants?

Mr Koval: I am not aware of anyone responding to that, but I will take that on notice and check that for you.

Answer:

There were 12 responses by email from applicants, and a small number of phone calls.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 22

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Surplus of cattle in domestic market

Proof Hansard page: 17

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: Can you tell me Secretary, or officers who were in the department at the time, whether the department explored any other options and solutions to the ongoing surplus of cattle in the domestic market, which we knew would inevitably flow from the cessation of exports from the north?

Dr Grimes: Again, I think we are going into the same territory. We will take it on notice and see if there is anything we can provide.

Senator BACK: I am not asking you what advice you might have given to the minister at the time. I am asking if the department addressed its mind to that issue.

Dr Grimes: I am unable to answer that question at the moment. We could take the matter on notice and provide you with information.

Answer:

Yes, the department considered the implications of a potential surplus of cattle in the domestic market in relation to the temporary suspension of the live cattle trade to Indonesia and more generally.

The department engaged Hydros Consulting to prepare a report on the financial impact of the temporary suspension, and ways the financial impact could be mitigated to maintain the industry's sustainability. Hydros Consulting held direct discussions with over 80 small to medium producers in the Kimberley and Northern Territory, and service providers to those producers. The report was commissioned to give the Australian Government an on-ground, real-life picture of the impacts across the sector of the temporary suspension of the live cattle trade to Indonesia. A copy of the report can be found at:

http://www.liveexports.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1984383/financial-impacts-of-export-restrictions-report.pdf.

The department also engaged the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences to provide a survey of beef cattle producers in northern live cattle export regions. The survey aimed to help governments, industry and service providers respond to the regional

Question: 22 (continued)

effects of the temporary suspension. The survey sample was designed to be population representative at the region level with 230 sample farms selected from the Australian Bureau of Statistics business register. Farm businesses indicated a range of strategies that they would adopt to respond to the impact of the suspension, including: finding alternative markets for surplus cattle, reducing non-essential expenditure on capital and repairs, changing mustering plans, increasing stocking rates and adjusting herd management. Around one-third indicated that they may need to address land degradation issues arising from overgrazing. A copy of the report can found at:

http://www.liveexports.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/1954396/ABARES-survey-of-beef-cattle-producers-in-northern-live-cattle-export-regions.pdf.

Longer term industry adjustment issues and consideration of the sustainability of the northern Australian beef industry were addressed through the creation of a Joint Government and Industry Action Agenda for the Northern Beef Industry, developed for the Northern Australia Ministerial Forum and released in November 2012. The report noted that Northern Australia is in an excellent position to leverage its competitive, low cost base to take advantage of increasing international demand, and that this will be enhanced as new northern supply chain options become increasingly viable in coming decades. A copy can be found at:

<http://www.regional.gov.au/regional/ona/files/20121129-strategic-directions-for-northern-australia-beef-industry.pdf>.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 23

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Animal Industry Sector

Proof Hansard page: 17

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK asked: I have a number of questions on agricultural productivity, starting with the live animal export ban. I will put on the record that it will go down as one of the most disastrous and ill-judged decisions on any animal industry sector. I foreshadowed at the time what the economic and animal welfare impacts of this would be into the longer term, with or without drought, and we now see them.

Firstly, did the previous government instruct the department to look into any other means, besides the establishment of the farm finance package, to attempt to address the economic impacts on the domestic beef industry resulting from the ban?

Dr Grimes: That question actually goes to the provision of policy advice to a previous government. As you would appreciate we are even constrained in our capacity to comment on policy advice to the current government. We could take the matter on notice and see if there is anything we can provide for you, but we are not in a position to be able to talk about our policy advice to a previous government.

Answer:

Yes, please refer to the department's freedom of information disclosure log for live animal exports at <http://www.daff.gov.au/biosecurity/export/live-animals/livestock/regulatory-framework/information-released-under-foi>.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 24

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Support for Tasmanian fruit and vegetable growers

Proof Hansard page: 18

Senator BACK asked:

Mr Koval: In terms of direct assistance to Tasmanian fruit and vegetable growers, I am not aware of anything bar what we have more generally available to assist producers. Regarding the Tassie taskforce—horticulture taskforce—we are in the process of finalising the members of that, the terms of reference and everything else, with government. That will commence shortly. But in terms of assistance provided specifically to Tasmanian fruit and vegetable growers, I am not aware of anything. I would have to take that on notice—

Senator BACK: Could you do that, because I am obviously anxious to know just what assistance the government is offering to fruit and vegetable growers—

Mr Tucker: Vegetable growers can access the farm finance arrangements that have been in place in Tasmania. The part of the department that can provide those details is coming on later this evening. We will be able to give you a breakdown at that stage of where access to the farm finance arrangements for Tasmanian producers is in terms of productivity enhancement loans.

Answer:

The government is assisting Tasmania's fruit and vegetable growers through establishing an expert industry taskforce to prepare an agreed plan that will detail what industry and governments can do to promote competitiveness, investment and jobs growth in these industries.

Tasmanian fruit and vegetable growers experiencing difficulties servicing their current levels of debt may be able to access assistance through the Australian Government's *Farm Finance Concessional Loans Scheme*. Under the scheme in Tasmania, eligible farm businesses can access loans of up to \$650 000 for debt restructuring or productivity enhancement activities. These loans can be used to restructure existing debt or implement systems and management practices that enhance sustainable primary production in Tasmania.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 25

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Additional funding for Rural Research and Development

Proof Hansard page: 19

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK asked: Thank you. I am aware that other senators probably have questions, so I want to keep moving to research and development. It is my understanding that the coalition has committed \$100 million of additional funding for rural research and development from 2014-15. Is that correct?

Dr Grimes: The government has an election commitment for the implementation of another \$100 million in additional funding for research and development yes.

Senator BACK: So what will that bring it up to?

