

AI-1	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	Complementary medicine task force	Senator KIM CARR: I'm glad that we've cleared that up. Tell me this, Minister: why are there no industry reps on the task force? Senator Canavan: I don't have responsibility for the portfolio and was not involved in the formation of the task force directly, so I'd have to take that on notice, sorry.	Spoken	40
AI-2	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	Australian Made Campaign Ltd cancelling licences	Senator KIM CARR: Is the department aware that Australian Made Campaign Ltd is currently cancelling licences? Mr Squire: Yes, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: How many have they cancelled? Mr Squire: I'd have to take that question on notice. It's a decision for AMCL.	Spoken	41
AI-3	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Shergold report	Senator KIM CARR: The Shergold report was received when? Ms Carew: It was received early in 2018 and made public in— Senator KIM CARR: Not when it was made public; when was it received by the department? Ms Carew: It was commissioned by the Building Ministers' Forum. I would have to take on notice the exact date— Senator KIM CARR: I'll help you out here: It was in about September 2017, wasn't it? Ms Carew: I would have to confirm that was the date. I understand it was only commissioned in August 2017. Senator KIM CARR: That's right, but it was received some three or four months before it was actually made public. That would be right, wouldn't it? Mr Power: I'm not sure— Ms Carew: I would have to take that on notice and confirm. Building ministers, though, first considered it at their April 2018 meeting.	Spoken	43
AI-4	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Dwellings with combustible ACPs	Senator KIM CARR: How many dwellings do we think are now the subject of combustible ACPs? Mr Power: You are probably aware that there are audits that are going across all jurisdictions. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I understand that. What, do you think, is the number? Mr Power: We take reports from each of the jurisdictions. We are constantly updating that. We've provided that to this committee and we can provide that again. Senator KIM CARR: You must be able to provide us with the current number. Mr Power: I'm not sure we have the current total number across all the states, at present, unless Ms Carew does? Ms Carew: No, we don't, but we'd be happy to collate that and provide it to you.	Spoken	44
AI-5	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Commonwealth role in building standards	Senator KIM CARR: In regard to the Commonwealth's role here, Minister, is it your view that the Commonwealth actually does have responsibilities in regard to building standards in this country? Senator Canavan: Again, not being the responsible minister, it's been explained to me—and most of the explanation involves this matter that we're talking about, because it's been topical—that our role is to coordinate and seek the cooperation of the states to form an appropriate building code and to ensure that it is appropriately enforced. But my understanding is that primarily the enforcement and monitoring of that code is at a state or territory level. Senator KIM CARR: What happens in circumstances where the Commonwealth actually finances a building? Senator Canavan: I'd have to take that on notice, but other witnesses might have information. Mr Power: Sorry, Senator: is the question what happens where the Commonwealth purchases— Senator Canavan: Where effectively the— Senator KIM CARR: The financing. Senator Canavan: You mean, we're going to own it? Senator KIM CARR: That's right. Senator Canavan: It is a hypothetical case. It potentially— Senator KIM CARR: It's not a hypothetical, but I'll give you a very specific case. Senator Canavan: I'm happy to try. Senator KIM CARR: For instance, at a university, where the Commonwealth's provided money under the EIF program or various others and the building's then been put up in breach of the building code, with cladding— Mr Lawson: Perhaps I can help. Those universities and so on are located in states. The states have the responsibility to maintain and regulate the safety of the construction of those buildings. Agencies such as universities or indeed Commonwealth agencies have occupational health and safety obligations to their employees, and they need to take those things into account, but that's separate issue from the approval of the building in the first place. Senator KIM CARR: When it comes to the building code, the Commonwealth's only too happy to put conditions—industrial relations, for instance. It makes all sorts of conditions, for tendering and various other things. But it seems that when it comes to the actual public safety issue the Commonwealth seeks to wash its hands of it. Mr Lawson: The building code that we're concerned with is the National Construction Code; it's not that other building code that's industrial relations— Senator KIM CARR: No, I accept all that. But knocking over a union is	Spoken	48-49

AI-6	Hume, Jane	Industry Growth	Cladding on government buildings	<p>CHAIR: It is an interesting issue, though, and I think Senator Carr does have a point. There were four government buildings in Adelaide, some of which were commissioned by the former Labor state government in South Australia, which had issues with cladding. I imagine the Commonwealth might have contributed some funding towards those buildings, though the Commonwealth had no control over the materials that were being used—that was a state government responsibility. It would be interesting to know where the Commonwealth's responsibility stops and starts if it contributes to infrastructure projects that are the responsibility of the state and the state uses flammable material. Senator Canavan: It is probably one for the Department of Finance, but I will take it on notice and see what we can do.</p>	Spoken	49
AI-7	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Building Ministers' Forum	<p>Senator KIM CARR: One of the complaints about the Building Ministers' Forum is that it's off to one side and not much happens. I know, in my case, it took eight years on disability changes—eight years! And we did something about that. The WaterMark was another one that went on forever. We did something about that. The question remains that, if it's off to one side, it never gets the attention it deserves. Does it ever report to COAG at a central level? Mr Lawson: I think there are two parts to that. My understanding is that, because it is not a formal COAG process, it doesn't have a formal reporting rule through that. We'd have to take it on notice. I think first ministers have discussed some of these issues, because, as you're aware, these issues are important, but we would have to take it on notice as to whether there has been that discussion. That's really PM&amp;C— Senator KIM CARR: What's the date for the return of answers? CHAIR: That is a good question. It's 26th March. Mr Power: I think the short answer is that we don't have that date or answer in front of us. We can take that— Senator KIM CARR: I can understand that. I can't recall an occasion when that happened, but you might be able to correct that. Mr Power: I think we'll have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: This committee is due to meet again in the week of the budget, isn't it? It's a Thursday. We'll have answers back by then, won't we? Mr Power: I don't think that answer is terribly difficult to get. Senator KIM CARR: I know. I suspect the answer is never. Dr Smith: We'll check it and take it on notice.</p>	Spoken	51
AI-8	Hume, Jane	Industry Growth	Building Ministers' Forum meetings	<p>CHAIR: Could I ask you to also take on notice, Ms Carew, how many times and the dates the Building Ministers' Forum has met since it was initiated. I think you said it began in 2005. Ms Carew: I'd be happy to do that.</p>	Spoken	51

Senator KIM CARR: Right. We will do that. Has the National Reference Group, the consultative group between this department and the ATO, met? Ms Mulder: The National Reference Group does have a history with the program. It has met several times since it commenced at the start of the incentive, but we have been looking at how we engage nationally, so officially it hasn't met for some time. Senator KIM CARR: That's what I thought. Ms Mulder: Having said that, they did come together for consultations for the proposed legislation in July last year. Senator KIM CARR: So they met last in July last year? Ms Mulder: Not formally as an NRG. Organisations were invited as part of the consultation process. Senator KIM CARR: Let me get it clear: has the group met or not? Ms Mulder: In terms of its professional capacity, not for some time. That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: What does 'not for some time' mean? When does that mean? When did it last meet? Mr Mullaly: Its last official meeting, I think, was March 2017. CHAIR: When do you expect it will meet again? Mr Mullaly: We've gone through a process to look at the purpose of the National Reference Group. Existing members were part of that process of looking at what it should achieve. We will now have our first meeting of the RDTI roundtable, on 7 March, and that meeting will constitute previous NRG members as well as new membership. We invited them to broaden the reach of the membership. Senator KIM CARR: A sort of two-year hiatus between the two? Ms Mulder: In the interim we did do considerable stakeholder engagement at the individual level, but we have certainly come to the conclusion that a national forum, along with our individual consultation, is a good way to go. Senator KIM CARR: I have a vague memory that there was actually a requirement under the old legislation. Is that right? Ms Mulder: Not to my knowledge, but I can clarify that. Senator KIM CARR: Were you unhappy with the old group? Is that why you didn't call it together? Is there a problem? Ms Mulder: My understanding—and please note that I wasn't in the program at that time—is that the purpose of the group had started to sway, and that's why they decided— Senator KIM CARR: What does 'sway' mean? Ms Mulder: Sorry. As you mentioned, the group is co-administered by the ATO and us. The purpose of the NRG, and primarily the purpose of their new RDTI roundtable, is to have stakeholders engage with the

AI-9 Carr, Kim AUSI - Industry Capability and Research National Reference Group Spoken 51-52

Senator KIM CARR: What's this new body all about? Ms Mulder: It's called the RDTI roundtable. It's membership includes existing members of the NRG and new membership to have a broader edge. Senator KIM CARR: Who are they? Ms Mulder: Apologies, Senator—I'll have to take that question on notice. I just don't have the list in front of me. We are going to the process of finalising membership at the moment. We are inviting some businesses to attend and I'd like to seek their permission first before we put their names out publicly.

AI-10 Carr, Kim AUSI - Industry Capability and Research RDTI roundtable Spoken 52

Senator KIM CARR: Is it the case that an Innovation and Science Australia finding was sent to a taxpayer without the customary reasons for decision document and that the taxpayer was informed that these could now only be obtained by making a freedom of information request? Ms Mulder: I'm not sure I completely understand your question. Senator KIM CARR: Do you want to take that on notice, because this is a specific— Ms Mulder: No, if you could rephrase it for me, that would be helpful. Senator KIM CARR: I'll read it directly: is it the case that an Innovation and Science Australia finding was sent to a particular claimant, or a taxpayer, without the customary reasons for decision document and that the taxpayer was informed that this could only be obtained by making a freedom of information request? Ms Mulder: I probably couldn't answer that definitively, so I'm happy to take it on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Will you take that on notice and check your records. Ms Kelly: We certainly will, and, of course, we would never discuss the particulars of an individual case. Senator KIM CARR: No, and I didn't ask you about a specific case. I'm asking: has it occurred, and you'll be able to tell me yes or no. You don't have to identify the particular case, but your records will show whether or not this has actually happened. Ms Kelly: We will certainly seek to confirm or establish that.

