

	1 Watt, Murray	DLO - Cash	AWU Court Proceedings	<p>Senator WATT: Minister, I go back to the questions I was asking before. When were you served with the subpoena to appear at court in the AWU proceedings? CHAIR: Minister, I'm going to instruct you that you do not have to answer questions that you do not feel are entirely relevant to this portfolio. Senator WATT: But the committee has decided— CHAIR: I'm going to allow Senator Watt to ask the questions, but you do not have to answer them if you do not feel they are entirely relevant to this particular portfolio. Senator Cash: Thank you very much for that. Senator Watt is entitled to come in here and pull his stunt; however, I am not going to indulge Senator Watt's stunt. Senator Watt, you have your media headline. The media have their footage of you coming in here and asking these questions. Senator WATT: I'm actually interested in answers. Senator Cash: You are running a protection racket for Bill Shorten. Senator Hume, I am more than happy to take on notice the questions that Senator Watt is asking and have them directed to the relevant committee, but I will also say, Senator Watt, given your obsession with this matter over many, many months now— Senator WATT: Yes, I am obsessed with lawbreaking. Senator Cash: I'm assuming that, each day, you go to the Leader of the Opposition and say to him, 'Mr Shorten, did you or did you not get the appropriate authorisations to hand over \$100,000 of union members' money to GetUp! at which point in time you were also a director?' Senator WATT: You're really going to try to turn this around? You know no-one believes you when you do this stuff. You have less credibility than any minister in this government. Senator Cash: I note that yesterday not one Labor shadow minister, member or senator who was asked that question could actually provide an answer, Senator Hume. Senator WATT: I don't think anyone in the AWU is being investigated by the police like your staff. Senator Cash: I am happy that you have come here this morning and you have the media footage you want. Senator WATT: No, I'd like an answer to my question. When were you served with the subpoena? Senator Cash: As I said, Senator Hume, I am more than happy to take on notice any of these questions and have them directed to the relevant portfolio and provide answers. Senator WATT: You are the relevant minister. It was served on</p>	Spoken	11-14	31/05/2018 0:00
--	----------------	------------	-----------------------	---	--------	-------	-----------------

	2 Rice, Janet	Corporate	Gender Guidelines	<p>Senator RICE: I'm thinking of other engagement processes with the community or other reasons why the community or the public would engage with the department. Can you tell me about what some of those may be? Ms E Kelly: There are other occasions where we engage in the process of receiving applications, largely relating to grants and other programs that we administer. My understanding is it would be unusual for us to collect gender details as part of those processes, but we will have to take it on notice and come back to you when we've done a final check of all of those other processes in which we engage with the public. Senator RICE: If you could take that on notice, that would be good. Ms E Kelly: Yes. Mr Schwager: The department also has inclusive language guidelines and supporting gender affirmation guidelines that have been made available particularly through our Pride Network. That's been out for comment with our Pride Network. We're trying to get our Pride Network to help us in the development of those inclusive language guidelines. Those guidelines will be used across the department, and that will help in all the language that we use, both externally facing and internally facing. Senator RICE: What training takes place—any information to staff to support respectful relationships? Mr Schwager: We have a range of learning activities. We have e-learning modules that are available to all staff on their desktop, as well as face-to-face learning activities. Those are available to all staff across the department to cover awareness of LGBTI+ issues, including transgender and intersex interactions. Senator RICE: Do you know what the take-up of those training modules has been? Mr Schwager: I'd have to take that on notice specifically. Senator RICE: Is any mandatory training required to be undertaken? Mr Hannigan: No. Senator RICE: Do you know if other agencies that fall within the portfolio are also compliant, or how they have gone with meeting the guidelines? Mr Hannigan: On receipt of advice from the Attorney-General's Department, portfolio agencies were advised of the guidance. As the portfolio agencies manage their own HR functions, each of those agencies would need to advise what actions they've implemented. But, certainly, in terms of corporate policy we advise and we tend to be a source of information for the portfolio agencies.</p>	Spoken	15	31/05/2018 12:00
--	---------------	-----------	-------------------	---	--------	----	------------------

	3 Patrick, Rex	Industry Growth	Automotive Tradespersons	<p>Senator PATRICK: Who is taking the lead on this problem? Mr Power: On apprenticeships and incentives for apprenticeships, it's the Education and Training portfolio. Of course, this portfolio has been strongly engaged with our sister department, Jobs and Small Business, in transition across, more broadly, the auto sector—for example, workers out of Holden, Ford and Toyota over a longer period of time. But, particularly in relation to apprenticeships, the incentive structures are for Education and Training. Senator PATRICK: Do you monitor the effectiveness of those incentive list programs in the context of your looking at the industry? Mr Power: We don't specifically monitor the effectiveness of specific incentives put in place, for example, for apprenticeships in this regard. Senator PATRICK: I understand there's another portfolio that's dealing with it. But, surely, if you're interested in the issue, you would be asking each other what you're doing and how effective is it to get some feedback on that. Mr Power: Definitely, skills and the supply of labour, the right labour into manufacturing. Automotive, broadly, as you know, Senator, is something that we are very keen on. This portfolio actually has a number of measures that we're in the process of implementing, particularly in relation to automotive engineers and that supply of labour into the future of the automotive industry. So we do that, and we do engage with all of the other portfolios. But have we specifically tracked the success or not of those apprenticeship measures? That would be a matter for the Education portfolio. Senator PATRICK: Minister, to help me out here, and noting your role in terms of Jobs as well, I'm wondering if I could get a consolidated answer through you, through Jobs and Employment, across all of the portfolios, specifically relating to automotive tradespersons. I want to get an understanding of what is being done by each— Senator Cash: Portfolio? Senator PATRICK: and who has got responsibility, how the success is being measured, and the metrics as they currently sit today. Mr Lawson: We'll take that on notice. We'll also talk to the relevant state authorities, because we work with the states on a lot of these apprenticeship and skills issues as well. Senator PATRICK: I have one more line of questioning. CHAIR: Senator Ketter has a follow-up to your question.</p>	Spoken	20	31/05/2018 12:00
--	----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--	--------	----	------------------

	4 Patrick, Rex	Corporate	Departmental Flight Expenses	<p>Senator PATRICK: This will be my last question, Chair. Other departments have looked at the disparity and said, 'You know what? That probably requires a little bit of investigation to see why that is happening.' I think that would be an acceptable answer, if you were to offer that to me. Mr Schwager: I'm certainly happy to dig into it and unpick and see how those figures— Senator PATRICK: There's a lot of money that could be saved here. Mr Schwager: Happy to look at it. Senator PATRICK: Thank you very much. Dr Smith: We will follow up on that. I would just note that there's quite a large regional network attached to this portfolio, which includes Northern Australia, of which there are fewer options, obviously, in flying. Senator PATRICK: Sure. And in those circumstances, where there's only one airline—and that might be because it's a regulated air route—it may simply be that code 1 applies, because it is the only available fare, therefore the lowest available fare. Dr Smith: Maybe. But we'll have a look. Senator PATRICK: That's the thing I want to pull apart. There is money to be saved here, potentially, and that's my interest. Dr Smith: Certainly.</p>	Spoken	21	31/05/2018 12:00
--	----------------	-----------	------------------------------	---	--------	----	------------------