Dr Grimes: I have not got the precise figures with me. Mr Koval might have them.

Mr Koval: In general terms we provide matching funds to research and development corporations and RIRDC worth about \$250 million a year.

Senator BACK: And how much does industry provide?

Mr Koval: I would have to look at the exact numbers, but they provide probably another 300-odd million. I would have to get the exact numbers for you. They provide additional money because of the caps and marketing. So the \$100 million is in addition to that \$250 million.

Senator BACK: I wonder if, in providing that advice on notice, you could give us a 10-year perspective?

Mr Koval: As in backward looking?

Senator BACK: That is correct. I want to see what the trend has been in both government and industry support over that period of time.

Mr Koval: Certainly we can provide a breakdown for you.

Answer:

Table 1 shows the figures for industry levy contributions and Australian Government matching payments and appropriation for the statutory and industry-owned research and development corporations between 2003 and 2013.

Question: 25 (continued)

Table 1: Australian Government and Industry Research and Development Contributions to the Rural Research and Development Corporations

Financial year	Government contribution # '000	Industry contribution (Levy)* '000
2003-04	\$196 823	\$201 231
2004-05	\$191 049	\$208 420
2005-06	\$218 035	\$206 582
2006-07	\$211 093	\$203 484
2007-08	\$218 644	\$218 548
2008-09	\$216 316	\$231 169
2009-10	\$225 579	\$216 763
2010-11	\$217 280	\$260 421
2011-12	\$242 065	\$273 866
2012-13	\$239 253	\$285 354

The figures were derived from the department's internal records.

All figures are calculated on an accrual basis.

Note: the Government contribution data includes appropriation amounts provided to the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation and Land and Water Australia, extracted from their annual reports.

*Note:

- The industry contribution column includes research and development levies payments through the Department of Agriculture. It also includes some levies which do not distinguish between support for marketing and research and development. It is not possible to establish the portions of these levies which were used for marketing or research and development at short notice.
- The industry contribution column does not include voluntary industry contributions.
- The Fisheries Research and Development Corporation receives payments from the state and territory governments in lieu of levy payments that have not been included in the figures.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 26

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Rural research and development funding

Proof Hansard page: 19

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: I wonder if you could also tell me either now or on notice how expenditure in the agricultural R&D sector compares with other industries and the rest of the Australian economy. Are we at the same level? Are we declining over time? Where does agricultural R&D fit?

Mr Koval: In long-term trends I think research and development is probably declining across the economy full stop, but I would have to go have a look and see what numbers we have. I think the Productivity Commission might have put something in their report. I will go pull it out for you and provide it on notice.

Answer:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) collects data on research and development (R&D) undertaken by Australian businesses, government (Commonwealth and states/territories), higher education and the private not-for-profit sector. ABS Catalogue 8112.0 – Research and Experimental Development provides statistics on R&D expenditure by different socio-economic objectives from 1992-93 to 2008-09. The socio-economic objectives include plant and animal primary production and primary products and others such as defence, mineral resources, energy, manufacturing, health, environment and several others.

The ABS figures show that total R&D expenditure on plant and animal primary production and primary products was \$1.08 billion in 2008-09, or 3.88 per cent of total R&D expenditure for all socio-economic objectives. This was less than R&D expenditure on manufacturing (18.02 per cent) and health (14.47 per cent) but more than R&D expenditure on education and training (1.21 per cent) and economics (1.15 per cent).

The level of R&D expenditure on plant and animal primary production and primary products increased from \$725.91 million in 1992-93 to \$1.08 billion in 2008-09. This represents a decline of 3.4 per cent in consumer price index-adjusted real terms.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 27

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Funding freed up from Land and Water Australia being abolished

Proof Hansard page: 20

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: If you cannot advise me now, can you take on notice the funding that was freed up as a result of Land and Water Australia being abolished? Did it remain in the R&D sphere for agriculture; and, if so, where did it go? Or did it actually go back into consolidated revenue?

Mr Koval: I would have to take that one on notice. I do not recall where the funding went and whether it was reallocated or absorbed into the system at the time.

Answer:

The Budget measure to cease annual appropriation funding to Land and Water Australia provided savings that were returned to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 28

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Funding saving from the abolishment of Land and Water Australia

Proof Hansard page: 20

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: Sure. I just want to establish the accuracy of the figures I have been given. I was told it was abolished in 2009-10, with a saving of \$46 million over four years. I wanted to establish whether that was accurate and what the fate of those dollars was.

Mr Koval: The numbers do sound about right, but I will have to take it on notice.

Answer:

Land and Water Australia ceased operation on 31 December 2009. The cessation was a 2009-10 Budget measure. The total savings returned to the Consolidated Revenue Fund was \$47.398million over 4 years commencing in 2009-10.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 29

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Community Food Grants

Proof Hansard page: 20

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Senator SIEWERT: Thank you. I go back to the food community grants. You said that there were 364 applications. What was the total value of those applications?

Mr Koval: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have that number with me, but I can get it for you.

Answer:

\$3 651 471.05.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 30

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Community Food Grants

Proof Hansard page: 21

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Senator SIEWERT: I am not asking for policy advice; I am asking for the process that was undertaken. Why were these projects chosen? Were they already underway? Were they seen to be more important to have priority given to them?

Dr Grimes: I appreciate that the question you are asking is around process, and we can answer questions around process. We have taken on notice the precise dates on which advice was provided. I gave an indication of the general process that was undertaken at the end of last year. We are probably not in a position to provide you with much more information at the moment, but we can certainly take details on notice.

Senator SIEWERT: Thank you.

Answer:

The department provided advice to the Minister on 7 November 2013, 18 November 2013 and 16 December 2013 regarding grants and the National Food Plan initiatives.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 31

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Chairs Committee

Proof Hansard page: 23

Senator EDWARDS asked:

Mr A Clark: I will give you the numbers shortly. I will have to give you later the precise date the chairs committee last met but there is a meeting coming up, scheduled for 25 March. That is for the chairs of both of the statutory authorities and the two peak industry bodies.