AI-11 Carr, Kim AUSI - Industry Capability and Research Innovation and Science Australia finding sent to claimant Spoken 56

Senator KIM CARR: In regard to the announcement that I see in the Financial Review today that the government's introducing new guidelines for software, what's the situation there? Ms Mulder: That's correct. The department has today released the guidance for software development. Senator KIM CARR: Have they been tabled, the guidelines? Ms Mulder: They went up on our website this morning. Senator KIM CARR: Is it expected that they will deal with the concerns that have been expressed about the position on software? Ms Mulder: Our expectation is that the guidelines released today, which are in a more user-friendly and easy-to-read format, will better clarify what's eligible and what's not eligible in the program and provide more certainty to those businesses that are undertaking a self-assessment as they apply for the RDTI. Senator KIM CARR: It's too early to get a response yet, I suppose? Ms Mulder: A response in what regard? Senator KIM CARR: From industry on this matter. Have you had any response from them? Ms Mulder: I think it perhaps may be a little early. Senator KIM CARR: When did the Financial Review get the guidelines? It was clearly before they were published on the departmental website. I read the article at five o'clock this morning, so presumably they were given yesterday. Is that the case? Is it normal practice for the department to release its guidelines— Senator Canavan: We'll take it on notice. Senator KIM CARR: I think we can probably work out the timelines here. But is it normal practice to release the guidelines in that way? Ms Mulder: I think we've taken that on notice, Senator.

AI-12	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Industry Capability and Research	New guidelines for software	Spoken	57
-------	-----------	---	-----------------------------	--------	----

Senator KIM CARR: When were you consulted about the ARC review? Ms Urquhart: I would have to take that on notice, unless my colleague Dr Mitchell recalls the timing. But there was an announcement last year by the Minister for Education, and we had discussed it with the Australian Research Council around that time. Senator KIM CARR: That was the one about the grants, from October last year. I'm talking about the one made two days ago.

AI-13	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	ARC review	Spoken	57
-------	-----------	--------------------------------------	------------	--------	----

Senator KIM CARR: Who is doing this informal review that has been going on for two years? Ms Urquhart: We are undertaking that in my division. Senator KIM CARR: It's your division? So there is a whole division doing it? Ms Urquhart: No, it's the science policy team. Senator KIM CARR: How many are in the science team? Dr Mitchell: It is a small subset of that team. Senator KIM CARR: I bet it is! So who is doing the review? Dr Mitchell: I will take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Surely you must know; it has been going to two years. It must be on someone's desk—this is the review; this is the person—so who is it? Ms Urquhart: Senator, as you would expect, officers are undertaking that work in my division. They report to me, the head of division. Senator KIM CARR: You told me that. I just want to know who it is. Ms Urquhart: We'll also be taking that to the National Science and Technology Council. Senator KIM CARR: I've got that. You've told me all of that. I want to know who is doing the review. It's not so difficult a question. Who's doing it? Ms Urquhart: I've said the review work is being undertaken by officers in that team. Senator Canavan: I've let this go for a while but Senator Carr is asking the same question, repeatedly. Senator KIM CARR: I haven't got an answer! Ms Urquhart: I heard that the official had taken that question on notice. CHAIR: I think that's fair and reasonable. Senator Canavan: My conclusion, here, is that the answer to Senator Carr's question is around identifying staff that would be below the SES level of the department. The normal convention is that we don't name such staff. But it's been taken on notice so we'll seek to provide you with information on that.

AI-14	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Officers undertaking review	Spoken	59
-------	-----------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------	----

Ms Urquhart: It wasn't a matter of removing people. As I explained, the intention with the new model, the National Science and Technology Council, is that it is focused on the forward agenda. The refreshed council has the opportunity to develop advice for the immediate and long term through a restructured work program. The horizon-scanning work that was a feature of the Commonwealth Science Council's work program continues. It's also intended the refreshed council will have research challenges agreed to address current or emerging issues, and will obviously also consider other issues pertaining to the science and research system, such as support for research on gender equity in STEM. Senator KIM CARR: Right. How do people get selected, then? They get appointed by the minister, clearly, but on what basis? What are the criteria? Ms Urquhart: There's no doubt that these are significant appointments, and there was considerable consultation in government. And, as I've said, the members were chosen on the basis of— Senator KIM CARR: Sorry, 'significant consultation'? Ms Urquhart: As you would expect with significant appointments within the usual processes. Senator KIM CARR: All right. What was the nature of this significant consultation? Ms Urquhart: I suppose my emphasis is on them being significant appointments. As I'm sure you appreciate, that involves a process of consultation with prime ministers and other ministers. Senator KIM CARR: So the significant consultation is talking to the Prime Minister? Ms Urquhart: I would apply the 'significant' to the appointment. Senator KIM CARR: You did say 'significant consultation'. Ms Urquhart: I did. Senator KIM CARR: Right. So I just— Ms Urquhart: I'm correcting myself. Senator KIM CARR: want to know what that involved, apart from talking to the Prime Minister. The minister wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, did they? Is that what happened? Ms Urquhart: I think it was considered in cabinet. Senator KIM CARR: In cabinet? What date was the cabinet meeting? Ms Urquhart: I'll have to take that on notice. I don't have that date in front of me. It was in the second half of last year. Senator KIM CARR: How long would it take you to get that date? Would it be easy? You'd have an officer here somewhere that could probably pull that out of the records pretty smartly, wouldn't you? Ms Urquhart: We obviously work with the Office of the Chief Scientist and with ministers to consider improvements that could be made to the Science

AI-15 Carr, Kim Science and Commercialisation Policy National Science and Technology Council

Spoken 62-63

Senator KIM CARR: I can tell. I might go to Mr Luchetti again in terms of the SKA. Mr Luchetti, you've indicated before to Senator Arthur Sinodinos that you are due to sign a treaty in March, that was correct was it? Mr Luchetti: That's right March 12. Senator KIM CARR: In Rome. I take it Australia has agreed to sign this treaty? Mr Luchetti: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: That's good. When will the treaty or the text of the treaty be made available? Mr Luchetti: I will have to take that on notice. There is a process that I understand that it goes through. We then need to ratify the treaty and then it moves into JSCOT and through that process. I'm not sure if it's just through that process or whether it generally becomes publicly available or all the member countries release it.

AI-16 Carr, Kim Science and Commercialisation Policy SKA treaty

Spoken 64

Senator KIM CARR: You mentioned earlier that you've brought together your capabilities in terms of optical astronomy. What financial obligations are we required to meet in regard to commitments to the Giant Magellan? Ms Forsyth: I don't have much detail with me in regard to the Giant Magellan Telescope, or the GMT. My understanding—and I'll take it on notice to confirm—is that we don't have any outstanding obligations, and the funding is managed by Education. Senator KIM CARR: You don't run that? Ms Forsyth: We contributed money a number of years ago, over a period time. Senator KIM CARR: It used to be run out of this department. Ms Forsyth: I might have to take some of these questions on notice. Ms Urquhart: The Department of Education and Training was managing the funding that went to the Giant Magellan Telescope, not the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science. Senator KIM CARR: When did that happen? Ms Urquhart: That pre-dates my arrival in Science Policy, which was 2013. Ms Forsyth: It was a period from about 2007 to about 2013. Ms Weston: The department has had representation on the Giant Magellan Telescope Advisory Committee. It's being run out of the ANU at the moment, who are looking after Australia's interests in that. There is active discussion at the moment about contributions from the US, for instance, and the work towards the build for that. But this is one of those assets that has moved between portfolios as there have been machinery changes. Senator KIM CARR: I see. The original contribution came out of this department, though, if I recall rightly. Ms Weston: I think that was part of the Super Science— Senator KIM CARR: Super Science Initiative—that's right. Ms Weston: Or 2008-09—around that time. Senator KIM CARR: I would have thought there was actually a requirement now that they're in the build stage for additional support. Ms Weston: We can take this on notice, but my recollection is that we were an early contributor and there are other contributors who now need to step up. But we will take that on notice for you. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much. Dr Mayfield: senator just a response to that: when we made our submission on 5 november we also sent a letter at that time to the royal commissioner, where we strongly refuted those statements that were made at that point in time. Then, when we made our

AI-17	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Giant Magellan Telescope	Spoken	66-67
AI-18	Patrick, Rex	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Letters to Royal Commissioner and SA Premier	Spoken	98

Senator PATRICK: Ms Manen, as you would recall, last estimates I asked questions about the Seafood Origin Information Working Group, which was established in November 2016. You advised that the group had met in 2017, and, from memory, there was a report and the government was going to respond to that report. Ms Manen: Yes, the government made a commitment to provide a report in relation to the work of the seafood working group. Senator PATRICK: Last time we met you said that there would be a meeting taking place in November. Ms Manen: Yes, that's right. Last time we met I mentioned that there were two subsequent processes underway—one that was run by Minister Littleproud in relation to fast food. He hosted fast-food forums. One occurred in May and one occurred in November last year. The meeting in November in particular was very positive. Representatives from the fast-food sector that attended that meeting indicated their support for making origin information available to their consumers, and they agreed that they would continue to explore ways that they could make that information available for products on their menus. I also mentioned when we last met, Senator Patrick, that the food ministers had asked for advice from the Consumer Affairs Forum. The Consumer Affairs Forum met in October of last year, but we are still waiting advice from CAF on the outcomes of its consideration. Senator PATRICK: Okay. In November, Minister Andrews wrote to a constituent of mine advising that a paper on the working group had been uploaded on the department's website. My understanding is that there's no final report at this stage. Ms Manen: That's right. Senator PATRICK: The minister basically stated that the papers that were uploaded onto the website were the views of the working group. Ms Manen: That's right. Senator PATRICK: But it's been put to me that they're not the views of the working group but the views of the department and that the views of the working group are not expressed on the website. Ms Manen: My understanding is that those papers, whilst written by the department, expressed the views of the general working group. Senator PATRICK: Have those papers been presented to the working group, and has the working group signed off on them? Ms Manen: I would need to take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: That's inherent in what you have just told me—that they are representative. Ms Manen: Certainly my