	5 Carr, Kim	Corporate	National Research Infrastructure Investment Plan	<p>Ms Weston: And they are considered part of the forward estimates in this instance. I just want to come back to your comment around there being an investment this year of around \$150 million. I'll get my colleague to speak to this too. Just on the National Research Infrastructure Investment Plan alone, in the measures table on page 51 of Budget Paper No. 2, that adds up to \$393 million. With the additional \$70 million for the Pawsey supercomputer, you're into \$463 million. My colleague is going to go through the targeted measures that this budget delivers for the innovation system in a moment, but I do note also that the Agriculture and Export Growth Plan and the Health and Medical Industry Growth Plan also have measures that fall into the innovation system. I'll just get my colleague to outline some of the other investments that go to show that it is more than— Senator KIM CARR: Well let's take your point on that. Page 51 says \$204 million of that is in this financial year. Ms Weston: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: You see, that's a device by which you can make the figures look larger with money that's already been announced. Ms Weston: No, that money hasn't been announced. That money was announced as part of this budget measure. So the \$1.9 billion invested in the National Research Infrastructure Investment Plan does include money that came as part of this budget exercise. Senator KIM CARR: To be spent by 30 June? Ms Weston: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: So it's not the forward estimates? Ms Weston: In this instance it does include 2017-18. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, in this particular instance. On how many occasions has that occurred in the past? Ms Weston: I'll ask my colleague on that, but I do recall seeing funding come in for the current year as part of the budget process. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, but is that part of the forward estimates? Mr Medland: I guess technically, no, it does not fall into the forward estimates, but practically, as part of a package, it would be counted as a contribution to the overall package. It has happened in the past. I can't recall the specifics, but we can certainly take that on notice and come back to you.</p>	Spoken	22	31/05/2018 12:00
	6 Carr, Kim	Corporate	Great Barrier Reef Funding	<p>Environment, there is the significant investment of around \$500 million to support the Great Barrier Reef. Senator KIM CARR: I see. That \$500 million for Great Barrier Reef, that's not actually in this forward estimates, though, is it? Ms Weston: I'll have to take that on notice. I'll have a look in my—</p>	Spoken	23	31/05/2018 12:00

7	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Total Resourcing for Industry, Innovation and Science	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Will somebody go through some other specific measures. If I turn to page 16 of the 2017-18 PBS, the total resourcing for Industry, Innovation and Science was 1.7 billion. On page 16 of 2018-19, the figure has been reduced to \$484 million. Can you explain that to me? Ms Weston: Can you tell me exactly where you are? Senator KIM CARR: I've got the figure here from page 16 of last year's Department of Industry, Innovation and Science statements. The total resourcing was supposed to be \$1.765 billion. It was supposed to be \$2.169 billion this year. Now we go to this year and we look at the 2018 figure. It has been reduced to \$1.684 billion and \$2.328 billion. What's the difference? Can you explain the difference, please? Mr Medland: Sorry, Senator— Senator KIM CARR: I've got the budget statements from last year— Mr Medland: The 2016-17 PBS? Senator KIM CARR: and I've got this year's. They have different sets of figures in them. Normally, the answer to a question like this is that one was estimates and the other was actuals. I presume that that's the first line of argument. How do we account for that substantive difference in figures? Mr Medland: Could you repeat those totals? Senator KIM CARR: In 2017-18 on page 16, do you see that figure for total resourcing? Mr Medland: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: There is also total resourcing for 2018-19. Do you see the difference in the figures? Mr Medland: I can indeed, yes. Senator KIM CARR: How do you account for that, Mr Medland? Mr Medland: Effectively, what you're looking at there is the total resourcing for the department, including the portfolio agencies. That's departmental funding, administered funding and cash that's sitting in the bank to cover liabilities. There's a difference between the two, and it could be because some funding is transferred as a result of machinery-of-government changes. In the previous year, the Energy functions transferred to the Department of the Environment and Energy. Or it could be that we've paid down some liabilities, and cash that had been set aside to pay for those liabilities is no longer needed. So a more appropriate mechanism would be to look at it line by line and do it that way. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. So will you take that on notice and explain it to me line by line. Mr Medland: We can certainly do that. Senator KIM</p>	Spoken	24-25	31/05/2018 12:00
---	-----------	-----------	---	--	--------	-------	------------------

	8 Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	Small Business Digital Taskforce	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Sure. Page 155 of Budget Paper No. 2 says: The Government will provide \$0.5 million in 2018-19 to develop a response to the findings of the Small Business Digital Taskforce led by Mark Bouris AM. What's that for? Ms Luchetti: On 20 November last year, the Treasurer announced the formation of the Small Business Digital Taskforce. It comprised representatives from the private sector, and Mark Bouris was the chair of the task force. It was formed to provide independent advice to government on how to improve the digital capability of Australian small business. The committee met with various small businesses, with industry bodies and with technology companies to look at how to provide and build digital capability for small business. The report was delivered to the Treasurer and the small business minister in March 2018 and is available on the department's website, and we're currently preparing a response to that. Senator KIM CARR: I see. So this report's already been delivered. Were there any contractors or consultants engaged as part of that process? Ms Luchetti: I'd have to just double-check that. I might take that on notice. I don't think so, but I'll take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: All right. Thank you. That would be good—and, if there were, what arrangements there were.</p>	Spoken	25	31/05/2018 12:00
	9 Carr, Kim	Corporate	Artificial Intelligence Capability Fund	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm just asking. I'm surprised. Can I turn to page 32 of the PBS, the Artificial Intelligence Capability Fund? I notice the funding for the financial years 2018-19 and 2019-20 is \$100,000. Senator Bushby asked the question before. I don't know if he realised that the grand total for this was \$100,000 for the financial years 2018 and 2019. Is that right? Am I correct about that? Who's handling this? Is that right—it's a hundred grand? Mr Medland: The \$100,000 in each year represents the administered funding associated with the measure. Senator KIM CARR: Right. So why is there no funding for 2020-21? Mr Medland: I think you're better off looking at the measures table, which provides an overarching picture of the funding that's available. Senator KIM CARR: All right, but explain to me the table on page 32. These are supposed to be an accurate reflection of what's actually going on, aren't they? Mr Medland: That would reflect a component or a subcomponent of the overall measure. If you actually look at page 19, that will provide the overarching picture. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. There are lots of dashes there. Ms E Kelly: That \$100,000, the \$200,000 and the \$300,000 are a small component of the overall NPP. We just need to check what that small amount of administered funding relates to, and we will come back to you with exactly what that relates to. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you, because I'm interested to know.</p>	Spoken	27	31/05/2018 12:00

10	Carr, Kim	Digital Strategy and Operations	New Website Contractor	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes. When was the new website beta.industry.gov.au launched? Ms Lee: I'll just have a quick look through my papers. CHAIR: Senator Carr, can we make this the last question. It's 11 o'clock. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I think we should be able to clean this one up pretty quickly on this particular matter. Ms Lee: I don't know the exact date. It's a beta site running in parallel with our current website. The beta site was released in May, just recently. Senator KIM CARR: Why do you need another one? Ms Lee: The intention is to decommission the old site after the beta site has been run for a period of time. Senator KIM CARR: Was there a consultant? Was there a tender to put together that new site? Ms Lee: No, there was not. Senator KIM CARR: I see. So who's done the work for that? Ms Lee: There have been contractors and APS employees involved in that. Senator KIM CARR: Who's the contractor? Ms Lee: I'll have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. What was the value of the contract? Ms Lee: I'll take that on notice too. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Spoken	28	31/05/2018 12:00
11	Carr, Kim	Corporate	FOI Documents	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. I just want to get through a few of these general issues. Has the department released any documents under FOI this year? Mr Moran: The answer is yes. Senator KIM CARR: I'm just wondering: there's been nothing on your disclosure log since 2017. Is that correct? Mr Moran: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: You are required to disclose FOI documents or documents you have actually released on your FOI log, aren't you? Mr Moran: I believe so. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. So can you confirm that there's been no disclosure released through your log since 2017? Mr Moran: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Could you just check. It won't take you long, will it? Maybe I've been misinformed. It won't take you long to check that. Mr Moran: We'll check that, Senator, and come back to you as soon as we can. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, please. So what FOI documents have you been obliged to release? Mr Moran: I can't describe the documents right now, but I can tell you about the number of requests. Senator KIM CARR: I'm particularly interested in how many you've been obliged to release. So how many requests have you had? Let's do it your way. Mr Moran: In the first three quarters of the current financial year, the department's received 59 FOI requests. Senator KIM CARR: And how many have you released? How many applications have you granted? Mr Moran: I'd have to take that on notice, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: You will have no trouble finding that out quickly I presume. Mr Moran: No, we can tell you that pretty quickly I think. Senator KIM CARR: I'm surprised you wouldn't have that in your brief. If you have not released any documents to the log—that is, not disclosed in the log—can you tell me why that is the case? Mr Moran: Yes, Senator, we will.</p>	Spoken	30-31	31/05/2018 12:00