Senator EDWARDS: Is there an agenda for that meeting?

Mr A Clark: The department will be putting forward the agenda. I have not seen it as yet.

Senator EDWARDS: Could you table it with this committee when it becomes available?

Mr Koval: Certainly.

Answer:

The draft agenda for the Wine Industry Chairs' Meeting is provided **[Attachment A]**.



Australian Government
Department of Agriculture

Preparations for the establishment of the Australian Grape and Wine Authority
Briefing for wine industry chairs of the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation, the Wine Australia Corporation, Wine Grape Growers Australia and the Winemakers' Federation of Australia

Second meeting agenda

Time: 10am – 12pm

Date: 25 March 2014

Venue: Department of Agriculture
 18 Marcus Clarke Street
 Canberra

Room: M.10.07

Chair – The Department of Agriculture (DA)

Item		Lead
1.	Welcome and introductions	DA
2.	Summary of the process to date	DA
3.	Deregulation agenda	DA
4.	Timetable for the establishment of the new authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the appointment of the board and chair • Update on remuneration for the board and chair • Role of appointed directors pre 1 July 2014 and the appointment of the chief executive 	DA
5.	Update on transition activities of Wine Australia and GWRDC	Wine Australia & GWRDC
6.	Corporate reporting/ financial statements	DA Wine Australia & GWRDC
7.	Other business	DA

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 32

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Genetically modified organisms

Proof Hansard page: 30

Senator FARRELL asked:

Senator FARRELL: I am aware that there is a case in Western Australia involving cross-pollution in respect of genetic modification. Are you aware of that case?

Dr Grimes: We are certainly aware of the court case that is currently underway.

Mr Aldred: This is not the correct division under which to ask about genetically modified organisms.

Senator FARRELL: Where should we ask those questions?

Mr Aldred: My belief that it is our Agriculture Productivity division. But we can take that on notice.

Answer:

Yes, the Agricultural Productivity Division is the appropriate division for general questions on genetically modified organisms in agriculture.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 33

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Genetically modified product

Proof Hansard page: 35

Senator FARRELL asked:

Senator FARRELL asked: Can imports into Australia that are certified organic contain any threshold of genetically modified product?

Mr Koval: I am not aware of the rules around definitions. I will have to look into that for you, Senator.

Senator FARRELL: Can you do that. Thank you.

Dr Grimes: We will take it on notice.

Senator FARRELL: Did you happen to know the answer, Dr Grimes?

Dr Grimes: I do not know the precise answer off the top of my head. We will ensure that the officers who are able to answer that question do answer it for you on notice.

Answer:

The Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code applies to all foods imported into Australia regardless of whether the foods are certified organic. All genetically modified foods intended for sale, whether imported or produced domestically, undergo a safety evaluation by Food Standards Australia and New Zealand (FSANZ) before reaching the market and must be labelled as genetically modified if the final product contains genetically modified material.

The Code requires that food—including ingredients, food additives and processing aids—derived from genetically modified (GM) crops be labelled as ‘genetically modified’ if any genetic material and/or protein not normally present in the food is contained in the final product. There are some exemptions to the GM food labelling requirements:

- Highly refined foods (other than those with altered characteristics), where the effect of the refining process is to remove novel DNA and/or novel protein, do not require GM labelling as they are analytically indistinguishable from conventionally produced (non-GM) foods. Examples of highly refined foods including sugars and many edible oils.
- Flavours which contain novel DNA and/or novel protein and are present in a concentration of no more than 1 g/kg (0.1 per cent).

Question: 33 (continued)

- Labelling is not required for foods where the unintended presence of a GM component is less than 10 g/kg (1 per cent) per ingredient of the final food.

The department understands that organic standards in some countries allow for threshold levels of approved unintended GM material in certified organic products. As long as these products comply with the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code, it is possible that imports into Australia of products certified organic overseas may contain threshold levels of GM material.

Agriculture

Question: 34

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Analysis of what it would mean should GM plants become endemic in all crops

Proof Hansard page: 35

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Senator SIEWERT: I will try to be quick. I want to follow up and just clarify the issue. I totally understand the issues around state decision making. But looking at the big picture in terms of productivity—and I suspect I am coming from a slightly different angle to the line of questioning from ALP senators—from a liability point of view, my understanding is that the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator is not, in fact, responsible once liability and following up contamination of crops gets past a certain point. Are you saying that you have not done any work looking at the consequences for agriculture of this becoming a very significant issue across Australia? I am not talking about individual state management. I am talking about the big picture liability that could be taken on by the spread of GMOs into conventional crops. I just want to be really clear about it.

Mr Koval: The issue of containment, coexistence and segregation, which goes to the heart of the question, is managed by state and territory governments' industry protocols. Have we done an analysis of what it would mean should GM plants become endemic in all crops situations? I am not aware of us having done a detailed analysis of that, but I will check and get back to you.

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture has conducted work on liability and coexistence issues associated with the cultivation of genetically modified crops in Australia. The following material is available at www.daff.gov.au/agriculture-food/biotechnology/reports.

With regard to liability, the department has published fact sheets and a report under the title 'A Farmer's Choice? Legal Liability of Farmers Growing Crops' (June 2006) and a report entitled 'Liability Issues Associated with GM Crops in Australia' (September 2003).