AI-19 Patrick, Rex Industry Growth

Seafood Origin Information Working Group

Spoken 72-73

Senator KIM CARR: In another one of your answers you say you are concerned about the duty avoidance, and remain committed to ensure that the trade remedies system is strong and robust and that the legislative framework achieves its objectives. While the ABF is the lead agency for ensuring compliance, do you think there is anything more that we can do to ensure that we collect the duties that are owed? Mr Seymour: There are obviously some clear responsibilities that sit currently with the ABF in that regard, and they take the lead. They are fit for purpose in that respect. The Anti-Dumping Commission now have, and have had for four years, the ability to conduct our own anticircumvention inquiries. We have done quite a few of those now. Where we find that businesses are circumventing in relation to duties, be they dumping or subsidy duties, we have the ability to alter the notice and provide further remedy to ensure that they cease that activity. And in some of those cases we work closely with reference to ABF to ensure that the case may be followed up as a fraud matter. It's difficult for me to say much more than that. I provide, through the International Trade Remedies Forum, a facility to ensure that industry in Australia has the ability to come to government and raise those concerns. Once those concerns are raised, we always ensure that those matters go to the appropriate authority for follow-up. Senator KIM CARR: Clearly it's a very important function. Mr Seymour: The Anti-Dumping Commission is not resourced to undertake a large compliance suite of activities. It's not really something that we have done. Senator KIM CARR: I see what you're saying, but what seems to be the implication of the proposition you're putting is that we have a total duty collected in 2017-18 of \$70.3 million: \$60.6 million on dumping and \$10.6 million on countervailing duties. That is a customs value on goods of \$1.03 billion. That's on the operating systems data provided by the Border Force. That implies that the post-transaction verification activity which was analysed—a just \$27 million of that—picked up 2.7 per cent, which is of course only seven per cent of the revenue. Is that level of abuse, avoidance, of concern to you? Mr Seymour: As the commissioner I would like to see 100 per cent compliance with all duty obligations for those who are transacting business into Australia. There is a great deal of detail that we go into in this area. I am quite happy to ask one of my

AI-20 Carr, Kim

Anti-Dumping Commission

Duty avoidance

Spoken 77-78

AI-21	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-dumping review cases	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How many cases have been done within the 155 days? Mr Seymour: There are a number of review categories and I can give you the detail if I could take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: You can take on notice how many have required an extension and how many have been within the 155 days. Mr Seymour: Certainly, we can take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	81
AI-22	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Aluminium exclusion	<p>In terms of your third party countries on the aluminium exclusion, did you actually get full cooperation from Border Force in terms of your work? Mr Seymour: This is in the anti-circumvention case I was referring to? Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Mr Seymour: My case manager worked closely with Border Force in relation to that particular case and was required to because most of the noncompliance data is obviously held by the Australian Border Force, in their customs database. Senator KIM CARR: Did you notice any recovery of duties as a result of this? Mr Seymour: I would have it take that specific question on notice— Senator KIM CARR: Could you— Mr Seymour: because he may well have made some calculations in that regard. Senator KIM CARR: Could you also take on notice whether or not there have been any prosecutions or infringement notices issued, and if not, why not? Mr Seymour: That may not be a matter that the Anti-Dumping Commission would have responsibility for, and if that is not the case, I'll refer that to ABF.</p>	Spoken	81-82
AI-23	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Former employees appearing before Royal Commission	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Minister, why does the government seek to prevent former employees from appearing before the Commission? Senator Canavan: I'm not aware of that particular issue. I would have to take that on notice. I'm happy for Dr Mayfield to add further to his comments. I'm not sure if that was a decision of Dr Mayfield or not, but I would have to take that on notice. Dr Mayfield: In terms of the High Court injunction, I only saw it from a distance. That was my understanding of it at the time, but I could be corrected on that. Senator Canavan: I wasn't the responsible minister, although I represent Mr Littleproud in the Senate, but my understanding in regard to the High Court injunction was that the government's view was that it was not appropriate for a state government formed commission to subpoena or seek to subpoena Commonwealth officials. It's a long-standing principle. That is why the court action was progressed, I believe. Ultimately, the commission dropped its demand for officials to be subpoenaed and therefore we did not proceed with the court action. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, I understand the principles of comity. The question about former public servants is a different matter entirely. Senator Canavan: I've taken that on notice. I'm not aware of that.</p>	Spoken	96-97



AI-24	Patrick, Rex	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Basin Plan modelling	<p>Senator PATRICK: I'll explore some of that, Senator Carr. On page 11 of the report it says: Whilst the modelling the MDBA employed for the Guide was partially disclosed to the CSIRO and the Goyder Institute for the purposes of review (for South Australia), none of the modelling used to form the basis of the Basin Plan as enacted has been made available to the scientific community, or the wider public. Basically, you've received this and no-one seems to be able to produce it. Can you advise me as to whether CSIRO has that modelling information? What follows from that is: can you please provide it to the committee? That's in the spirit of openness you talked about. Senator Canavan: I'm happy for officials to add to this, but I'm reading the same section of the report as you are, Senator Patrick. Your question will probably be a matter for the MDBA, given that it reads as if it's their modelling and, obviously, not CSIRO's. Obviously, you could ask the— Senator PATRICK: I understand that, but no-one knows. There's been an order of production in the Senate for it; no-one seems to be able to find it. If CSIRO has it, it's quite a reasonable question for me to ask for them to locate it and provide it. Senator Canavan: I'm happy for them to answer that aspect; I'm just flagging that, given it doesn't appear to be their modelling, I doubt they'd have the authority to release it. But I'm happy for the officials to make further remarks. Dr Mayfield: Senator, there was some work done to provide advice to the MDBA. In terms of the level of detail of the modelling work that was reviewed, I couldn't tell you. I would have to take that on notice and, given that it happened so many years ago— Senator PATRICK: That's not a criticism. Dr Mayfield: A review of the work was undertaken and advice provided back to the MDBA at the time. Senator PATRICK: Just to be clear: that's not a criticism; I'm simply seeking to find documents that appear to be unfindable, and we know that CSIRO had possession of them. That's all I'm trying to do there. There was the claim made, and the minister read from it: In 2011, management of the MDBA improperly pressured the CSIRO to alter parts of the CSIRO's 'Multiple Benefits' report. This rendered parts of that report misleading, as they no longer reflected the views of, at the very least, Dr Matthew Colloff, who was one of the authors. I'm putting that to you so that you can respond to that. Is anyone aware of, because it was a while ago, the circumstances; and is</p>	Spoken	98-99
AI-25	Patrick, Rex	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Science used in Murray-Darling Basin Plan	<p>Senator PATRICK: I'm trying to establish what CSIRO's view is on the science that was used to form up the environmentally sustainable levels of take in the current Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Was that science consistent with what we know now? Dr Marshall: We can certainly take that on notice. Thank you for clarifying.</p>	Spoken	100
AI-26	Patrick, Rex	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Menindee fish kills	<p>Senator PATRICK: What activities have you been doing in the field, as opposed to back in the offices, in relation to the Menindee fish kills? Dr Mayfield: I'm not aware of which particular activities in the field, but I am aware that we have looked at our understanding of the issues and put forward our position. Senator PATRICK: Could you take it on notice to find out, just in case there are some activities you're not aware of? Or are you completely satisfied there are none? Dr Mayfield: We'd be happy to take it on notice to check.</p>	Spoken	101
AI-27	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO Charter	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you able to indicate whether there have been any incidents where CSIRO has not fulfilled its obligations under that charter? Ms Zielke: The CSIRO board, of course, presents its performance statements as part of the financial statements and the annual report each year. There are a number of activities that relate to the statement that are actually covered in those details. I don't believe we have a comprehensive reporting mechanism in relation to that. Senator KIM CARR: There was a review following some of the controversies in CSIRO a couple of years ago. I thought that review was hardly complimentary to CSIRO. Ms Zielke: I know I'm new. I expect that you are talking about one that was undertaken in 2015, though, to assist the board in reviewing those processes. A number of practices have been put in place to change those arrangements, restructure some of our reporting arrangements, in relation to that. Senator KIM CARR: So we could say there have been instances when the CSIRO management and board have not actually fulfilled their obligations? Ms Zielke: I'd need to take that on notice. I'm not aware of anything at this stage.</p>	Spoken	101

AI-28	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Academy of Science review	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Senator Patrick, asked about your involvement in the studies for the Murray Darling on the fish question. There was a study undertaken by the academy. CSIRO had a person on that review, is that right? Dr Mayfield: There was no CSIRO officers on that review. Senator KIM CARR: What was Dr Penny Whetton's capacity. Dr Mayfield: I'm not aware of her involvement in that review. Senator KIM CARR: You are not aware? Dr Mayfield: No. Senator KIM CARR: Have I got it wrong? Are you saying she wasn't involved? Dr Mayfield: No. What I'm saying is that I'm not aware that she was involved. Senator KIM CARR: Perhaps you should have a look at the Australian Academy of Science's website and see whether or not I've got it wrong. That's not my issue though. My issue goes to the question as to whether or not anyone from CSIRO was reprimanded for providing information to the Academy of Science's review. Dr Mayfield: No, I'm not aware of anyone being reprimanded. Senator KIM CARR: You're not aware? Dr Mayfield: I don't believe anyone has been. Senator KIM CARR: Dr Marshall, will you take that on notice? Dr Marshall: Certainly. Are you suggesting that, in fact, someone from CSIRO did? Senator KIM CARR: Someone was obviously on the review. I can draw your attention to the Academy of Science's statement now. You're saying to me, 'In what capacity?' Presumably, you're not acknowledging their official engagement. I would like to know though—you'll take it on notice—has there been any reprimand issued to any CSIRO personnel for participating or providing information to the Academy of Science's review into the Murray Darling, which recently reported to the Leader of the Opposition? Dr Marshall: A couple of days ago, in fact. Senator KIM CARR: That's right. You know the one. Dr Marshall: Very recent. Senator KIM CARR: Very recent, so you should have no trouble with your records. Dr Marshall: We have no trouble with the records anyway. It might take us more than two days to review the document. It's 700 pages, I believe. Senator KIM CARR: No. It's the Academy of Science's review, which was commissioned by Mr Shorten and supplied to Mr Shorten. It was published last week. Dr Marshall: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: I'm asking you, on notice, were any officers of the CSIRO reprimanded for participating in that review? Dr Mayfield: We can take that on notice. Can I also say that our work around the Murray Darling Basin is all</p>	Spoken	102-103
AI-29	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Climate Science Centre staff	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How many staff are currently working under CSIRO's Climate Science Centre? Dr Mayfield: As of 22 January of this year, the Climate Science Centre had 146 staff working there. Senator KIM CARR: And they're all in Hobart? Dr Mayfield: No, they're across three different sites. We have some here in Canberra at our Black Mountain site, in Hobart and also at Aspendale in Victoria. Senator KIM CARR: What does the breakdown look like? Dr Marshall: I don't believe I have that information with me today. Senator KIM CARR: All right. Perhaps you could provide that for me at a later date, on notice. Dr Marshall: Yes.</p>	Spoken	103
AI-30	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Lead agency for climate science	<p>Senator KIM CARR: At the moment, who is responsible for coordinating climate science within the Commonwealth? Senator Canavan: I'm not sure coordinating would be the word I'd use, but the Minister for the Environment is responsible for the Commonwealth government's climate policy. Senator KIM CARR: So the environment department, is it? Senator Canavan: Well, the Minister for the Environment is. I'm not familiar myself with all the divisions of responsibilities. I would expect it would be the environment department, but certainly the Minister for the Environment is the responsible minister. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, that's a fairly vague answer. Would it be possible to take that on notice? Who is the lead agency for climate science in the Commonwealth of Australia at the moment? Senator Canavan: I'm happy to take it on notice. I don't think it's a question, though, that's best directed to this committee. Given you're asking about environmental policy, it would probably best to ask that in the Senate environment committee.</p>	Spoken	103-104