12	Carr, Kim	DLO - Cash	Meetings with Manufacturers	Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Minister, how many manufacturers have you met with this year? Senator Cash: I'd have to take on notice the exact amount, but, as you know, I'm constantly—my senior advisors and myself—meeting with stakeholders.	Spoken	31	31/05/2018 12:00
13	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Awareness of Growth Centres	Senator KIM CARR: Okay. Do you have any figures on the success of individual growth centres in terms of their awareness? Mr Lawrence: I don't have that information in front of me. Again, the work with Woolcott Research was about understanding of the overall initiative. Senator KIM CARR: Could I get on notice, please, what information you have about the reach of each of the growth centres? Mr Lawrence: Yes, we can do that.	Spoken	39	31/05/2018 0:00
14	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Growth Centres Marketing Campaign	Senator KIM CARR: I'm just wondering: does that meet the criteria for advertising campaigns under the guidelines for information advertising campaigns for non-corporate Commonwealth entities? Mr Lawrence: I believe so. Senator KIM CARR: So have you been through that process? Mr Power: Ms Cook might be able to help you with that. Ms Cook: My understanding is that the advertising component of the communication strategy, that Mr Lawrence is talking about, is below the threshold required to go through that process. Senator KIM CARR: That's a threshold of \$250,000? Ms Cook: I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you for doing that, but I've got the guidelines in front of me here: The Independent Communications Committee considers campaigns and provides advice to Chief Executives on all advertising campaigns valued at more than \$250,000 or where requested to do so by the Chief Executive. Does this campaign involve expenditure of \$250,000? Mr Lawrence: Senator, are you referring just to the specific advertising component, or to the overall communication strategy for the—? Senator KIM CARR: I want to know whether or not non-corporate Commonwealth entities under the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act are covered by these measures? That's the important question. I note here that there's a campaign valuation of \$250,000 and I want to know whether or not this program fits within those guidelines? You're suggesting it's restricted to campaign advertising. Mr Lawrence: I would have to take that on notice. Ms Cook: We will take this on notice, but my understanding is that this is not what is considered a government advertising campaign. There is some— Senator KIM CARR: I've got the guidelines here in front of me. Are you saying that the growth centres are a non-corporate body? Mr Lawrence: Each growth centre is a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee. Senator KIM CARR: I see. So, they're not covered by these guidelines, is that what you're saying? Ms Cook: That would be my understanding. Senator KIM CARR: I see. Because it's not departmental advertising, is that how you're arguing? Ms Cook: It's not departmental and it's not campaign. Senator KIM CARR: Alright. You take it on notice and see whether or not it meets the criteria of	Spoken	39-40	31/05/2018 0:00

15	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Whole-of-Portfolio Communications Budgets	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Perhaps if I can get a whole-of-portfolio response on what the communications budgets are for all the agencies for the forthcoming financial year. Ms Cook: Certainly. Senator KIM CARR: But you're absolutely clear there's no communications expenditure planned for the next financial year? Ms Cook: In terms of advertising campaigns? Senator KIM CARR: What other communications campaigns do you have? Ms Cook: Advertising campaigns are the communications campaigns that we would refer to. Senator KIM CARR: You said 'in terms of'. When I hear an officer talk to me about 'in terms of' something, I presume there's something 'in terms of' that I haven't understood. Ms Cook: No, sorry. Mr Schwager: Of course there are day-to-day communications activities that are taking place all the time on social media and through our website to promote the activity of the department and its programs. Senator KIM CARR: Your normal activity. What's the communications budget for the forthcoming year? Ms Cook: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: But there are no special campaigns, no additional campaigns. That's what you're telling me? Ms Cook: Not that I'm aware of, no. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Spoken	40-41	31/05/2018 0:00
----	-----------	-----------	--	--	--------	-------	-----------------

16	O'Neill, Deborah	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Women in STEM	<p>Senator O'NEILL: So we can look for gender targets to be set in your party now. Can I just go to a couple of questions around this package in the budget — Senator COLBECK: Very clever. Senator O'NEILL: for encouraging women in STEM—the budget package of \$4.5 million over four years that you were talking about, Mrs Manen. You identified a number of measures in your answer to Senator Stoker. Could you just clearly list them for me, and indicate any of them that are already in action? I noticed there was a lot of 'will be, will be, will be,' and not a lot of 'we have achieved.' Ms Weston: Of course, Senator. Some of these measures are budgeted to start from 1 July 2018. Some of these measures are National Innovation Science Agenda measures, which are underway, but for the ones budgeted in this budget, the funding doesn't start until 1 July and, hence, 'will be' are some of the words we're using to describe the new budget measures. Mrs Urquhart: If I might add to that, Senator? We outlined previously some of the outcomes and achievements of the Women in STEM and Entrepreneurship measure that's been running since 2015 from the National Innovation and Science Agenda. In respect of the specific measures that you asked us to list for the budget, there is the Women in Science Strategy. Obviously, we've already begun to think about the strategy within the department and how we will progress that. There is the Decadal Plan for Women in Science, and we have been in discussion with the Academy of Science about progressing that. There is the Women in STEM Ambassador, the minister specifically, who's currently having a conversation with us about that role. Likewise, for the Girls in STEM Toolkit: as part of the process of seeking support for this measure, we've done quite a bit of thinking about it. Senator O'NEILL: Okay. I notice that the \$4.5 million is forward-loaded at 1.8 and then 1.1, 0.8 and 0.8. Would you be able to give me a breakdown of the split of the 1.8 across those measures for the coming financial year and your forward projections for 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22? How do you expect that expenditure to be spread across those initiatives? Mrs Urquhart: We're anticipating \$1.75 million in 2018-19, \$1.11 million in 2019-20, \$0.81 million in 2020-21 and \$0.81 million in 2021-22. Support for the role of Women in STEM Ambassador,</p>	Spoken	42-43	31/05/2018 0:00
17	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Woolcott Research	<p>Senator KIM CARR: There he is. Mr Lawrence, in relation to that Woolcott research, I take it there was a report? Mr Lawrence: There was a report to the department on that. Senator KIM CARR: Was it confidential? Mr Lawrence: I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: I'm wondering if I can have a copy of it today. Mr Lawrence: I will get someone to check and get it through to you, if we can. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. You have given us a summary, but I'm wondering whether I can get a copy. Mr Lawrence: I'll take that on notice. I'll check and try and get it through to you today. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much. ... Mr Lawrence: Thank you. Just before I go, Senator Carr, on that report from Woolcott, the department's only received the draft report. We receive the final report next week, and I'd be willing to provide that to you once it's received. Senator KIM CARR: We can't have a copy of the draft report? Mr Lawrence: I'm happy to provide the draft report on notice but equally as happy to provide you with the final report, which is finalised. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. That's fine.</p>	Spoken	43 & 51	31/05/2018 0:00