With regard to the coexistence, the department has published the following reports:

- Adapting the GENESYS gene flow model for GM canola in Australia (March 2009)
- Maintaining product integrity in the Australian seed and grain supply chain – the role of sampling and testing for GM events (December 2008)

Question: 34 (continued)

- Sampling Plan and Test Protocol for the Semiquantitative Detection of Genetically Modified canola (*Brassica napus*) Seed in Bulk Canola Seed (August 2007)
- Potential impacts from the introduction of GM canola on organic farming in Australia (May 2007)
- GM grains in Australia - identity preservation (December 2006)
- Development of a protocol for accreditation of non-GM grain produced in a designated non-GM region - Eyre Peninsula Study (February 2005)
- Segregating GM and non-GM grain in the Australian grain storage system (July 2004)
- Gap Analysis in relation to Quality Management for the Supply Chain Management of Genetically Modified Products (2003)
- Tracking potential GM inputs to the stockfeed supply chain for feedlot beef: a discussion paper (2003)
- Review of Technologies for Detecting Genetically Modified Materials in Commodities and Food (2002)

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 35

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Department meeting with WA Minister Baston's office to discuss fenthion

Proof Hansard page: 72

Senator LINES asked:

Senator LINES: Has your department met with WA Minister Baston's office to discuss fenthion?

Mr Koval: I am not aware of us as a department meeting with officials or members of the minister's office.

Senator LINES: Is that a 'no' or do you need to check?

Mr Koval: I will check to make sure, but I am not aware of us doing so. We have spoken to Western Australian departmental officials.

Senator LINES: About fenthion?

Mr Koval: About fenthion and fruit fly management and those types of things.

Senator LINES: What did those discussions go to particularly?

Mr Koval: We talked about the circumstances in these regions, the need for extension and communication and those types of things.

Senator LINES: When you say 'regions', do you mean the various regions that exist within WA and indeed across the country?

Mr Koval: That is correct.

Senator LINES: To what extent? What was said?

Mr Koval: I will have to go back and look at the individual notes.

Answer:

No, the department has not met with WA Minister Baston's office to discuss fenthion. Through the Dimethoate and Fenthion Response Coordination Committee, the department has had ongoing contact with state and territory departments of agriculture and fruit fly affected industries, including the Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia. These discussions have included updates and discussion on the range of field trials and other fruit fly

Question: 35 (continued)

management research underway, and discussion on how to implement those research outcomes in growing areas and for the treatment for fruit for safe domestic and international trade.

The Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia, has also made available updates on its fruit fly management trials available on its website (www.agric.wa.gov.au/pest-weeds-diseases/pests/pest-insects) and through the FruitWest quarterly magazine (http://www.fruitwest.org.au/images/stories/Magazine/FWWinter13_LR.pdf).

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 36

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: WA Department of Agriculture area-wide management strategy is possible in the Perth Hills

Proof Hansard page: 73

Senator LINES asked:

Senator LINES: So, the WA department of agriculture thinks that an area-wide management strategy is possible in the Perth Hills?

Mr Koval: As far as I understand it, that is the case, yes.

Senator LINES: Apart from the trial they are conducting at Jarrahdale are they conducting any other area-wide management trials that you are aware of?

Mr Koval: I am not aware. We can ask them and get you the information on notice, if that is helpful.

Answer:

The department has contacted the Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia, who confirmed that the situation as described during the hearing into the *Implication of the restriction of the use of fenthion on Australia's horticultural industry* on 3 February 2013 in Perth has not changed. The Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia is conducting an area wide management trial in Jarrahdale and research into the various components that could contribute to an area wide management approach in various locations, including Roleystone.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 37

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Briefings to the minister regarding ongoing issues and the impacts on growers

Proof Hansard page: 74

Senator LINES asked:

Senator LINES: We have heard this afternoon from various senators and from APVMA. In light of those ongoing issues and the impacts on growers, has the department given the minister advice as to how this matter should be resolved?

Mr Tucker: Yes, we have provided advice to the minister.

Senator LINES: What did that advice go to?

Mr Tucker: I do not think it is appropriate for us to talk about the details of our advice, but we have given advice to the minister.

Senator LINES: Can you tell us why it is not appropriate?

ACTING CHAIR: It should not be a secret. What if the growers want to know? What if the growers say, 'What is going on?' and the minister says, 'I'm not telling you'?

Mr Tucker: The question was to me. The question was not to the minister. If you wish to put the question to the minister—

Senator LINES: I want to know why you are saying it is not appropriate to give us the context of that advice.

Dr Grimes: The issue is going into the provision of policy advice. We can certainly indicate that we have provided advice.

Senator LINES: What is your objection to not telling us the content of that advice?

Dr Grimes: As a general rule, Senate estimate hearings do not traverse into policy matters. It is essentially that convention.

Senator LINES: I know the general rule. Can you tell me specifically what the issue is about not giving us the content of that advice?

Dr Grimes: As I have indicated to you, it is the convention of Senate estimates. We can take the matter on notice.

Senator LINES: I am not accepting a convention. I want you to tell me what it is.

Question: 37 (continued)

Dr Grimes: We can certainly take the matter on notice and refer it to the minister.

Answer:

The advice provided to the minister included information in relation to the current regulatory status of fenthion and the concerns raised by growers in the Perth Hills regarding their different pest pressures. The advice also clarified the roles and responsibilities of the Australian Pesticides Veterinary Medicine Authority, the Minister and the States and territories with regard to pesticide regulation. The Minister was also advised of the alternative methods that were available and the results that some growers were having using these alternative chemicals and pest control methods.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 38

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Advice sought from department by the minister

Proof Hansard page: 74

Senator LINES asked:

Senator LINES: Thank you very much. You have told us that you have given advice to the minister. Has the minister sought advice back from the department around fenthion issues?

Mr Koval: We have had a number of conversations with the minister around this issue.

Senator LINES: Around which issue?

Mr Koval: Fenthion, fruit fly and everything else.

Senator LINES: What did those discussions go to?

Mr Koval: The majority of the discussion has been around the current situation in terms of the status of the chemical, the growers and those types of things.

Senator LINES: Can you give us some more information?