AI-31	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Staff at Climate Science Centre since formation	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Perhaps I could add as a question on notice: could you give me a breakdown for CSIRO, by calendar year, of the number of staff who have worked at the Climate Science Centre since its formation? Are you able to do that? Dr Marshall: We could provide information on notice, yes. Senator KIM CARR: Have you got that now, or do you want to take it on notice? Dr Marshall: I probably can't do it year by year now, so I think to make it consistent it's probably best to take it on notice.</p>	Spoken	104
AI-32	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Climate Science Centre funding	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Fair enough. What's the level of funding, from the appropriation and from external revenue, for the Climate Science Centre? Can you provide that? Dr Marshall: For this particular financial year, the Climate Science Centre has a budget of \$25.5 million. Senator KIM CARR: Is that appropriation monies? Dr Marshall: No, that's a combination of appropriation and external. Senator KIM CARR: Can you give me a breakdown please of appropriation and external revenue. Dr Marshall: Of that \$25.5 million, \$16 million would be coming from external sources and the balance would come from appropriation. Senator KIM CARR: How does that compare with the situation in 2013? Dr Mayfield: I'm not sure I have a comparison number for you at this point in time. Senator KIM CARR: What are the external sources for the \$16 million? Dr Mayfield: There are a range of sources, including various programs being run through the Department of the Environment and Energy and the work we do with the Qingdao National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology and other state bodies. Senator KIM CARR: Can you give me an itemised breakdown? Dr Mayfield: Yes. Dr Marshall: To be fair, it's also a collaboration between the University of Tasmania and the University of New South Wales. Senator KIM CARR: That'll show up in the breakdown, won't it? Dr Marshall: I just wanted to acknowledge the support of our partners. Senator KIM CARR: It's all public money. The \$16 million is all public money for all of the government agencies, isn't it? Dr Mayfield: No, as I said before, some of that comes from Qingdao national marine laboratory. Senator KIM CARR: How much? Dr Mayfield: I believe \$5 million per annum comes that way. Senator KIM CARR: If you could give me a table on that, that would be great. And the same for 2013, if you could, please. Is that the only funding that you'd say could be identified as climate science funding in CSIRO at the moment? Dr Mayfield: If you look at the broader adaptation and mitigation context, there is a lot more work being done. Senator KIM CARR: And what is that? Dr Mayfield: I probably couldn't give you the number of— Senator KIM CARR: Could you give it to me on notice and how that compares with the situation in 2013? Is that all right? Dr Mayfield: Yes.</p>	Spoken	104-105
AI-33	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Climate change scientists	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you also provide a breakdown of the staff working in CSIRO in terms of the same levels—that is, cite the climate change scientists now and in 2013 across the organisation? Thank you.</p>	Spoken	105

Senator STORER: In 2011, Bight Petroleum Pty Ltd was granted permits for EPP 41 and 42 in the Great Australian Bight. Offshore exploration permits are typically leases for only a few years at a time and given on condition of minimum work requirements. With regard to the granting of permits, do you agree it is important that minimum work requirements are met? Mr Waters: Yes, indeed. The granting of an exploration permit of the type you are talking about is based on an agreed work program over a period of time. That is the basis on which the joint authority will have granted the permit, and there are compliance obligations on the company concerned, the operator, to fulfil those obligations. Senator STORER: How many extensions has Bight Petroleum been given since 2011 to meet these minimum work requirements? Mr Waters: The exact number I will have to take notice. I should point out that the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator commenced as an organisation in January 2012, so prior to that makes it a little difficult. But if we take it on notice, I will be able to address the body of your question. Senator STORER: Has Bight Petroleum met any of the minimum work requirements outlined in any of the extensions since 2011? Mr Power: Again, I will take that on notice. But I am not aware of any issues of noncompliance arising from that particular permit. Senator STORER: So are you aware of any evidence that Bight Petroleum have undertaken any of the agreed work between 2011 and 2019? Mr Waters: As one of the requirements the company is required to submit an annual title assessment report, where it reports on its ongoing activities with regard to its work program. Again, I'm not aware of any issues of noncompliance with the lodgement of the report or with the work program itself. Senator STORER: Are you aware that Bight Petroleum have been awarded five extensions since 2011, despite seemingly never having met the minimum work requirements? Mr Waters: I'll have to take that on notice. I am not surprised that they have been granted suspensions and extensions to their work program; it is a usual activity that companies engage in. As to how many they've been granted, I'm sorry, I would have to take that on notice.

Senator PATRICK: I did at some time ago that looked at how the department might have considered Commonwealth sites for the radioactive waste management facility. I got a response from the department in relation to Woomera. It had taken advice from Defence, and Defence had said no. On this map there are three numbers: 52A, 45A and 40A. Location 52A is inside the Woomera Prohibited Area. I believe that Defence has indicated that is a place they don't want to have a facility, even though they've already got waste there. Could you give me some idea as to whether locations 45 and 45A were considered by the Commonwealth in the selection process? I note that both of those sites were recommended as a possibility in this very extensive report. Senator Canavan: I'm happy to refer to officials. I, myself, would probably need to take that on notice though, given that that part of the selection process occurred before I was the minister. I would note that we have established a process which has sought voluntary applications from landowners. I'm not familiar with the land ownership of these two sites there. Are you saying they're on Defence land—40a and 45a? Senator PATRICK: I'm actually just trying to clear that up. I don't actually know myself, so it's not a loaded question. Senator Canavan: I'm not aware either, but I might pass to Ms Chard and she might have some information. Senator PATRICK: I just thought the department would have been aware of this study and would have some information. Ms Chard: Of the three sites that you're referring to, two of those sites are within the Woomera protected zone and one is just outside of the boundary. I note the map indicates that two of them look like they are outside of the boundary— Senator PATRICK: Which ones are inside and which one's outside? Ms Chard: I'll have to take that on notice—the specific one. The one that's outside of the boundary was also assessed by Defence, and all three sites were assessed by Defence as being incompatible with their operational requirements. Senator PATRICK: Particularly in relation to the one that's outside Woomera Prohibited Area, firstly, is it owned by Defence, and, secondly, noting it's outside the Woomera Prohibited Area, what would be the basis of their saying no? Ms Chard: I would have to take on notice what the ownership is, but position of Defence has been that it's inconsistent with their operational requirements—that their operational activity that occurs in and around

AI-34	Storer, Tim	Resources	Bight Petroleum	Spoken	109
AI-35	Patrick, Rex	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Commonwealth sites for the radioactive waste management facility	Spoken	111-112

Senator PATRICK: Thank you. I understand that they've got this red zone that is owned by Defence and orange zones and green zones and so forth. I did an FOI to both Defence and ARPANSA. Defence came back. I think everyone's aware of the CSIRO waste at Woomera, but there's also another facility called Koolymilka, which is owned by Defence and has some intermediate-level waste, some of it owned by Defence, some of it administered by Defence. I did ask for a copy of their manual, their emergency response plan. In that plan there were a number of risks that they identified associated with the facility. They included things like fire, flood, storm, civil protest activity at Woomera, missile strike from something that might be on the range, aircraft strike from an aircraft nearby and they mention, 'terrorist activity aimed at accessing the facility for publicity purposes, or for removing drums from the facility for use in a dirty bomb'. That is a Defence assessment. It's in their emergency response plan and they have a contingent for it. Some sort of way of reacting to that plan. I've spoken to residents of Kimba who basically have said that the Department of Industry has been silent on that particular prospect even though it has been raised during community consultation. I'm giving the department an opportunity to lay out has the community been consulted about the possibility of a terrorist attack and what was the nature of that consultation, if there was any? Senator Canavan: Can I say up-front that I've never been provided with any advice that this is at all a risk. Obviously, in putting forward a proposal for a radioactive waste facility the department and myself have gone through the assessment of the risks of handling, storage and transport of radioactive waste and this has never been raised as an issue. I have no reason to believe there is any risk of this. I want to state again, as I have many times at this committee and other places, that, of course, the waste we're talking about is already stored, or the level of waste we're talking about is already stored at Lucas Heights—30 kilometres from our largest city—and it's been managed safely for decades. I don't know if officials wanted to add anything. Senator PATRICK: To be fair, Minister, Defence did tell me they had not provided you with a briefing and that they had not provided the community with a briefing of that nature. But, I would ask you to take it on face value. I'm happy to provide your office with the document that I

AI-36	Patrick, Rex	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Security information provided to potential National Radioactive Waste Management Facility host communities	and that they had not provided the community with a briefing of that nature. But, I would ask you to take it on face value. I'm happy to provide your office with the document that I	Spoken	112-113
AI-37	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia and Major Projects	NAIF Board appointment process	Senator KETTER: Can I ask the department to commit to more detail in terms of the process that was undertaken to identify Mr Rolfe as a candidate for the position? Ms Reinhardt: I think we'll have to take that on notice, whether he was part of the formal process that was outsourced or whether it was an internal process, because there are a number of different pathways. Senator KETTER: My recollection from the last estimates was that there was an external agency used. But that ended up being an internal appointment of Mr McCormack, I think. Senator Canavan: We'll take that on notice. I can recall Mr Rolfe being identified as a potential candidate through a selection process. It might have been for a separate appointment. But I'll take that on notice and we'll make sure the record's correct, to get the information. Senator KETTER: Coming back to you, Minister, what due diligence did you personally undertake prior to appointing Mr Rolfe to the NAIF board? Senator Canavan: I've probably gone through that, largely. As I said— Senator KETTER: Perhaps if I could clarify my question, you indicated that you weren't aware of the donation that Infigen had made. Senator Canavan: No, absolutely not. Senator KETTER: Mr Rolfe, as you indicated, is the CEO of that company. Wouldn't that be part of a due diligence process? Senator Canavan: I've made a number of appointments to boards and other bodies, and it's not a practice of myself or my office to check up on their political donation history. I don't see how that would be relevant. In this case, as you've rightly outlined, it wasn't Mr Rolfe himself at all; it was a company he's CEO of, but that's not a criterion in the appointment of people to boards. Senator KETTER: You're saying you only become aware of that donation after the appointment? Senator Canavan: Yes. In fact, may I say, I was a little surprised because, as I indicated, Mr Rolfe has longstanding connections to the Queensland Labor Party, an appointment by Queensland Labor government. I've got nothing against that. It's not a crime to support the Labor Party. But he was qualified for the role, and that's why he was appointed. Senator KETTER: Who recommended Mr Rolfe to you? Senator Canavan: I'd have to take that on notice, as I said. This is going back about a year, and my recollection is that he was identified through a process. I did speak to a number of others who had dealt with Mr Rolfe in the past, both in Queensland and elsewhere. He's obviously got extensive	Spoken	118-119