18	O'Neill, Deborah	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Woman in Science Strategy	<p>Senator O'NEILL: What work have you done? Is it ready for release? Is it just going to be timed? Mrs Urquhart: No. We've been scoping the work that we will be doing and commencing consultations. Senator O'NEILL: Can you just take me through that? What's happened so far? Mrs Urquhart: We've been doing some scoping work about the strategy and we've been talking to some people in the sector. Senator O'NEILL: What's the nature of that scoping work? Mrs Urquhart: It's the sort of planning work that you would normally do in undertaking a policy exercise of this type. Senator O'NEILL: Is it being done entirely within the department? Mrs Urquhart: Not entirely, as I mentioned. We've had rolling discussions with different peak bodies and so on in the process of implementing the Women in STEM and Entrepreneurship measure since the National Innovation and Science Agenda. We have what you might call a continuous process or conversation going on. But we have had discussions about the prospect of the strategy and the decadal plan with various parties, which I could bring you on notice more specifically, if you would like. Senator O'NEILL: I would appreciate that.</p>	Spoken	43-44	31/05/2018 0:00
19	O'Neill, Deborah	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Women's Advisory Round Table	<p>Senator O'NEILL: So the roundtable met in March. Did they consider the \$4.5 million package a game-changing announcement for the position of women? Ms Weston: That was a budget announcement. Like all budget things, they're usually held close, but we certainly did listen to that committee and it did help us with our consideration of the measure. Senator O'NEILL: The roundtable is scheduled to meet up to three times a year. When are the next two meetings? Have they been scheduled for this year? Ms Weston: I'll just ask one of my colleagues to answer that, Senator. Mr D Wilson: We are still in the process of working with the minister's office and roundtable members to identify times in the diary to schedule the next meeting. Senator O'NEILL: So there are none scheduled? Senator Cash: No, it will be scheduled. Mr D Wilson: It will be scheduled. Senator Cash: People come from different states, and it's obviously the scheduling of everybody's diaries. Senator O'NEILL: Could you advise as soon as you know those dates? Is it still the case that the positions on the roundtable are not remunerated? Mr D Wilson: That's correct, yes. We can take your other question on notice.</p>	Spoken	52	31/05/2018 0:00

20	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Program Uncommitted Expenditures	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Ms Weston, in the previous estimates rounds, I've asked for a list by program level of uncommitted expenditures—that table. I wonder if I can get that updated. Ms Weston: That was provided as a question on notice, I understand, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I know, but I would like— Ms Weston: Another one? Senator KIM CARR: an updated one, given that the budget measures now do change that. Ms Weston: Yes. Previously, you've had a list of the programs you'd like. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I want all programs. Across the whole— Ms Weston: We'll readjust what you normally ask for and add the extra ones in there. Senator KIM CARR: That's right. Please. But I need it updated to the current status. Ms Weston: Yes, sure. We might try to do that closer to the time the questions are due, so you get the most up-to-date information. Senator KIM CARR: If you could, please.</p>	Spoken	52	31/05/2018 0:00
21	Carr, Kim	Economic & Analytical Services	Department Evaluation Unit	<p>Senator KIM CARR: On notice, if you could give me an indication of the scope of the evaluations, major costs, effective full-time staff and the projects you've actually undertaken. Mr Turvey: Sorry, Senator, could I get you to repeat that? Senator KIM CARR: On notice, because it's too detailed a question to answer now. How many of your evaluations have been undertaken by external consultants? Mr Turvey: We tend to use consultants where the evaluations are complex and large, or if there's a specific need or issue that we need to address. There are a couple running at the moment that we're using consultants to do. But, unlike some departments, we do some in-house. We have expert evaluators in-house, so we do some of them ourselves, but sometimes we outsource. Senator KIM CARR: I'm pleased to hear that. Can you tell me the occasions on which you've used external consultants and the cost of those external consultants for the specific projects. Senator KIM CARR: Take it on notice</p>	Spoken	52-53	31/05/2018 0:00

22	Ketter, Chris	Digital Strategy and Operations	Department ICT Services	<p>Senator KETTER: My concern is in relation to outsourcing and deskilling in the public sector, particularly in relation to ICT. Recently, Mr Paul Shetler, previously the CEO of the Digital Transformation Office, said: Over the last 40 years, as we've outsourced technology, there's been a progressive deskilling of the public service. The reliance on consultants is remarkable and the amount spent on them is eye watering. That's just not necessary if we re-skill the public service ... I have a range of questions to follow up on that to find out whether there is anything happening. I understand that in another committee DHS and the ATO, I think, have submitted that bringing these skills in-house rather than outsourcing has actually provided an efficiency dividend. I'm sure you'll want to take a number of these on notice. How many digital specialist roles are there in the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science and, roughly speaking, what would be the total cost each year in sustaining these roles? I'm not sure who I am speaking to but, Ms Kelly, you look like you know— Ms E Kelly: 'Digital specialist role' is going to take a fair bit to define. For example, I would think that people who work on our business.gov.au site about providing services to business, I'm not sure whether they would be included in the 'digital specialist role' or whether it's a more technical definition. Senator KETTER: I'm talking about the types of digital specialists who have comparable skills to those which you might outsource. I've got questions about the contracts there. It's a vast department, so I'm sure this is something that you would want to take— Ms E Kelly: We will need to take those on notice. Senator KETTER: How much over 2016-17 did the department spend in terms of outsourced ICT services? Ms E Kelly: We have an in-house service. We rely on APS staff and contract staff, but our service is provided in-house. From time to time, when we engage on particular developments, we engage external services, but we're largely an in-house service. Senator KETTER: I'm interested in the external part of that, so can you come back to me on that. Have you evaluated your internal and external investment in ICT services and digital transformation? Do you believe the split is appropriate, given the department of industry's vision and needs going forward? Ms E Kelly: I think that's something that we</p>	Spoken	57-58	31/05/2018 0:00
----	---------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------	---	--------	-------	-----------------

23	Ketter, Chris	Corporate	Shared Services Strategy	<p>Senator KETTER: I'm very interested to get, on notice, the number of contractors that you're using in this area and how that's changed in recent years. What risks has the department identified in terms of legacy ICT hardware and software? What's the vision for ICT in the future? Ms E Kelly: We have a number of systems that we think need to be brought forward. We've recently created a new grants management system that we use in our grants hub, which delivers our own department's grants as well as those for other departments across government. We've made an investment in a new system there to replace a system that we considered was no longer fit for purpose. As part of the initiative in relation to the R&D tax incentive, we are going to replace the system that supports that scheme. We're currently planning for the development of a new system using the funding that was provided in the budget for that scheme. There always will be a number of legacy systems and we prioritise those for investment over time as resources allow, but our core business systems are, obviously, the ones that get our most urgent attention. Mr Schwager: I'd like to add, in terms of the user contractors in-house, particularly in our shared services hub—where we do use contractors and have used contractors—as we move into a more mature shared services space part of the job of those contractors is to skill up employees so that we can transfer skills in-house, so that we become less reliant on contractors over time. That's certainly a deliberate strategy of our current engagement of contractors, and that applies particularly in areas like project management, for example. Senator KETTER: Is this strategy you mentioned documented somewhere? Mr Schwager: Not particularly. It's just about achieving cost efficiencies over the long-term, and part of that is to ensure that, as much as we can, we transfer those skills over time to in-house staff. Senator KETTER: I'm very interested in how you've come to the conclusion that you should be looking at that, and if there's any material that the department has that I— Mr Schwager: Happy to take that on notice. Dr Smith: We can provide you with the overarching shared services strategy and the IT systems that underpin that. Senator KETTER: Will that go to the issue that Mr Schwager's talking about? Mr Schwager: We'll</p>	Spoken	58-59	31/05/2018 0:00
24	Bushby, David	Science and Commercialisation Policy	RV Investigator	<p>Senator BUSHBY: Excellent. If I may, I have one final very direct question. How much is the investment into the RV Investigator, and also how much for the Centre for Accelerator Science? Mrs McLaughlin: The additional funding for the Investigator through to 2021-22 is \$31.2 million. Senator BUSHBY: Taking it up to a total of what? Do you have a total for the RV Investigator? Mrs McLaughlin: As to the total for the RV Investigator, that's the amount that's going to be subject to a contract very soon through NCRIS. I can get you the total number on notice. ... Senator BUSHBY: If you have it on hand, could you walk us through the at-sea hours and the funding that the RV Investigator was allocated from 2012-13 through to the predicted funding for 2019-20. Dr Williams: I haven't got those with me. I'll take that on notice and make sure you get them.</p>	Spoken	61 & 114	31/05/2018 0:00