Mr Koval: It is the work we are doing around research. Much of the work that Mr Aldred talked about in terms of the chief plant protection officers and what they were doing around this issue and those types of matters.

Senator LINES: When was that advice sought from the department?

Senator LINES: When was that advice sought from the department?

Mr Tucker: Almost the first day he became a minister. The other thing that I think is worth while covering is that we also covered the roles that we have talked about in this committee and others about the role of the APVMA, the state department, growers and Horticulture Australia Limited. We are helping to work through that little jigsaw of all the pieces in terms of the roles of the various players in chemical control and use.

Senator LINES: Specifically what was the minister seeking from the department in relation to fenthion?

Mr Tucker: I think we are getting into the realms of policy advice again and we have given our response in terms of our capacity to answer questions on policy advice.

Question: 38 (continued)

Senator LINES: In the same way I did not accept it before, I would like you to take that on notice and think about why you cannot supply the answers that I have asked for.

Mr Tucker: We can take that on notice.

Answer:

Refer to answer to question on QoN 37 from the Additional Estimates hearings February 2014.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 39

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Wine Australia/Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation merger

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator EDWARDS asked:

1. What steps including criteria have the Industry bodies instigated in the past to select highly qualified persons to sit on any Board selection panel?
2. What has been WAC/GWRDCs involvement to date?
3. What is the process being undertaken to establish the Board?
4. What has been WAC/GWRDCs involvement to date?
5. What consultation has been carried out with WFA/WGGA? What was their response?
6. How will conflicts of interest be managed on the Board?
7. How will AGWA report? Will it be similar to how WAC/GWRDC currently report?
8. How would WAC/GWRDC like AGWA to report?
9. How would you alter the reporting of AGWA in light of the deficiencies of WAC/GWRDC reporting?
10. The term 'synergies' was a selling point for the merger. How will this be quantified, leveraged and reported on?
11. How do we encourage a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship at AGWA?

Answer:

1. The industry bodies, the Winemakers' Federation of Australia (WFA) and Wine Grape Growers Australia (WGGA) would be better placed to answer this question. The government requests that selection panel member nominations should reflect an appropriate balance of skills, experience as well as gender diversity.

Question: 39 (continued)

2. The Wine Australia Corporation (Wine Australia) and the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation (GWRDC) have no involvement in the selection of members for the Authority Selection Committee, which provides director nominations (other than the chair) to the minister. This process is being conducted as per Division 2 of the *Wine Australia Corporation Act 1980* (Wine Australia Act).
3. Division 2 of the Wine Australia Act establishes the Authority Selection Committee which will provide the Minister for Agriculture with director nominations for the Australian Grape and Wine Authority. The chair appointment process is detailed in the *Grape and Wine Legislation Amendment (Australian Grape and Wine Authority) Act 2013* (Wine Amendment Act).
4. Wine Australia and GWRDC do not have a role in establishing the board; however, they are aware of the process.
5. The Wine Australia Act requires that members of the Authority Selection Committee, other than the presiding member, be nominated by a representative organisation. WFA and WGGA are the representative organisations and have provided the minister with two nominations each. The minister is required to consult the representative organisations before appointing the chair.
6. Conflicts of interest will be managed by the board. As a *Commonwealth Companies and Authorities Act 1997* (CAC Act) body, AGWA directors are bound by the disclosure of interests provisions of the CAC Act. The Wine Amendment Act also specifies that a director cannot be a member of the executive of a representative organisation (i.e. WFA or WGGA).
7. The Wine Amendment Act contains the Australian Grape and Wine Authority's (AGWA) reporting obligations to Parliament and/or, to the representative organisations. The requirements include that AGWA must prepare a Strategic Plan, an Annual Operational Plan, an Annual Report, and the conditions when it must convene an Annual General Meeting (AGM), such as at the request of a representative organisation or at the request of 10 or more eligible producers in the same year.
8. The Wine Amendment Act determines how AGWA will report. Wine Australia and GWRDC were consulted on the draft Bill for this Act.
9. The Department of Agriculture is not aware of reporting deficiencies of Wine Australia or GWRDC. Both organisations are required to produce an Annual Report, Annual Operational Plan and a Corporate Plan (Wine Australia) or Strategic Plan (GWRDC). Both organisations have met these requirements. Wine Australia is also required to convene an AGM.
10. The AGWA is expected to create synergies through the alignment of research and development and marketing activities under a single strategy for the industry, as well as through various service delivery operations being provided by a single organisation instead of two. These aspects will be captured through AGWA's reporting obligations and reflected in its performance.
11. Appointing a skills-based board will be important for the performance of AGWA. The board and senior management will ultimately be responsible for determining the culture of AGWA.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 40

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: White Paper

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

Comparing the Agricultural Competitiveness Issues Paper and the work undertaken by the Agricultural Productivity division, it is reasonable to say that the White Paper is very much focused on this division.

- a. Is the White Paper on Agricultural Competitiveness impacting on the work being undertaken in Agricultural Productivity division?
- b. Can you explain to the committee the rationale for having the White Paper developed by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet rather than the Agricultural Division?
- c. Is there a cost to the Department of Agriculture for the development of the White Paper?
- d. Which division is responsible for this cost?
- e. How much is this cost?
- f. Are any programs within the Agricultural Productivity division on hold until the completion of the White Paper?
- g. Is the division contributing to the development of the White Paper? If so how?
- h. On the Agricultural Competitiveness White paper website, it states that the taskforce will hold roundtables in rural and regional centres with invited farmers and other agricultural representatives? Was the department consulted on how and who would be invited to meet with the taskforce?

Answer:

- a. Yes. Contributing to the White Paper process is part of the work of the Division.
- b. The agricultural white paper is being undertaken by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet in accordance with the Government's election commitment. This whole-of-government approach reflects the fact that many of the issues confronting Australian agriculture are not the sole responsibility of the agriculture portfolio.