AI-38	Storer, Tim	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Meetings with Equinor	<p>Senator STORER: That's another question I have: how many meetings would you say that NOPSEMA has had with Equinor? Mr Grebe: I'd have to take the exact number of meetings on notice. Senator STORER: That's okay.</p>	Spoken	127
				<p>Senator PATRICK: I like to take something, just to help guide us through this time of questioning that I've got, and it's really just to help the witnesses as well. Once they've got it, the minister might want to have a look at this. I've got two pages of pictures which come from the acoustics book. The third page is an acoustic model that I generated this afternoon on Excel, just using basic acoustic theory, so it's first order but it's designed to illustrate a point. I've read the PGS submission quite extensively. I can see they've got a seismic survey configuration where they've got an acoustic source—that's got a source level of 256 dB, which is quite high—which they operate at seven metres. Obviously, that transmits sound outward. The first pictures are not quite accurate but are designed to show how typically, when sound is transmitted through the ocean, it is transmitted spherically. Basically, every time it doubles its range it loses about 6 dB. If you go to the third page, in the first column is the range in metres and in the second column is what's happening with spherical spreading. Are you with me, Mr Grebe? Mr Grebe: Yes. Senator PATRICK: Okay. So we can see that, in a circumstance where you've got spherical spreading and a source level of 256 dB to start with, by the time you've gone 4,000 metres the source level will have dropped to about 184 dB. That's about the level where a dolphin will start to suffer hearing injury. The bottom line is that at anything outside 4,000 yards it becomes less of a problem for a dolphin—so a reasonable distance away. If I look at the second page, that shows a different situation where the sound velocity profile, which is basically the speed of sound as a function of depth, has trapped the sound in a surface duct and the sound is travelling. Basically, because it's trapped, it doesn't lose as much energy as a function of range. The formula for that normally is 10 log the range, and there's a factor taken in for the height. That's the third column in my little model here. You can see that, if I go out with cylindrical spreading, the sound will actually travel about 256 kilometres before it drops below 185 dB. The point of that exercise is to show you that the amount of attenuation in the sound varies significantly depending on the sound velocity profile. I know this because I've operated in submarines and we used this extensively to try to either hide or get very long detection ranges. So it's a really key factor in sound propagation that you use an accurate sound velocity profile. I</p>	Spoken	129-130
AI-39	Patrick, Rex	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Acoustic modelling			

Senator PATRICK: Following on from that, do you know where the peak for the transmission frequency is? It's clearly a broadband source. What's the peak frequency for transmission? Mr Grebe: For the source? The peak sound pressure level? Senator PATRICK: Yes. It will have a frequency range. At each different frequency it will have a different source level, and it will have a peak at a particular source level—at some particular frequency will be where the peak of the energy is. Mr Grebe: It's complicated in the array, but, in any case, the peak SPL across all frequencies is 255 parsecs. Senator PATRICK: No, it will not work like that. You will not build a transducer, even if it's by broadband, that has a constant source level across a wide frequency range. There's also another rule that says the depth of the sound channel must be 10 times the wavelength before it takes advantage of the surface duct. If you've done the analysis at 100 kilohertz but there's a huge spread—the transducers are likely to go up several thousand kilohertz—the model will show that it doesn't transmit very far at that peak, but there will be other frequencies where it will be coupled into the surface duct and it will transmit a long way. Mr Grebe: I didn't bring a bioacoustician, so I'm going to defer to my earlier offer of taking a detailed answer on notice. Mr Smith: As you indicated, these are very technical, detailed questions which we are more than happy to take on notice. Mr Grebe is head of the environment division, but he's not an expert on seismology. He wasn't part of the assessment team for that project either. If we can take it back, we'll provide you with an answer. Senator PATRICK: I'm happy to have a conversation with you offline provided that the outcome of that conversation becomes public. I'm saying that I think there is a serious mistake that's being made acoustically here that doesn't take into account the worst case scenario. The worst case could occur on any day, and that could cause damage to any number of marine mammals.

AI-40	Patrick, Rex	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Peak frequency for transmission	Spoken	130-131
-------	--------------	---	---------------------------------	--------	---------

Senator KETTER: Are there mandatory courses, qualifications or industry experience required for NOPSEMA inspectors or assessors to review safety cases? Mr O'Keeffe: We employ people who are highly experienced in certain areas. In one particular case, there may be someone who's got particular experience in electrical work. Others are ship's mates, people with college degrees, university degrees and a mixture of formal education and direct experience. Yes, that's the case. Senator KETTER: Okay. I'm looking for the particular qualification. Is it the electrical equipment in hazardous areas certificate IV? Mr O'Keeffe: We have three of our people who are specialists in electrical work which would cover EEHA, electrical equipment for hazardous areas. Senator KETTER: Do you have any electrical engineers performing these functions? Mr O'Keeffe: We have three people who are qualified experienced electrical people, yes. Senator KETTER: What do you mean, 'electrical people'? Mr O'Keeffe: I need to take on notice the precise qualifications in that respect. Senator KETTER: If you could, thank you. When NOPSEMA reviewed the safety case for Prelude, did the organisation have suitably qualified inspectors to review the electrical equipment in hazardous areas? Mr O'Keeffe: We look at a range of risks, of which electrical equipment is one, as well as, generally, process safety, marine safety and structural integrity. We've got a mix of people. My team has about 35 people with ages somewhere between 40 and 65 years of age. They're all highly experienced people, working in a variety of areas. We do it on a team basis. If we need skills we will go and recruit them as appropriate, and we've been through that recently in refreshing our team due to some retirements. Mr Smith: And if we think there are any gaps in our expertise we can also use consultants, and we have done that on occasions. Senator KETTER: But my question is: when you reviewed the safety case for Prelude, did you have people that were suitably qualified in those areas? Mr O'Keeffe: Yes, all \ our people would have been appropriately qualified to look at the thing in its entirety. Senator KETTER: With a minimum certificate IV in EEHA work? Mr O'Keeffe: As I said, I would need to take that specific one on notice. Senator KETTER: All right.

AI-41	Ketter, Chris	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Electrical qualifications	Spoken	132
-------	---------------	---	---------------------------	--------	-----

AI-42	Ketter, Chris	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Prelude facility safety concerns	<p>Senator KETTER: All right. In December 2018, leading up to the wells being opened and gas flowing to Prelude, did NOPSEMA receive any specific information about safety concerns from employees or safety experts working on the project and, if so, what was the nature of their concerns? Mr O'Keeffe: We receive input from employees or workers on different facilities at different times. Yes, we did receive information from the Prelude facility workers out there, and we looked into those. Sometimes they relate to working conditions. Sometimes they relate to specific things. I don't recall the specifics of that, but we treat each one of those as a complaint and we look into it. We include it as a part of our inspection routine and we go and have a look at each one of those, whether it's on the Prelude or, indeed, any other facility. Senator KETTER: So, there was more than one complaint? Mr O'Keeffe: Again, I'd take that on notice. I'm aware of one specifically, and there may have been others. Mr Smith: Can I also add that, when we conduct inspections, we always start and finish with a meeting with the health and safety representatives, and they are likely to have raised issues, if they have concerns, during those meetings. Those meetings are confidential from management to protect the workers if necessary and provide them with that opportunity to raise issues directly with the regulator. Senator KETTER: So that was a confidential issue that was raised? Okay. And you're going to take on notice how many complaints were received. Mr O'Keeffe: Yes. Mr Smith: Yes.</p>	Spoken	132-133
AI-43	Ketter, Chris	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Prelude electrical compliance	<p>Senator KETTER: Did NOPSEMA send a suitably qualified electrical inspector to the Prelude in December to check electrical compliance? Mr O'Keeffe: Again, I'll need to take that one specifically on notice. But we do have three electrically qualified people in our team who have been involved with this and other facilities.</p>	Spoken	133
AI-44	Patrick, Rex	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Sound velocity profile	<p>Senator PATRICK: Very quickly, Mr Grebe—if you don't know the answers, just say so and you can take them on notice—will the survey vessel be taking a sound velocity profile on at least a daily basis? Mr Grebe: I'll take it on notice to confirm it's in the environment plan, but most seismic surveys take sound velocity profiles regularly, because they need to ensure that the data they receive is properly analysed and calibrated. Senator PATRICK: Normally, they're transmitting down, and the sound velocity profile doesn't affect sound travelling directly downwards, and that's what I'm most interested in. Thank you for taking that on notice.</p>	Spoken	135