25	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Antarctic Science	<p>Ms Weston: Like any program in the budget, there is a process that involves consultation—part of which has already happened through the Drew Clarke review—and then developing guidelines. As Mr Wilson has said, we do have time in this instance, but it does provide some certainty because people were concerned about collaborative science and how it was to progress. Senator KIM CARR: So where's the money coming from? Is this new money, or is it redirected from somewhere else? What's the source of the money? Ms Weston: I'll have to take that on notice, Senator. But there is a— Senator KIM CARR: Ms Weston, I think you know your program a bit better than that. I'm really surprised when you have to take something like that on notice. Ms Weston: Well, I just— Senator KIM CARR: You don't know what this program's money is for and you don't know what the source of the money is. It's got all the hallmarks of a stitch-up to deal with some marginal seats. That's what I put to you, Mr Wilson: that's what this is about, isn't it, to make up for the CRC, which is about to fall over? Ms Weston: Absolutely not. Senator Cash: I don't think that's an appropriate question to put to the officer. Ms Weston: Certainly, it is more to do with providing certainty around Antarctic science. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, and marginal seats. Senator Cash: We'll take that as a comment, Senator Carr. Mrs Urquhart: I will just comment that the certainty in the long view of the funding commitment is consistent with the Science Statement again, when I talked earlier about taking— Senator KIM CARR: So, where's the money coming from? Ms Weston: Why I'm a bit anxious—I need to have a look at my book, but I think the funding is offset from the CRC program itself. Senator KIM CARR: Oh, I see. So, what: it's a redirection out of the CRC program? Ms Weston: Yes, Senator. I need to check that though; I will take that on notice. Because it is one of— Senator KIM CARR: CRC—have they been told this? Ms Weston: the original CRCs.</p>	Spoken	63	31/05/2018 0:00
----	-----------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	---	--------	----	-----------------

26	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Public-benefit CRCs	<p>Senator KIM CARR: All right. Tell me which of the public-benefit CRCs have got alternative sources of funding? Mr Stirling: I'll have to take that on notice— Senator KIM CARR: I'm sure you do— Mr Stirling: and come back to you— Senator KIM CARR: but it won't take you long to answer it. Mr Stirling: with some detail. Senator KIM CARR: It won't take you long at all to answer that. How many public-benefit CRCs are there? Mr Stirling: I think it depends on how you define 'public-benefit CRCs'. Senator KIM CARR: How would you like to define them? Mr Stirling: The way we look at the activities of a CRC within the breadth of the CRC Program relates to the industry problem that they're undertaking to solve. There are a range of ways—you could look at the number of industry participants in a CRC. That could be an indicator of whether it's an industry-led CRC or a public-good CRC, to use your terminology. Senator KIM CARR: How many of those are there? Mr Stirling: I would say there are probably five public-good CRCs. Senator KIM CARR: Can you name the five, please? Mr Stirling: I'll take that on notice to clarify. Senator KIM CARR: Name the five CRCs that I would call public-good CRCs. Mr Stirling: You've already talked about the Antarctic CRC and the Lowitja CRC. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. So, there are two that have been bailed out. What's happening with the other two—the bushfires and autism ones? Mr Stirling: You've also mentioned bushfires and autism. Senator KIM CARR: What's the fifth one? Mr Stirling: I'll have to take it on notice to clarify exactly. Senator KIM CARR: Bushfires—what alternative funding sources do they have? Mr D Wilson: I think, for example, with the Lowitja—I'm not quite sure what you're referring to about being bailed out. It does not finish until June 2019, so there's more than another year to go. Senator KIM CARR: Sure. But is there an \$8 million announcement the government's made for them? Mr D Wilson: I understand there have been discussions with the Department of Health. Senator KIM CARR: Has there been an \$8 million announcement which benefits that group of people? Mr D Wilson: I'm not aware. I'd have to take that on notice. I'm not quite sure.</p>	Spoken	67-68	31/05/2018 0:00
27	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC Advisory Committee Workload	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Have any of the members of the committee raised issues about their workload or support from the department? Mr Stirling: I think we've provided some answers to that question on notice to you. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, you have. I'll ask the minister. Are you aware of any questions of workload being raised with you or with other officers of the department? Senator Cash: I'd need to take that on notice. Senator Seselja has carriage of this on a day-to-day basis.</p>	Spoken	68	31/05/2018 0:00

28	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	International Science Facilities	<p>Senator KIM CARR: You're not? I see. Let me ask more general questions. Do you look at the OECD global science activities? Is that part of your remit? Mrs Urquhart: Yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Scientific access to international facilities here? Mrs Urquhart: It would depend on the question. For example, within my division, we manage the Square Kilometre Array activity; we also look at the government's work with the European Southern Observatory on optical astronomy. Senator KIM CARR: Any other international facilities? Mrs Urquhart: I would have to check and get back to you, just to be sure. But I would note that research infrastructure policy and funding obviously sits with the Department of Education and Training. They do international engagement in the Department of Education and Training in that respect.</p>	Spoken	70	31/05/2018 0:00
29	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Cooperative Effort in the Antarctic	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Are we still involved in the Antarctic? I thought there was a fairly substantive cooperative effort in the Antarctic. Ms Galindo-Fleming: The marine science one with Swinburne university? No, I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	71	31/05/2018 0:00
30	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Chinese engagement with Australia in science collaboration	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Have you seen or are you aware of any evidence, in terms of your official responsibilities, of changes in the ability or willingness of Chinese research groups, research bodies or officials to engage with Australia in science collaboration in the last 12 to 18 months? Mrs Urquhart: To be comprehensive in that answer, I would need to take it on notice. But I would pass the observation that I've had a colleague from our division travel to China, only recently, to undertake discussions about our usual bilateral arrangements. We enjoy, I think, a very healthy collaboration with China, I guess focused on the fund. Also, in other arrangements, I engage very positively with Chinese colleagues in the context of the Square Kilometre Array organisation. So, no, I have not witnessed or observed any issues. Senator KIM CARR: Officially, does the department have any evidence of changes? Ms Urquhart: That I would need to take on notice.</p>	Spoken	71-72	31/05/2018 0:00