Question: 40 (continued)

- c. Yes.
- d. Agricultural Productivity Division.
- e. \$2 477 300.
- f. No.
- g. The division is contributing to the development of the White Paper by coordinating departmental input to the process.
- h. Yes.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 41

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Growers in the Perth Hills

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

1. Can the Department confirm that area-wide management strategies took into consideration the environmental conditions faced by the various growers in the Perth Hills?
2. Have departmental officials inspected the orchards in the Perth Hills to fully understand what the growers are facing.
3. Particularly, those who are in close proximity to urban residential areas.

Answer:

1. Advice from the Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia is that fruit fly research, including development of area-wide management strategies have taken into account environmental conditions.

2&3. The Department of Agriculture has not visited orchards in the Perth Hills. Officers from the The department or APVMA have , however, met with Perth Hills growers on at least four occasions in the last two years.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 42

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Department met with Ken Baston's office

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

Has the Department of Agriculture met with Ken Baston's office to discuss the restricted use of fenthion?

Answer:

No.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 43

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Ongoing issues and impacts on growers

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

In light that this has been an ongoing issues and greatly impacts on growers, has the Minister been given advice as to how this matter should be resolved.

Answer:

Yes.

Agriculture

Question: 44

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Genetically modified organisms

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

1. I refer to the current court case in Western Australia regarding cross-pollution of Genetic Modification crops with organic crops, having made that reference, I want to set that case aside because I don't want you to dismiss the question on the basis that the matter is before the courts, so my question is:
 - a. What planning is the department doing in readiness of the real possibility that at some point someone is likely to be successful in seeking compensation due to a cross-pollination event.
 - b. And if no planning is being done, aren't we facing the real possibility that GM is going to be considerably constrained.
 - c. Is it true that Australia imports certified organic food which may contain a threshold amount of genetically modified organisms?

Answer:

- a. and b. The Commonwealth, State and Territory governments have agreed to a nationally consistent regulatory scheme for gene technology under the Gene Technology Agreement. Under this agreement the states and territories retain responsibility for decisions on whether to allow the production of approved genetically modified crops in that state or territory on marketing grounds. In this context, the department has worked with state and territory governments and industry to ensure that there is a robust framework in place to manage the cultivation, coexistence and segregation of genetically modified crops. Planning has taken into account liability concerns—the 2006 review of the *Gene Technology Act 2000 (Cth)*, considered whether there was a need to introduce a strict liability regime and determined that liability concerns can be adequately dealt with under existing protocols and through common law and consumer protection legislation.

As noted in response to Question on Notice 34 from Additional Estimates February 2014, the Department of Agriculture has also conducted work on liability and coexistence issues associated with the cultivation of genetically modified crops in Australia. The material is available at www.daff.gov.au/agriculture-food/biotechnology/reports.

Question: 44 (continued)

- c. As noted in the response to Question on Notice 33 from Additional Estimates February 2014, the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code applies to all foods imported into Australia regardless of whether the foods are certified organic. As long as these products comply with the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code, it is possible that imports into Australia of products certified organic overseas may contain threshold levels of GM material.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 45

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Barry O'Sullivan

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator LUDWIG asked:

1. While not being formally employed by the department, was Mr O'Sullivan involved in any formal or informal manner in the development of the Agriculture White Paper before being sworn in by the Australian Senate as a Senator?
2. Did Mr O'Sullivan meet with the Prime Minister or the Minister before being sworn in as a Senator for Queensland to discuss the Agriculture White Paper?
3. Did Mr O'Sullivan provide or was provided with any documentation from the department concerning the Agriculture White paper?
4. Did Mr O'Sullivan have any contact with the department at all, concerning the White Paper – including, but not limited to, phone calls or emails, concerning the white paper and any travel or meetings Mr O'Sullivan held before being appointed as a Queensland Senator?
5. Did the department provide any travel support to Mr O'Sullivan, including but not limited to the provision of travel briefs through the office of the Minister or directly to Mr O'Sullivan; the arranging meetings for Mr O'Sullivan; or any other form of support?

Answer:

1. The department is not aware of Mr O'Sullivan undertaking any role with relation to the Agriculture White Paper.
2. The department is not aware of any meeting between Mr O'Sullivan and the Prime Minister or the Minister for Agriculture to discuss the Agriculture White Paper, and did not provide any briefing.
3. No
4. No
5. No

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 46

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Boards (for Departments or agencies with boards)

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator LUDWIG asked:

Since September 7th 2013;

- a. how often has each board met, break down by board name;
- b. what travel expenses are provided;
- c. what is the average attendance at board meetings;
- d. how does the board deal with conflict of interest;
- e. what conflicts of interest have been registered;
- f. what remuneration is provided to board members;
- g. how does the board dismiss board members who do not meet attendance standards?
- h. Have any requests been made to ministers to dismiss board members since September 7, 2013?
- i. Please list board members who have attended less than 51% of meetings
- j. what have catering costs been for the board meetings held this year; is alcohol served;

Answer:

Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation

- a. The GWRDC Board has met once (20 November 2013).
- b. The costs of travelling to attend the meeting were met by GWRDC, including airfares, accommodation, meals and other costs.
- c. All Board members attended the meeting.

Question: 46 (continued)

- d. The Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation has a Directors' Interests Policy which reflects the provisions of *Commonwealth Authorities and Corporations Act* (CAC Act) Division 4 - Conduct of Officers.

The Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation maintains a register of Directors Interests and the update of Directors' Interests is a standing item at all Board and Committee meetings.

- e. Since September 7 the following Director's interests have been registered:

The Hon Rory McEwen, has been appointed the new presiding member of the Fisheries Council of South Australia.