AI-45	Patrick, Rex	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Passive acoustic monitoring	<p>Senator PATRICK: .... The streamer that follows behind the vessel clearly is a receiver. Mr Grebe: Streamers, yes—there's more than one. Senator PATRICK: Yes, streamers—they're receivers? Mr Grebe: Yes. Senator PATRICK: Are they capable of passive processing such that they can detect the presence of noises that are made by whales, dolphins and other marine life? Mr Grebe: I don't believe the technology proposed for passive acoustic monitoring uses in-streamer microphones in this particular instance. That technology is being developed, although that application of passive acoustic monitoring technology is being implemented in some places. I'd have to take on notice if it's— Senator PATRICK: I can tell you the technology is there. I spent many decades— Mr Grebe: The technology is there. Putting it into a streamer is new. Senator PATRICK: Okay. An alternative is putting a sonar buoy over the side with a sonar buoy processor. I can assure you they can also listen for whales. I know your plan talks about visual spotting, and that's clearly a good thing, but it seems to neglect the fact that it is actually very easy to detect marine mammals at long distances using a passive receiver. Mr Grebe: Yes. I think passive acoustic monitoring is an important control, particularly for species that surface less often, blue whales particularly, which are relevant. Senator PATRICK: So you say it's important, but you're not aware of— Mr Grebe: I'll have to take on notice how it's described— Senator PATRICK: What worries about me about the decision-making process you've gone through is that you're not aware of some of these things. Mr Grebe: It's a document of about 1,500 pages with appendices, and I'm not— Senator PATRICK: No, you made a decision on the basis— Mr Grebe: Not myself, no. I wasn't the decision-maker. Senator PATRICK: Okay. Well, someone has made a decision on the basis of the document. I've read most of it, and I can't see any passive receiving, hence my question. That's me done. Thank you very much, Chair.</p>	Spoken	135
AI-46	Hume, Jane	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Data61	<p>1. In 2017, Data61 produced a report Distributed Ledgers: Scenarios for the Australian economy over the coming decades. What follow up work has been done to build upon the Data61 Report? Is there an identified roadmap for Australia to drive blockchain innovation leading to the positive outcomes described in the report? 2. Has there been any work done to benchmark Australia's plans to encourage blockchain innovation with competitor economies around the world? 3. What plans have been developed to engage with key industry sectors in the joint development of roadmaps for blockchain innovation in those sectors?</p>	Written	
AI-47	Waters, Larissa	Resources	Black lung disease	<p>1. Is the Department aware of a proposal from the Mine Dust Victims Group to establish a Victims' Fund, for victims of Black Lung and other dust diseases, such as silicosis, associated with the coal mining industry? 2. If so, have you briefed the Minister on this proposal? 3. The group proposes that the Victims' Fund is funded in a similar way to the United States model, where coal companies pay a levy of \$1.10 per tonne of coal produced, to assist victims of Black Lung. It would be used to support victims of Black Lung and other dust diseases with their medical expenses. Has the Department done any policy work on this issue?</p>	Written	
AI-48	Waters, Larissa	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Northern Australia Infrastructure Fund	<p>1. In January, media reports stated that the Fund had approved a loan for \$50 million for an unannounced project in North Queensland. Can you provide details of this loan, its recipient, and its purpose?</p>	Written	
AI-49	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Ministerial Functions	<p>Ministerial functions In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in calendar year 2018, please provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of functions;</li> <li>• List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff;</li> <li>• Function venue;</li> <li>• Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);</li> <li>• Details of any food served;</li> <li>• Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage;</li> <li>• Any available photographs of the function; and</li> <li>• Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ul>	Written	

				In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc. hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio in calendar year 2018, please provide the following: •List of functions; •List of attendees; •Function venue; •Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive); •Details of any food served; •Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; •Any available photographs of the function; and •Details of any entertainment provided.	Written
AI-50	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Departmental Functions		
AI-51	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Executive Office upgrades	Were the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries, upgraded in calendar year 2018? If so, please provide an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive).	Written
AI-52	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Facilities upgrade	Were the facilities of any of the Department's premises upgraded in calendar year 2018, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment? If so, please provide a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrade together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). Please provide any photographs of the upgraded facilities.	Written
AI-53	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Staff Travel	What was the total cost of staff travel for departmental employees in calendar year 2018?	Written
AI-54	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Media Monitoring	What was the Department's total expenditure on media monitoring in calendar year 2018? Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all media monitoring contracts in that period.	Written
AI-55	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Advertising and Information Campaigns	What was the Department's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in calendar year 2018? What advertising and information campaigns did the Department run in the relevant period? Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in that period.	Written
AI-56	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Promotional merchandise	What was the Department's total expenditure on promotional merchandise in calendar year 2018? Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period. Please provide photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise.	Written
AI-57	Bilyk, Catryna	Strategic Policy	Ministerial overseas travel	Please provide an itemised list of the costs of all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in calendar year 2018. This list should include the costs of: •Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel; •Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials; •Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; •Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided; and •Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.	Written
AI-58	Bilyk, Catryna	Corporate	Social media influencers	What was the Department's total expenditure on social media influencers during calendar year 2018? What advertising or information campaigns did the Department use social media influencers to promote? Please provide a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts. Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts.	Written
AI-59	Storer, Tim	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Zooplankton loss	While the mortality to zooplankton may be short term and recoverable, even Richardson et al. 2017 suggest the impact could span 38-42 days. Given this, on what scientific basis did NOPSEMA determine the impact of zooplankton loss would not cause serious knock-on	Written

AI-60	Ketter, Chris	Geoscience Australia	Mineral Exploration	<p>1. Can you advise value of mineral exploration investment for the following financial years: a. 2007-2008 b. 2008-2009 c. 2009-2010 d. 2010-2011 e. 2011-2012 f. 2012-2013 g. 2013-2014 h. 2014-2015 i. 2015-2016 j. 2016-2017 k. 2017-2018 l. 2018-present</p> <p>2. Can you provide a table outlining investments made by the Exploring for the Future Fund and: a. The purpose of the investment b. Value of investment c. When the investment was made d. The recipient of the investment (please provide ABN's) e. Activities undertaken as a result of funds f. Where funds were spent g. Outcomes/deposits identified from this investment h. Who approved this investment</p> <p>3. Has the Exploring for the Future fund led to any mining projects? a. If so, what are those projects? 4. Has GeoScience Australia sold any data gained from the Exploring for the Future Fund? a. What was the value of that sale? 5. How much of the total funding from the Exploring for the Future Fund is unallocated? 6. What is the dollar value of the Exploring for the Future Fund spent on administration?</p>	Written
AI-61	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Projects	<p>Can we please have an updated table of projects and draw down figures, as set out in QoN SI-45 from the October 2018 Estimates Round? Please include any new projects as applicable and revise the date to 28 February 2019.</p> <p>Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility 1. How much funding has withdrawn from NAIF's draw down facilities by project proponents? 2. Does the NAIF use a garden service for indoor or outdoor pot plants/flowers maintenance? a. Who are the contracts with? b. How much does each contract cost? c. How often do they visit? d. How much was spent on this service in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>3. Have any floral displays or indoor plants or pot plants been hired or leased for display in any offices? a. Who were the contracts with? b. How much was each contract cost? c. How much was spent on this service in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>4. What was the total cost of all subscriptions by the NAIF to online news services, newspapers, magazines, journals and periodicals from 1 January 2016? a. What are these services / newspapers / magazines / journals / periodicals? b. How much was spent on these subscriptions in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>5. What was the total value of all gifts purchased for use by the NAIF since 1 January 2016? a. What were the gifts purchased? i. Who were they gifted to? ii. What was the cost of the gift? b. How much was spent on gifts in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>6. Does the NAIF purchase bottled water or provide coolers? a. What is the monthly cost of this? b. How much was spent on this service in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>7. Does the NAIF provide fruit for the board or staff? a. What is the monthly cost of this? b. How much was spent on this service in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>8. How much was spent on the following services in the following financial years, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018 - present: a. Taxi hire b. Limousine hire c. Private hire care d. Hire car rental e. Ridesharing services f. Chartered flights</p> <p>9. How many media or public relations advisers are employed by the NAIF? 10. Are media or public relations advisers currently independently employed by contract? a. Who are these contracts with? b. What is the value of these contracts? c. How much was spent on media or public relations advisors in financial year: i. 2015 -16 ii. 2016 -17 iii. 2017 - 18 iv. 18 - present</p> <p>11. What is the forecast for the current financial year for the number of media or public relations advisers to be employed and their total cost?</p>	Written
AI-62	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	<p>1) What is the gender pay gap at CSIRO when it is calculated in accordance with the method set out by the Workplace Gender Equality Agency as opposed to the CSIRO "in-house" method?</p>	Written
AI-63	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Gender pay gap	<p>1) Did CSIRO consider whether or not to issue a limited waiver of confidentiality obligations as requested of all Australian employers by the Commissioner for the purposes of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian workplaces? a. If CSIRO did not issue this waiver, who made the decision that it would not issue the waiver?</p>	Written
AI-64	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment	<p>1) Did CSIRO consider whether or not to issue a limited waiver of confidentiality obligations as requested of all Australian employers by the Commissioner for the purposes of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian workplaces? a. If CSIRO did not issue this waiver, who made the decision that it would not issue the waiver?</p>	Written

AI-65	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Staff email monitoring	1) What resources (full-time equivalent staff and other resources) are directed towards monitoring of CSIRO staff emails or email accounts? In answering please provide a breakdown by resource type and year for the years 2015 to present.	Written
AI-66	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	National Science and Technology Council	1. At the last meeting of the National Science and technology Council: a. What was the membership of the Council? b. Who attended? c. Did the Prime Minister attend the whole meeting? d. What was the agenda? e. What were the costs of conducting the meeting?	Written
AI-67	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	National Science and Research Priorities	1. In regards to the ARC review of the National Science and Research Priorities, when did the Department become aware of the review announced on 31 October 2018? How did the Department become aware? 2. In regards to the Departments own internal work on the National Science and Research priorities: a. When did the Department's work commence? b. Was the Department briefed the Minister or the Minister's office? If so, which Minister and on what date? c. What are the specific "data issues that research activities against each priority cannot be measured and reported to an acceptable level of accuracy"? d. What is meant by an acceptable level of accuracy? e. What data have you sought to use to measure the effectiveness of the priorities? f. When was a draft discussion paper produced and which agencies was it circulated to? g. Please provide a copy of the draft discussion paper h. Has feedback been received from agencies? If so who and when? i. Has there been formal or informal consultation with stakeholders or experts? If so who and when? j. Was preliminary work presented to the national Science and Technology Council? k. Lack of transparency regarding the ABCB's decision making process: have Government Ministers, MPs and Senators able to see the final draft provisions of the ABCB's National Construction Code, the most significant standard for building construction in Australia, before it is published? b. Is it true that when the ABCB consult as part of their various projects, the submissions returned are not made public? c. Is there a concern that this reliance on secrecy as well as the ABCB process of making final determinations itself is resulting in a lack of transparency particularly regarding the evidence basis for critical decisions including matters of safety? d. Why is there a need for secrecy regarding the feedback from industry on important building and construction matters including critical safety issues? e. Specifically regarding the ABCB decision to allow photoluminescent exit signs to replace electric exit signs, why were submissions made by fire brigades, fire engineers, specialist evacuation consultants, disability groups, electrical contractors, the lighting industry and overseas organisations involved in emergency evacuation seemingly ignored? 2. Lack of representation of affected stakeholders in the decision making process: a. Why does the ABCB NCC decision making process exclude affected stakeholders from key parts of the decision-making process? 3. Technical content development process: a. Standards Australia is the peak standards development organisation in Australia with over 90 years' experience in developing standards. Their extensive and detailed processes are published on their website including the key principles of balance, transparency and consensus. Government, industry and the Australian public trust Standards Australia and this trust is demonstrated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the Commonwealth Government and Standards Australia in 2018. The National Construction Code is the most significant standard regarding building construction in Australia. i. Does the ABCB NCC development process align with the Standards Australia process and if not, why not? ii. Does the ABCB have a policy to ignore advice from Standards Australia technical committees? iii. Why does the ABCB rely on internal decision making processes when its staff do not have expertise in all areas of building and	Written
AI-68	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	ABCB processes to revise National Construction Code		Written