31	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	China Scholarship Council	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Are you aware of a body called the China Scholarship Council? Ms Urquhart: No, I am not. Senator KIM CARR: Are you aware of concerns being expressed by this body to the Australian embassy in Beijing about delays in issuing visas to scholars who have been issued scholarships to visit Australia? Ms Urquhart: No, Senator, I'm not aware. Senator KIM CARR: I'm wondering if you could take that on notice. Ms Urquhart: I'd be happy to take it on notice and look into it, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: Good. I know that you're not the sole agency here, but you are a partner agency here in the research community. Ms Urquhart: Very much so. Senator KIM CARR: Could you also confirm whether or not up to 63 people who have received scholarships from the China Scholarship Council—visiting scholarships for postdocs and above—have been waiting 11 months to get visas? That's visas to Australia. And are you aware of reports that the China Scholarship Council is encouraging scholarship-holders to instead seek countries other than Australia? Ms Urquhart: Are they scholarships to undertake research in universities, Senator? Senator KIM CARR: Yes. And often they're fee-paying as well—so they're doing postdoc coursework as well. Ms Urquhart: We would need to talk to our colleagues in the Department of Education and Training, obviously, as well.</p>	Spoken	72	31/05/2018 0:00
32	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	University Precincts Advisory Committee	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. What did it cost to run the committee, Mr Lawrence? Mr Lawrence: There were no costs associated with running the committee—the people that sat on the committee were not remunerated at all. Senator KIM CARR: I see. So there were no transport costs or any of those types of— Mr Lawrence: Not that I'm aware of. I can take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	73	31/05/2018 0:00

33	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Inspiring Australia	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Can I turn to the national science engagement strategy, Inspiring Australia. Has there been any change in the budgetary arrangements for that? Ms Weston: No. No additional funding or reductions. Senator KIM CARR: There's been a stakeholder review? There was one in March 2016. Did that review take place? Mrs Urquhart: I recall that in March 2016 there was work done then to inform implementation of STEM related measures out of the Innovation and Science Agenda. I don't know that I'd use the word 'review' because my recollection is that it was a specific set of information-gathering at that time in March. Senator KIM CARR: I see—information-gathering. Mrs Urquhart: So I would like to take the details on notice, because I'm stretching my memory. Senator KIM CARR: If you would, please, thank you very much. How long did this information-gathering process take? Mrs Urquhart: I wouldn't be able to tell you; I just recall that we did seek to get some advice as we were moving to implement STEM measures from the Innovation and Science Agenda. Senator KIM CARR: Were there any conclusions drawn from this information-gathering session? Mrs Urquhart: Obviously the information informed the STEM measures that were subsequently implemented, but, as to whether there were recommendations per se, I can't recall. But I'm more than happy to take that on notice and come back to you. Senator KIM CARR: Can I get a copy of the information-gathering report or whatever you call it? It's obviously not a review. Mrs Urquhart: No. My recollection is that it wasn't a review, but I'm more than happy to look at that because I may be wrong. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Spoken	73-74	31/05/2018 0:00
34	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Prime Minister's Science Prizes	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How much are the Prime Minister's prizes costing? Ms Weston: Over the period 2018-19 to 2021-22, the figure is \$4.28 million. Senator KIM CARR: Is that an increase or a decrease? Ms Weston: I'll have to take that on notice. I might be able to get that for you before the end of the session. I'll get someone to have a look at it. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Spoken	75	31/05/2018 0:00

	35 Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	SKA Phase 1	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Do you think this has any impact in terms of the delivery of phase 1 of the project and the delay that we've experienced with this? Mrs Urquhart: Certainly, I came away from the last board meeting feeling that the membership were particularly seized of wanting to make up for delays that had occurred in the process prior to that. The convention might have been a part of that, but I think you will recall there was a cost-control project that Australia was very keen to see happen that occupied a lot of time for a lot of people. That said, there have been consortia working on different elements of the telescope— I should say the observatory because, obviously, there are two telescopes and one observatory—and that work's all been going on in parallel.. It's a complex project, Senator. You know as well as I do that it's pushing the boundaries of technology and science. This undertaking, particularly around the Square Kilometre Array low facility, is quite a venture. That, in and of itself, I think, has played into the progress of different consortia, who are at different stages. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, is the Australian government still committed to phase 1? Senator Cash: Absolutely. Senator KIM CARR: Even though the South Africans haven't committed the money that they're required to? Mrs Urquhart: I know that, with the commitment of funding in the Innovation and Science Agenda, in no more concrete way could the government have made clear its commitment to this initial phase. In terms of South Africa, I'd have to take that on notice. I have a recollection of some news from South Africa, but I can't recall the specifics, so I would need to come back to you that. Senator KIM CARR: Weren't they required to put in 150 million euros? Mrs Urquhart: I would need to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: That's for phase 1. Mrs Urquhart: I would need to take it on notice. I'm not confident— Senator KIM CARR: If you would, please. When you're doing that, can you give us an indication of how that stands up against the Australian commitment? Mrs Urquhart: Yes, I certainly can do that.</p>	Spoken	76	31/05/2018 0:00
--	--------------	--------------------------------------	-------------	---	--------	----	-----------------

36	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	SKA Capability	<p>Senator KIM CARR: You need to explain that to me in much clearer terms. Are you saying there will be a reduction in capability or are you saying we're going to have to actually commit more money? Mrs Urquhart: A decision hasn't been taken yet on what formally will be built. The cost-control project was all about determining, for a nominated cost cap, whether the increasing costs in the consortia on different elements had taken the viability of the project, if you like, beyond that cap. The project really, I think, delivered the understanding that, for this deployment baseline, you could do the science you wanted to do across both the low and mid facilities in, respectively, Australia and South Africa. But, at the same time, the board gave a mandate for the organisation to continue to explore a fuller design for future decision-making. Senator KIM CARR: It seems to me there's still an open question. Mrs Urquhart: Certainly, in terms of what actually will be built, that will have to be a decision made in the new organisation at the commencement of construction. Senator KIM CARR: And when will that be? Mrs Urquhart: That will require ratification of the convention, and my recollection is that you need the three host countries and a number of others. I'm not sure if it's one or two, so I would need to come back to you on that. Senator KIM CARR: And on the details of when that decision is required. Mrs Urquhart: Yes.</p>	Spoken	77	31/05/2018 0:00
37	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	SKA Procurement	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I also asked you, some 12 months ago, to what extent the procurement arrangements for good and services to be undertaken to operate the facilities in Australia would be consistent with the Commonwealth of Australia's procurement processes, and I'm not certain I've ever got a clear answer to that. Can you provide that answer now? Mrs Urquhart: Yes, I can certainly provide you with our understanding of the issue now because having a convention text in play means, obviously, we have a clearer view across privileges and immunities and so on and their interaction with the project. Yes, I certainly can come back to you with that. Senator KIM CARR: On notice? Mrs Urquhart: Yes.</p>	Spoken	77	31/05/2018 0:00
38	Carr, Kim	Economic & Analytical Services	Australian BERD Performance	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you provide me with a breakdown of the Australian BERD performance compared to other OECD nations since 2013? Mr Lawson: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	78-79	31/05/2018 0:00

39	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	R&D Budget Measures	<p>Senator KIM CARR: That's a 16 per cent drop. What impact do you think the government's budget measures will have on our R&D performance in this country? Mr Lawson: The budget measures provide an incentive for companies to increase their R&D. We expect those measures themselves are likely to increase the amount of R&D performed. But there will be other changes going on in the economy, of course, at the same time. Senator KIM CARR: Sure. Mr Lawson, you know that invites the obvious question: how do you know that? Mr Lawson: We know that from a lot of empirical work that's been done in Australia, internationally by the OECD and by— Senator KIM CARR: Can I have a copy of that empirical work that leads you to the collusion that the government's measures will lead to an increase in R&D by Australian companies? Mr Lawson: The empirical work shows that, by focusing R&D on additionality, you are likely to increase the R&D. We can— Senator KIM CARR: Will you take that on notice— Mr Lawson: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: the empirical work that demonstrates the increase that we're going to receive as a result of these budget measures? Mr Lawson: Senator, I said: these budget measures will have that impact, but there will be a whole range of other things going on in the economy which will also affect— Senator KIM CARR: Okay, Mr Lawson. That's fine: you'll be able to show me the modelling that the government's relied upon and I'll look forward to that. Mr Lawson: We can provide the OECD's work and other work on the interaction between R&D incentives.</p>	Spoken	79	31/05/2018 0:00
----	-----------	------------------	---------------------	--	--------	----	-----------------