Dr Michele Allan updated her interests as follows:

1. Forest and Wood Products Australia – complete term 11.10.13
 2. William Angliss Institute – Chair
 3. Meat and Livestock Australia – Chair
 4. Grains and Legumes Nutritional Council – Chair
 5. Grain Growers – Non Executive Director as of 1.2.14 –Grain Tech is a wholly owned subsidiary
 6. Cooperative Research Centre for Hearing – Non Executive Director
 7. Ruralco Holdings Limited – Non Executive Director
 8. Callaghan Innovation - Non Executive Director
- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 73 'Termination of Appointment' of the PIRD Act only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No.
- i. Not applicable.
- j. Catering cost \$92.09, No alcohol served.

Question: 46 (continued)

Rural Industries and Development Corporation

- a. The RIRDC Board met twice – in October and December 2013.
- b. Board members are reimbursed for incidental travel expenses such as mileage, taxi and meals. The corporation pays for flights and accommodation on a corporate travel account.
- c. There was full attendance.
- d. In line with the RIRDC Conflict of Interest Policy (reflective of CAC Act). Section 21 of the CAC Act requires that a Director who has a direct personal interest in a matter that is being considered by the Board must disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Board. The Board manages the potential for conflict of interest for Directors and senior management by an annual declaration of potential conflicts and by a standing agenda item at each Board meeting that requires Directors who may have a conflict of interest in any matter to be discussed at that meeting to identify the potential conflict. Where a material potential conflict is identified the Director leaves the meeting during discussion of the matter. Potential conflicts are recorded in the Board minutes and are available for consideration by the Corporation's Auditors. Members of the Audit Committee also provide an annual written declaration to the Board stating they do not have any conflicts of interest that would preclude them from being members of the committee.
- e. October 2013 – Marilyn Sleight appointed to Intersect Limited.

December 2013 – Sam Archer appointed as Chair of Local Land Services; Roseanne Healy appointed as Chair of the Frankston Regional Aquatic Centre.
- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at
<http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 73 'Termination of Appointment' of the PIRD Act only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No.
- i. None.
- j. For the two Board meetings held the total cost for catering was \$618.18. No alcohol was served.

Question: 46 (continued)

Grains Research and Development Corporation

- a. The GRDC Board met three times.
- b. The travel expenses provided for Board meetings include travel, flights, mileage, allowances and expense reimbursements.
- c. 161st Meeting, 25 & 26 September
 - 8 Directors attended both days
 - 1 Director attended one day162nd Meeting, 3, 4 & 5 December
 - 100 per cent attendance163rd meeting, 10, 11 & 12 February
 - 8 Directors attended three days
 - 1 Director attended two days
- d. The GRDC maintains a conflict of interest policy and register. Conflicts of interest are declared at every Board meeting and managed according to the policy.
- e.

<i>Director</i>	<i>Entity 1</i>	<i>Entity 2</i>	ENTITY 3	<i>Entity 4</i>	<i>Entity 5</i>	<i>Entity 6</i>
Richard Clark	Director NSW Northwest Local Land Services Board	James Clark (brother) – Chair of Northern Panel <i>Perceived direct</i>				
Richard Brimblecombe	Managing Director and Shareholder in Quantum Power Ltd					
Jeremy Burdon	CSIRO Fellow	Trustee, Bioversity International [part of CGIAR system]				
Jenny Goddard						
Kim Halbert						

John Harvey						
Rob Lewis	Adelaide University (Special Projects Waite Research Institute)	Australian Genome Research Facility Pty Ltd (Director)	Science Without Bounds Pty Ltd (sole Director)	Flinders University Manager Special Projects DVCR Office	Honorary Fellow SARDI	Flinders Partners Pty Ltd (Senior Advisor)
Sharon Starick	SA Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	Rural Business Support (Chair)				
John Woods						

- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 73 'Termination of Appointment' of the PIRD Act only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No.
- i. Nil.
- j. Catering costs from the 7 September 2013 to 28 February 2014 are \$6,809, comprising of sandwiches, tea and coffee. Alcohol is not served at the Board meetings.

Cotton Research and Development Corporation

- a. Since the 7 September the CRDC Board has held 3 board meetings and 1 board teleconference.
- b. Board members are provided with accommodation, meals, airfares or car mileage allowance.
- c. 100 per cent for all meetings.
- d. The board manages conflicts of interest in accordance with the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997*. The board has a standing agenda item for declaration of Director's interests and conflicts of interest. The Board Charter sets the procedure for how the Board manages conflicts of interest including when a director with a conflict of interest can or cannot participate in discussion or voting as determined by the other directors.
- e. At the 24 and 25 February board meeting two directors notified the board of conflicts of interest associated with two research project funding recommendations before the board.

Question: 46 (continued)

- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 73 'Termination of Appointment' of the PIRD Act only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No.
- i. NA.
- j. The catering costs for board meetings held this financial year are \$4,041. Alcohol is not served at board meetings.

Board Meeting Date	Code & Location	Type	Cost
5 – 6 August 2013	2013-04 Narrabri NSW	Meeting	\$1,618
3 October 2013	2013-05 Teleconference	Teleconference	\$nil
6 – 7 November 2013	2013-06 Brisbane Qld	Meeting	\$1,761
22 January 2014	2014-01 Narrabri & teleconference	Meeting & Teleconference	\$126
24 – 25 February 2014	2014-02 Narrabri NSW	Meeting	\$536

Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority

- a. The APVMA Advisory Board has met on 27 September 2013, 12 December 2013 and 13 February 2014.
- b. Section 19 of the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Administration) Act 1992* provides that members are to be paid such allowances as are prescribed. Where a member is in employment of a state, then they are not to be paid allowances, but are to be reimbursed expenses reasonably incurred in performing duties as a member of the Advisory Board. The current Remuneration Tribunal determination is Determination 2013/16 'Official Travel by Office Holders' which took effect on 1 September 2013. Determination 2013/16 is applicable to Advisory Board members and sets out provisions that apply for office holders required to travel for official business away from their office locality, or home base in respect of part-time office holders. APVMA Advisory Board members are part-time office holders.
- c. Average attendance at APVMA Advisory Board meetings is 9 Board members and 4 invited guests.