AI-69	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	Complementary Medicine	<p>1. Was the ACCC a member of the taskforce that recently considered concerns raised by the industry about the application of ACCC guidelines for use of the Australian Made logo? 2. Was the Department aware whether the ACCC continued to take any enforcement or compliance activity in relation to the existing guidelines while the taskforce was undertaking its activities? 3. Would it be normal process to expect a compliance agency to pause compliance activities while the basis of compliance activities were being reviewed for possible unintended consequences? 4. What is the key differentiator between Australian Made and non-Australian Made complementary medicines? 5. Is it correct to say the interpretation of what is Australian Made has changed due to the recent court ruling by the Federal Court in regards to Nature's Way? 6. One of the reasons that has previously been given for the changes to the use of the Australian Made logo for complimentary medicines was consumer expectations. What research did the Department undertake in relation to consumer expectations about the use of the Australian Made logo on Complimentary Medicines? 7. What was the overall finding of this research? 8. Was any consideration given to differences between ingredients for foods and ingredients for medicines? 9. How many people are currently employed manufacturing complimentary medicines in Australia? 10. What is the value of complimentary medicines manufactured in Australia to the Australian economy? 11. What modelling has the Department undertaken of the risks to the industry, in particular to local manufacturing jobs as a result of not being able to use the Australian Made logo on products which are manufactured in Australia? 12. Do you think being able to label products as Australian made implies a certain level of quality which assists Australian manufacturers to market their products globally? 13. What is the value of complimentary medicines that are currently exported from Australia? 14. What will be the impact of removing the Australian Made logo on those products that are manufactured in Australia to this export market? 15. What timeframe has been given to the complementary medicine industry to comply with changes in the Country of Origin Labelling regulation? How long have companies previously been given to comply with changes in labelling laws? 16. The Food Labelling Law reforms were afforded a two-year transition to label</p>	Written
AI-70	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Industry Capability and Research	CRC program	<p>1. Has the Department removed the requirement for external reviews? 2. What review process is currently in place? 3. What criteria are applied to satisfy governance standards? 4. What criteria are applied to determine if a CRC is no longer functioning appropriately – or according to the law? 5. With the new priority for critical minerals applications in CRCPs, will there be any funds left for other CRCs – not in this category? 6. How will “critical minerals” be defined?</p>	Written
AI-71	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Growth Centres	<p>1. What are the current funding levels committed and non-committed for each Growth Centre? 2. Please provide an update of the value of the industry commitment for each growth centre? What is the nature of these industry commitments? 3. What are the current staffing levels for each growth Centre? 4. Was there a review conducted of the growth centres in 2018? Who conducted the review? Is the review report publicly available? If not when will it be made available? 5. What are the current key performance indicators for each growth Centre? Please provide a breakdown advising which Growth Centres have met or exceeded their KPIs</p>	Written
AI-72	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Entrepreneurs' Programme	<p>1. What is the current status and proposed expiry date of contracts for delivery of the entrepreneurs program? 2. What evaluations or reviews have been conducted of the Entrepreneurs Program? 3. Are these reviews publicly available? If not when will they be available? 4. What is the current and forecast funding levels for the Entrepreneurs Program? What is the current range of services provided? What is the breakdown of services provided by industry sector and region?</p>	Written
AI-73	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund	<p>1. What is the status of the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund? How many projects have been approved? How much funding remains?</p>	Written

AI-74	Carr, Kim	Economic & Analytical Services	Electorate briefs	1. How regards to SI-94 how many electorate briefs has the Department produced? What programs do the briefs cover? What other information is contained in the briefs? How is it possible that providing a copy of each brief would be an "unreasonable diversion of Departmental resources"? How many staff members have been involved in the production of the briefs? If it remains impossible to provide a copy of all briefs, please provide a copy of the brief for the seats of Herbert and Dawson, with confidential information redacted?	Written
AI-75	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Movement of funds	1. Table 1.3 of the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (p. 15) there is a series of movement of funds in annual appropriations. Please outline, disaggregate and explain each movement by financial year and program 2. Table 1.3 of the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (p. 15) there are movement of funds for special appropriations. Please outline, disaggregate and explain each movement by financial year, Act and program 3. Table 2.1.1 of the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (p. 21) there are decreases in expenditure on the Square Kilometre Array of \$19.52 million in 2018-19, and \$14.2 million in 2020-21, with increases in 2019-20, 2021-22 and beyond the forward estimates. What is the reason for these movements in funds, and does this impact on the quantum of the original NISA measure? 4. Table 2.1.1 of the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement (p. 21) there are decreases in expenditure on the Advanced Manufacturing growth Fund \$3.8 million in 2018-19 and increase of \$4.741 million in 2019-20. What is the reason for these movements in funds, and does this impact on the quantum of the original NISA measure?	Written
AI-76	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Discretionary grants	1. Please update the discretionary grants spreadsheet provided in response to Question on Notice no. BI-75 from the 2018-19 Budget Estimates, to provide budget, committed and non-committed funding from 2009-10 to 2023-24 for all identified programs and any other discretionary grant programs that may be established.	Written
AI-77	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Upcoming appointments	1. Please provide a list of all upcoming appointments - including those to boards, positions, working groups, committees - that are due to be made by the Minister in the next twelve months. Include and identify any positions that require cabinet approval and include positions like appointments to international bodies, or appointments as international counsellors. Please provide a list of all portfolio appointments - including those to boards, positions, working groups, committees - that are appointed by the Minister or Secretary. List the date of expiry of the appointment, and the length of term.	Written
AI-78	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Australia-India Strategic Research Fund	1. Please provide a list of each grant under the Australia-India Strategic Research Fund since 2016, including the title of the project, the participating institution (including the federal electorate of each Australian based institution), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-79	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Australia-China Science and Research Fund	1. Please provide a list of each grant under the Australia-China Science and Research Fund since 2016, including the title of the project, the participating institution (including the federal electorate of each Australian based institution), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-80	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Industry Capability and Research	R&D Tax registrations	1. For the R&D Tax Incentive please list by federal electorate: (a) Number of registrations (b) Number of registrations for the 43.5 percent refundable tax offset (c) Number of registrations for the 38.5 percent non-refundable tax offset (d) Number of registrations from manufacturing firms	Written
AI-81	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Inspiring all Australians in STEM	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Inspiring all Australians in STEM since 2016, including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), a short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-82	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Industry Capability and Research	CRC headquarters and partners	1. Please list for each CRC: (a) The federal electorate of its headquarters (b) Each university partner for each CRC	Written

				1. For each federal electorate please list: (a) Number of business/management services/grants in 2018-19 to date, 2017-18, and 2016-17 (b) Number of Accelerating Commercialisation services/grants in 2018-19 to date, 2017-18, and 2016-17 (c) Number of Innovation Connections services/grants in 2018-19 to date, 2017-18, and 2016-17 (d) Number of Incubator Support Services services/grants in 2018-19 to date, 2017-18, and 2016-17	Written
AI-83	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Number of grants		
AI-84	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Automotive Diversification Program	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Automotive Diversification Program since 2016 , including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-85	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program since 2016 , including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-86	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Global Innovation Strategy	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Global Innovation Strategy since 2016 , including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-87	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Tasmanian Jobs and Investment Fund	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Tasmanian Jobs and Investment Fund since 2016 , including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-88	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Support for Business	Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund grants	1. Please provide a list of each grant under programs supported by Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund since 2016 , including the title of the project, the participating business/partner (including the federal electorate), short description, and amount of funding awarded	Written
AI-89	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Staffing and Facilities	1. (a) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of Department facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL (b) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of CSIRO facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL (c) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of ANSTO facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL (d) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of AIMS facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL (e) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of IP Australia facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL (f) Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of NMI facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL	Written
AI-90	Carr, Kim	Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS)	RV Cape Ferguson	1. When will a decision need to be made on a replacement or refit of the RV Cape Ferguson? a. What is the best estimate of the cost to replace the RV Cape Ferguson? b. What is the best estimate of the cost to refit and extend the life of the RV Cape Ferguson?	Written
AI-91	Carr, Kim	Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS)	Economic value of Great Barrier Reef	1. The AIMS Index of Marine Industries 2018, recently published, concludes that income based on the marine environment was \$68 billion in 2015-16. Is it possible to make conclusions on the economic value of industry around the Great Barrier Reef? If so, what is that economic value? a. Is there also data on jobs dependent upon the Great Barrier Reef? b. Is there any assessment of the economic or scientific risk of continuing bleaching events on the Great Barrier Reef, to the health of the marine eco system in central and north east Queensland? c. Has there been any major changes in the health of the reef that is discernible over the 2018/19 summer to date? d. What is the state of monitoring and data gathering on the Great Barrier Reef?	Written

AI-92 Carr, Kim Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS) AIMS staffing

1. Over the past 24 months, how many individuals have been carrying out duties within your agency who were not engaged under the Enterprise Agreement covering AIMS staff? 2. Can you please supply a breakdown of the number of scientific qualifications by section within AIMS, including the number of those academically qualified (broken down by qualification level, e.g. bachelor, masters, PhD) vs other qualifications and what qualifications they possess. 3. Can you please provide the number of staff who have been appointed from overseas into senior management roles and they roles they are filling? 4. Does AIMS have any plans for redundancies in the next 12-24 months? 5. Can AIMS provide the number of employment issues which were sent to Fair Work Australia in the last 12 months? 6. How many senior executives have left AIMS over the past 6 months? Can you please tell us their positions and reason for leaving?

Written

AI-93 Carr, Kim Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO) Nuclear medicine

1. Can ANSTO provide an updated assessment of the domestic and international market for nuclear medicine? 2. Has ANSTO had to alter its business model for technetium generator during or since the shortfall of supply? 3. Are there any controls on third parties on selling nuclear medicine products produced/supplied by ANSTO? Does ANSTO have any legal recourse to prevent this? 4. What are the risks to the public and the Commonwealth to third parties potentially on selling nuclear medicine products produced/supplied by ANSTO?