40	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Business expenditure on R&D	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Do we have any figures on the value of business expenditure on R&D, year to date,? Ms Mulder: Those figures were for the complete 2015-16 income year. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Ms Mulder: For the 2016-17 income year—and just noting that that's not complete at this point—I do have some figures, but they won't be complete until 30 September this year. Mr Lawson: And I hasten to add that the numbers we're talking about are the registration data that goes into AusIndustry. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I know. Mr Lawson: They are different from the tax office data that comes in. Senator KIM CARR: All right. Mr Lawson: I'm a little uncomfortable here about bits and pieces of numbers which can sound a bit confusing in the way that— Senator KIM CARR: Well— Mr Lawson: So we might have to take some stuff on notice and provide a more— Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Do you have the figure for the value of R&D as distinct from registrations? Ms Mulder: I have the R&D registered expenditure. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Ms Mulder: For the complete income year of 2015-16 that was \$16. 1 billion. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Mr Lawson: Again, which is not the number that— Ms Mulder: No. Mr Lawson: was actually claimed for that year, for a set of reasons, and not the number which would feed into any calculation of cost-of-revenue changes and so on. Senator KIM CARR: Am I correct in assuming that you intend to have a budget saving of \$1 billion from changes to the non-refundable R&D component? And \$1.4 billion from the refundable component? Is that the breakdown of the \$2.4 billion? Mr Lawson: Senator, you're possibly referring to the table on page 21 of the budget paper No. 2, which is a Treasury table. It would be best for Treasury to answer those sorts of questions. Senator KIM CARR: You don't have any advice on that? Mr Lawson: As I said, this is Treasury table. We should defer to them to answer questions on their tables. Senator KIM CARR: Obviously, you'd prefer me to ask them directly. Is that what you're saying? Ask them directly? Mr Lawson: Yes, Senator. We can take it on notice if you wish. Senator KIM CARR: if you would please.</p>	Spoken	80-81	31/05/2018 0:00
----	-----------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	--------	-------	-----------------

41	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	Treasury projections	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I've probably been shooting questions at you for that length of time! Can you tell me a year since 1989 where the Treasury projections have been right? Mr Lawson: Which— Senator KIM CARR: Just name one of them. One of them will do. Mr Lawson: I'd have to check. I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: It won't take you long to answer it, though, I'm sure! The answer is none, isn't it? Mr Lawson: It's the nature of projections that they're subject to a number of different forces. You're predicting what will happen with the state of the economy as the main driver of what people do on R&D, paying tax revenue, and all those sorts of things. It's a somewhat— Senator KIM CARR: We've heard these arguments backwards and forwards since that time, haven't we? Not much has changed. Treasury says, 'It'll cost this much,' and it ends up costing more. Treasury says, 'It's been costing too much,' makes assertions that there must be something going on and then decides to cut it. Mr Lawson: I think these questions might be better addressed to the Treasury. Senator KIM CARR: I know. But you have policy responsibility, don't you? Mr Lawson: We have policy responsibility for part of the program and the Treasury has policy responsibility for part of the program. Senator KIM CARR: Not much has changed in that either! If you look at the modelling on which this is based—do you get all the Treasury modelling? Mr Lawson: We get the results of the Treasury modelling. Senator KIM CARR: But not the models themselves? Is that how it works? Mr Calder: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: You really don't have any idea how many companies will be affected by the recent budget measures, do you? Mr Lawson: No, I don't think that's correct. That advice was provided to the government. I believe the Treasury took a series of questions on notice. Senator KIM CARR: You don't have any idea how many companies are affected, do you? You have operational responsibility here. Mr Lawson: There are a range of measures; for example, the \$4 million cap. The \$4 million cap on the refundable amount means: a company that's spending about \$10 million or more on R&D and has not got revenue. There are not many of them around. Any amount over the cap is carried forward into a future year where they can get benefits when they are in profit. Based on our</p>	Spoken	81-82	31/05/2018 0:00
42	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	R&D intensity of business measure	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What's the evidence, Mr Lawson, in terms of global experience, that the test based on the R&D intensity of business measure will change behaviour and increase additionality? Mr Lawson: We are happy to take that on notice and provide you the data. Senator KIM CARR: I take it the department will also be distributing further guidance materials regarding this intensity measure and how it will be calculated? Mr Lawson: We are consulting with Treasury and that will be part of the consultation over the legislation. Senator KIM CARR: So when will that be issued, do you think? Will it be before the legislation's issued or after? Mr Lawson: This part of the legislation belongs to the Treasury so we should take that on notice and really have the Treasury answer those sorts of questions.</p>	Spoken	84-85	31/05/2018 0:00

43	Storer, Tim	Industry Growth	Advanced manufacturing sector	<p>Senator STORER: I think I'll move onto interest in advanced manufacturing. I note the statistics on the website—the 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 employment figures, value-added sales and service exports. I was wondering whether there is an update—the 2016-17 figures—on the statistics in advanced manufacturing and whether we are going in a positive direction in this sector. Senator Cash: Is this the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund? Mr Power: No, I think you're referring to the manufacturing sector more broadly, Senator? Senator STORER: Yes. Mr Power: I don't have the statistics in front of me. We can check if we have an update on those. Senator STORER: Has there been growth in employment in the advanced manufacturing sector in the last year? The figures I have from this website are that it was 224,000 in 2013-14; 206,000 in 2014-15; 206,000 in 2015-16 and I'm just wondering whether— Senator Cash: Sorry, what website did you say that was, Senator? Senator STORER: I believe it's from industry.gov.au—it quotes ABS statistics. Has there been growth in employment, value-added sales and service income, and exports from the advanced manufacturing sector in the last year or two? Senator Cash: Senator, we may have to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	87-88	31/05/2018 0:00
44	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	ADC funding	<p>Ms Weston: Departmental priorities are set by the executive and the secretary every year. There's an allocation for each of the divisions, and I think the commissioner is saying that the department has given him an increase of \$1.1 million for his budget, and that's continuing at the moment. Senator KIM CARR: Is that indexed? Ms Weston: I think we do have an indexation, but I will get back to you on that. Senator KIM CARR: It should be, shouldn't it? Ms Weston: There is a general efficiency dividend applying to departments, so I would need to confirm that.</p>	Spoken	95	31/05/2018 0:00
45	Ketter, Chris	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	ANSTO expenses not requiring appropriation	<p>Senator KETTER: You might have just touched on the answer to my next question. There are some changes in respect of the figure for expenses not requiring appropriation in the budget year. Compared with previous years' figures, it appears to be an additional \$145.478 million for 2017-18—if you go back to the PBS for last year. Dr Paterson: This could be the impairment. Mr Lawson: Are you referring to the previous portfolio budget statement book? Senator KETTER: Yes. Mr Lawson: We only have this year's with us at the moment. Senator KETTER: You might have to take something on notice. Dr Paterson: We'll take it on notice, Senator.</p>	Spoken	108	31/05/2018 0:00