Question: 46 (continued)

- d. Section 23 of the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Administration) Act 1992* provides that members must give written notice to the Minister for Agriculture of any direct or indirect financial interest that could conflict with the proper performance of the Advisory Board's function. The Terms of Reference for the Advisory Board also require members to sign conflict of interest declarations and then raise any specific conflicts of interest that may be identified through particular agenda items for meetings with the Chair and the APVMA CEO.
- e. No conflicts of interest have been registered during the period 7 September 2013 to 28 February 2014.
- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 24 'Termination of Appointment' of the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Administration) Act 1992* only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No requests have been made to the Minister for Agriculture ministers to dismiss board members from 7 September 2013 to 28 February 2014.
- i. No APVMA Advisory Board members have attended less than 51 per cent of meetings from 7 September 2013 to 28 February 2014
- j. Catering costs for the 27 September 2013 Advisory Board meeting were \$1,380.00, noting this was based on a per person rate that included both catering and room hire. Catering costs for the 12 December 2013 meeting were \$724.00 and for the 13 February 2014 meeting were \$928.00. No alcohol was served at any of the meetings.

Wine Australia

- a. Wine Australia board has met 3 times since 7 September 2013.
- b. Flights, accommodation and transport are provided for those board members who have to travel from interstate.
- c. Average attendance is 8 board members and 3 invited guests.
- d. The board deals with conflict of interest by adhering to the board policy developed to manage conflicts of interest.
- e. One conflict of interest has been registered:
 - a. one Wine Australia board member is also a board member of Winemakers Federation of Australia (WFA) and Wine Australia provides funding to WFA

Question: 46 (continued)

- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 20 'Termination of Appointments' of the *Wine Australia Corporation Act 1980* only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No.
- i. Nil.
- j. \$709 and no alcohol is served.

Fisheries Research and Development Corporation

- a. FRDC board meets 5 times a year (face-to-face)
- b. Cost of flights, taxis if applicable, and allowances are paid as per the remuneration tribunal 2013-16 Determination: Official Travel by Office Holders
- c. 2 face to face meetings in Nov 2013 and Feb 2014 – 100 per cent attendance
- d. In accordance with statutory requirements as per the CAC Act and the FRDC Board Governance policy – material personal interests.
- e. Material personal interests are declared and updated at each board meeting, and reported in the Annual report.
- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to board members. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 73 'Termination of Appointment' of the PIRD Act only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a board member.
- h. No
- i. Nil
- j. Catering costs for board meetings (morning tea, lunch, afternoon tea) totalled \$1,760 from 7 September – 28 February 2014. (these costs are deducted from directors' travel allowances) No alcohol is served during board meetings.

Question: 46 (continued)

Australian Fisheries Management Authority

- a. Since 7 September 2013 the AFMA Commission has met twice.
- b. Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2013/16: Official Travel by Office holders details the provision that apply to AFMA commissioners when they travel for official business away from their office locality, or home base in respect of a part time office holder. The Determination available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2013/compilations/travel-allowance-compilations/2013-16-determination-official-travel-by-office-holders/2013-16-Determination-26.9.2013.pdf>
- c. The AFMA Commission consists of nine members included the Chair. Since 7 September 2013 the average attendance at meetings is eight.
- d. The *Fisheries Administration Act 1991 section 20 Disclosure of Interests to Minister*, details the requirements of AFMA Commissioners with regard to Conflicts of interest. In addition the Commission has in place guidelines for Commissioners on disclosing conflicts of interest. The guidelines put in place a process to ensure that such 'conflicts are identified, disclosed and managed in a rigorous and transparent way that promotes public confidence in the integrity, legitimacy, impartiality and fairness' of the decision-making processes of the Commission.
- e. Registered conflicts relate to other state and commonwealth advisory bodies, company boards, family member associations and not for profit organisations that may have an interest or perceived interest in the management of Commonwealth Fisheries.
- f. Remuneration is paid in accordance with the determinations of the Remuneration Tribunal. Remuneration tribunal determination 2014/03 Remuneration and Allowances for holders of part time public office sets out the remuneration payable to Commissioners. The Determination is available at <http://www.remtribunal.gov.au/media/documents/2015/2014-determinations/2014-03-principal-determination-remuneration-and-allowances-for-holders-of-part-time-public-office/2014-03-PTOH-Principal-Determination-1.03.2014.pdf>
- g. Under section 21 'Termination of Appointment' of the *Fisheries Administration Act 1991* only the Minister can terminate the appointment of a Commissioner.
- h. No.
- i. No Commissioners have attended less than 51% of meetings.
- j. Total catering costs for Commission meetings held this calendar year is:
 - a. Lunch for two days of meeting (15 people) \$631.50 No Alcohol served
 - b. Dinner (10 People) \$419.60 (includes Alcohol)

Question: 46 (continued)

Sugar Research and Development Corporation

Please note that the Sugar Research and Development Corporation ceased to exist on 30 September 2013 and we are unable to get information relating to any board meetings that may have occurred between September 7th – September 30th.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2014

Agriculture

Question: 47

Division/Agency: Agricultural Productivity Division

Topic: Farmer Markets

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator STERLE asked:

1. Did Clunes Farmers Market receive Department of Agriculture funding for a feasibility study into a Farmers Market?
2. If so, with the cut to Farmers Market funding will any other funding be made available to Clunes Farmers Market for planned projects?
3. Will any funding be provided to the Regional Development of Victoria in relation to Farmers Markets?

Answer:

1. No.
2. See question 1 above.
3. Not at this time.