Written

AI-94 Carr, Kim Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO) ANSTO Staffing

1. Over the past 24 months, how many individuals have been carrying out duties within your agency who were not engaged under the ANSTO Enterprise Agreement? 2. Can you please supply a breakdown of the number of scientific qualifications by section within ANSTO, including the number of those academically qualified (broken down by qualification level, e.g. bachelor, masters, PhD) vs other qualifications and what qualifications they possess. 3. Can you please provide the number of staff who have been appointed from overseas into senior management roles and they roles they are filling? 4. Does ANSTO have any plans for redundancies in the next 12-24 months? 5. Can ANSTO provide the number of employment issues which were sent to Fair Work Australia in the last 12 months? 6. How many senior executives have left ANSTO over the past 6 months? Can you please tell us their positions and reason for leaving?

Written

AI-95 Carr, Kim Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO) Radioactive incidents

1. Is ANSTO aware of any previous risk reports, recommendations or assessments that were done on any part of the equipment or process which may have highlighted any contamination risk or mechanical disruption prior to the second radioactive spill in August 2017? If so when and what did ANSTO do to implement these recommendations? 2. Did ANSTO receive any reports, assessments or recommendations from staff in relation to any part of the equipment or processes which were involved in the reportable radioactive incidents in 2017 and 2018? What did ANSTO do with these reports?

Written

AI-96 Carr, Kim Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) CSIRO staffing

1. Over the past 24 months, how many individuals have been carrying out duties within your agency who were not engaged under the Enterprise Agreement/s covering CSIRO staff? 2. Can you please supply a breakdown of the number of scientific qualifications by section within the CSIRO, including the number of those academically qualified (broken down by qualification level, e.g. bachelor, masters, PhD) vs other qualifications and what qualifications they possess. 3. Can you please provide the number of staff who have been appointed from overseas into senior management roles and they roles they are filling? 4. Does the CSIRO have any plans for redundancies in the next 12-24 months? 5. Can the CSIRO provide the number of employment issues which were sent to Fair Work Australia in the last 12 months? 6. How many senior executives have left the CSIRO over the past 6 months? Can you please tell us their positions and reason for leaving?

Written



AI-97	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Climate science	<p>1. How many staff are currently working at or under the CSIRO Climate Science Centre?  2. Where are staff located? Please list how many research staff and support staff by location?  3. Are there any other staff, or research groups, working on climate science in the CSIRO?  4. What is the level of funding for the climate science centre from the appropriation, and separately from external revenue?  a. How does this compare with the situation in 2013?  5. What is the proportion between external and appropriation funding for climate science at the CSIRO? And how does this compare with 2013?  6. How does the level of staff working in climate science at the CSIRO compare with in 2013?  7. According to the Australian Climate Science Capability Review in 2017 there was a climate science capability gap in a number of areas, including some at the CSIRO. It suggested that there were areas that required immediate investment – climate observations, understandings, modelling and service – a total of 27 FTE. Has the CSIRO been able to assist in meeting these immediate needs?  a. How many new staff were hired in climate science areas in 2017? How many left?  b. It also suggested that 77 FTE are needed over four years. Has the CSIRO been able to assist with meeting this staffing gap?  i. In particular it suggested another 25 FTE in 2018. How many staff were hired in climate science areas in 2018, and how many left?  ii. Are there any plans to hire new staff in climate science in 2019 or 2020? What is the anticipated number who will be leaving?  c. In particular the review raised concerns about our modelling resources. Given the climate centre is responsible for ACCESS have there been any additional staff allocated to modelling?  d. Given the time since the review, what are the current plans to improve or enhance areas of capability within the CSIRO Climate Science centre?</p>	Written
-------	-----------	--	-----------------	---	---------

AI-98	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Review of the Implementation of the Australian Jobs Act 2013	<p>1. Section 127, subsection 1 of the Jobs Act requires a review of the operation of the Act and subsection 2 of that requires that A review under subsection (1) must be conducted in a manner that provides for wide public consultation. How did the conduct of the review satisfy the requirement for wide public consultation?  2. Is it correct – as suggested on p 18 of the report - that only one submission was received?  3. The report notes 38 survey responses including from six suppliers? Is the Department satisfied that this constitutes a solid basis for assessing the effectiveness of the operation of the Act?  4. Why did the scope of the review preclude considering AIP requirements for Commonwealth Government procurement, grants and loans?  5. Was there consultation with industry on the scope and terms of reference for the review? If yes – who was consulted and when?  6. The review makes eight recommendations for the enhancement of the operation of the Act. Which recommendations have been accepted by the Government?  7. What action is being taken to give effect to the recommendations?  8. What resourcing will be available to the AIP authority in 18/ 19 and 19/20?  9. The review notes that an Australian Industry Participation Advisory Board is provided for in the Act at the discretion of the Minister. Has the Department provided advice to each Minister in the last five years regarding the appropriateness of appointing a Board?  10. Given the report commentary on recommendation 2 that the broader communication effort needs to be lifted and noting that that the report suggests (p70) the “Overall suppliers did not see AIP Plans as effective instruments that were having an impact on their operations.” Has the Government considered whether the appointment of a Board could assist deal with those issues?  11. How many AIP plans have been approved so far in 2018/19?</p>	Written
-------	-----------	-----------------	--	---	---------

AI-99	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Northern Australia and Major Projects	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility	<p>1. Has the Department reviewed its approach to Aboriginal nations given the current process has seen Native Title bodies in both focus regions engage in court action and lodge complaints through the Human Rights Commission opposing the proposed National Radioactive Waste Management facility? 2. There is a new community outreach team (see: <a href="https://prod-radioactivewaste.industry.slicedtech.com.au/news/meet-new-nrwmf-community-engagement-team?fbclid=IwAR3IEskjRwJOsHxSaf8TqBWxxOVcxnF5zgy3tACqArSFyecXrmUwD9ot_Y">https://prod-radioactivewaste.industry.slicedtech.com.au/news/meet-new-nrwmf-community-engagement-team?fbclid=IwAR3IEskjRwJOsHxSaf8TqBWxxOVcxnF5zgy3tACqArSFyecXrmUwD9ot_Y</a>) - can you clarify the scope of works of this team given the continuing legal and procedural contest and uncertainty around the National Radioactive Waste Management Project? 3. Is Bruce Wilson still the overall NRWMP leader? 4. Will both of the communities currently being assessed be offered another \$2 million in disruption payment funding as the process continues in 2019? 5. Will the Regional Consultative Committees be re-established in 2019? 6. Has the Department conducted any internal or external review of the operations and outcomes of the Consultative Committee's to date? a. If so, what were the key findings? b. If not, is such a review being considered? 7. Does the Department accept that there have been adverse mental health concerns associated with the NRWMP - as documented recently at: <a href="https://mobile.abc.net.au/news/2019-02-13/foi-documents-show-kimba-divided-over-nuclear-waste-site/10807462?pfmredir=sm">https://mobile.abc.net.au/news/2019-02-13/foi-documents-show-kimba-divided-over-nuclear-waste-site/10807462?pfmredir=sm</a> a. What is the Department doing to address these mental health and community well-being issues? 8. Has the Department made new plans and timelines to advance a community ballot to test the level of support for a NRWMP in the affected regions? a. Has the Department held any discussions or correspondence on this issue with either the Kimba District or Flinders Ranges Councils? 9. Rowan Ramsey, the federal MP for Grey, the electorate which covers the two affected regions, has expressed disappointment that the planned community ballot has been delayed because of legal action but has stated that "Minister Canavan has announced a way will be found for Hawker and Kimba to have their say" - can the Department detail this 'way' and its timeline? 10. What is the status of the radioactive waste categorisation and re-containerisation process currently underway at Woomera? 11. Can you advise the status of</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, but that's not the question I asked you. It was: have you had a conversation about how you would go about banning the product? Ms Carew: There have been conversations, yes. Senator KIM CARR: And they're saying it's difficult to implement a ban at the border. Ms Carew: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: It's because they don't have resources to do it; is that their issue? Ms Carew: I would have to check the notes of those discussions.</p>	Written
AI-100	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Banning combustible ACPs		Spoken

Senator STORER: So it's the usual situation that minimum work requirements are not met but there is a granting of an extension? Mr Waters: The company—in order to meet its work commitment—seeks to suspend, extend or both a permit year for a range of reasons. That doesn't mean they're noncompliant with their obligations; it means that, if you like, we have shifted the permit term so that they remain compliant and then have an obligation to undertake their work. Senator Canavan: I wouldn't necessarily characterise this as the normal course of events; each case is analysed itself on its merits. Obviously, it is the right of acreage holders to seek an extension for their commitments, but that's always assessed against the requirements. There are a number of cases before me where extensions haven't been granted and title holders have entered into a period of noncompliance or seeking a good-standing agreement with us. Ms Schofield: As a title holder progresses, they are required to do an annual titles assessment report. That is submitted in accordance with the year that they have over their permit, and that goes into the titles administrator each year and is assessed. As Mr Waters indicated, if there are issues of noncompliance, then they are dealt with in that format. As the minister mentioned, companies can, at particular points in time, over the course of their permit year—and there are some restrictions around when they enter years when they do then have to carry out those commitments— apply for variations, suspensions or extensions. So there is quite a structure around how a title holder can apply for variations, suspensions and extensions. I don't have all of those time frames in front of me. I was just looking to see whether I had them. I'm happy to provide you with those so that you can get a sense of the rules and requirements about how that process works. As the minister says, the companies all apply if they need for that to happen for business reasons, reasons around weather or other changes; those come in and get assessed, and then decisions are made by the joint authority on those suspensions and extensions. Senator STORER: Thank you.

AI-101 Storer, Tim

Resources

Time frames for title holders

Spoken

109

Senator PATRICK: I was hearing a lot of self-promotion there, Commissioner. It is always hard to work out how you compare things. I presume your US counterparts have an equivalent number of staff per application and all those sorts of things. How do you compare in terms of your staff numbers and the applications that are made that you have to process? Mr Seymour: I may have to come back to you with some data. There is some data available on that. The US system is somewhat different to the Australian system. The Australian system is wholly integrated. So both the assessment of injury dumping on the Australian manufacturer and the effect of the subsidy on the Australian manufacturer is all done with the Anti-Dumping Commission. In the US model, it is bifurcated. The International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce does the dumping and subsidy analysis, but the injury and causation test is done separately by the International Trade Commission. Each of those organisations has substantial resources.

AI-102 Patrick, Rex

Anti-Dumping Commission

Comparison to US Anti-Dumping System

Spoken

75