46	Rhiannon, Lee	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	GBIRd project funding	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Less than. I understand the GBIRd project is seeking funding from the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity. Is that correct? Dr Steele: Are you referring to the US government entity called DARPA? Senator RHIANNON: Well, there's DARPA and there's IARPA, I've found. DARPA we dealt with in the previous question. I understand you are seeking funding from the CIA via the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity. I'm trying to understand if that's correct. Dr Steele: I guess your question is directed as to whether CSIRO understands that that's what's going on by the research collaborators. I'm not aware. I have not heard that mentioned to me in any way, shape or form. I have no reason to give any credence to the question. Senator RHIANNON: It sounds like maybe it would be best if you took it on notice, because you're not actually ruling it out. Dr Steele: I'm happy to take it on notice, but I would not want to mislead you at this point in time to give you the impression that I believe there is any credibility to it. Senator RHIANNON: To be clear what's going on notice: how much funding has GBIRd sought from IARPA, and how much would be coming to CSIRO? Please detail what these funds are intended to be used for Dr Steele: Senator, the question I'm prepared to take on notice is: what is CSIRO's knowledge in relation to any of this? Senator RHIANNON: I understand that we can ask questions and you take them on notice. Dr Steele: Indeed, Senator, and that's what I'm doing. But I'm being clear about the fact that what we will answer is: what is CSIRO's knowledge? Senator RHIANNON: Yes.</p>	Spoken	119-120	31/05/2018 0:00
----	---------------	--	-----------------------	---	--------	---------	-----------------

47	Rhiannon, Lee	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Identified GBRd's	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Just sticking with some of the FOI documents, they reveal that the GBRd has identified six potential offshore islands in Western Australia for the potential release of gene drive mice. How many of these islands meet GBRd's selection criteria of being closed to the public? Dr Steele: I am familiar with them—but I admit that it's not since February that I have reread them—and I'm pretty certain I remember the references that you are referring to. I think a more accurate description of what the FOI material refers to is that it names approximately six islands, and I believe that they are off the coast of Western Australia, as islands to be looked at to see whether or not any of those were suitable islands for which there was, shall we say, the potential to be used as an experimental base. You've now asked a question as to whether or not any of those have been validated for the purpose of that, and I'm going to take that question on notice to the extent it is known by CSIRO. But I'm going to make the point that the FOI material was talking about exchanges with other Australian players, not just CSIRO, and I'm not at all certain in my mind, as I sit here now, that it's CSIRO who's doing the determination as to whether or not they qualify against the GBRd criteria. I'm pretty certain that would be done in any case by agencies of the Western Australian government. Senator RHIANNON: I was hoping you would be able to provide more information on this and that you wouldn't need to take it on notice, but I will take it a bit further. On page 34 of this FOI material, you get the impression, very clearly, that all islands are now about to be involved. So the question is: why did GBRd decide to 'move forward on all six islands'? I understand that they don't actually meet the selection criteria. Dr Steele: I have several comments in response. The first one is: my recollection of the amount of FOI material is that it was quite extensive. I appreciate and thank you for the help with page 34, but I'm marrying that up against a folder which was around about two inches thick in my brain. I go back to the answer I gave to the last question, which is to say that I'm not at all certain that we're in a position where the islands have been tested against the criteria that the GBRd project collaboration had established for suitable islands, so I can't validate whether they've</p>	Spoken	121	31/05/2018 0:00
----	---------------	--	-------------------	--	--------	-----	-----------------

48	Rhiannon, Lee	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Co-hosted conferences by CSIRO	<p>Senator RHIANNON: From 11 to 15 September last year CSIRO co-hosted a conference aimed at 'identifying synthetic biology solutions to conservation problems caused by environmental change'. Who funded that conference? Dr Steele: As with other activities that CSIRO conducts from time to time, when we conduct scientific conferences there is usually funding from CSIRO involved in that. I can't tell you whether there were any other funding sources involved but certainly there would have been CSIRO support for it. Senator RHIANNON: The emphasis is on solutions to conservation problems caused by environmental change. It is widely recognised that the drivers of ecological system collapse and species extinction are land-clearing and the overexploitation of native wildlife. Were those issues discussed at the conference? Dr Steele: I wasn't at the conference. The best I can do for you is see if we can find a copy of the agenda or any proceedings that came out of the conference. I am not aware that there was any publication of the proceedings of the conference. I will take on notice whether there are any documents to give you any indication. Senator RHIANNON: Thank you. How much was spent on that conference? Dr Steele: I will take on notice— Senator RHIANNON: Could you just take the question on notice. Dr Steele: Senator, stay with me for a moment please.</p>	Spoken	122	31/05/2018 0:00
----	---------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--------	-----	-----------------

49	Rhiannon, Lee	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Gene drive workshop regulatory meeting	<p>Senator RHIANNON: According to other FOI documents, CSIRO ran a gene drive workshop followed by a regulatory meeting on July 26. Who attended the regulatory meeting? Dr Steele: When you say 'regulatory meeting' what are you referring to? Senator RHIANNON: I am just going on what was in the FOI documents, and it was described in that way. I am assuming it is a meeting about regulations for these new developments that CSIRO is working on. Dr Steele: If you are prepared to identify the specific document out of the US FOI that is being referred to there—not necessarily now; I am happy if you provide that to the secretary of the committee later—we will see what we can find out in answer to that question on notice. Senator RHIANNON: I do think I gave you enough information, because you haven't denied that there was a gene drive workshop last year followed by a regulatory meeting. I'm just asking for details of that and who attended that second meeting. Dr Steele: I was actually looking for any further particulars that you could give me, just to make sure I was answering precisely the question you are asking. Senator RHIANNON: I am still asking for it on notice. Could you also take on notice what the agenda of the meeting was. Dr Steele: To the extent that I'm able to confirm to myself that I've identified the correct meeting, I'm certainly happy to answer that question on notice. Senator RHIANNON: And also the minutes from the meeting. I am asking for that because—you use the words 'slur' et cetera; I am not an enemy here—transparency is incredibly important. There is angst among the public about this. That's why we're getting queries about it and I need to ask the question. I think transparency is so important. Dr Steele: I absolutely agree with your point. Just to be clear: the public debate about this is both informed and uninformed, which does add to the importance of transparency, clarity and public debate about it on well-formed facts. I am very happy to provide answers to these questions that way. But my point is that it is a constructive dialogue when it is factually based and there is some willingness among the dialogue parties to actually accept that there could be a number of different perspectives taken.</p>	Spoken	122-123	31/05/2018 0:00
50	Rhiannon, Lee	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Gene drive mosquitoes	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Has CSIRO already commenced research developing gene drive mosquitoes? Dr Steele: I will take that question on notice. I am not aware that we have, but I am very happy to correct the record if it turns out that we have</p>	Spoken	123	31/05/2018 0:00

51	Patrick, Rex	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Lithium industry	<p>Senator PATRICK: Fantastic. I've been reading this report on the lithium industry in Australia by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, and I've been running around like Duracell bunny ever since. It's pretty interesting technology, disruptive technology in a number of senses. We, as we always do, have a lot of lithium in the ground, and we're shipping it overseas where all the value-adding takes place. We are doing some—the second stage of processing is being planned for Kwinana. There is some lithium activity going on around the country. It's pretty exciting stuff. I'm wondering what CSIRO's doing in this space? Dr Mayfield: With regard to lithium batteries, we have a number of things happening. With respect to some of the effort you're talking about in Western Australia, where there are spodumene deposits and there are technologies that are evolving, we have conducted some pilot plant work for some junior companies. Senator PATRICK: Is that the stuff with ARENA? Or the Clean Energy Finance Corporation? Dr Mayfield: I don't believe so. This was with a junior mining company, looking at trying to process the materials. They may have had some CEFC funding, but I'm not aware of it. I would have to check that. Senator PATRICK: I know you're doing ultrabatteries. Dr Mayfield: Yes. Senator PATRICK: I think you've done some lithium work with an Adelaide company, PMB Defence, I think. Is there any other stuff you're doing in that lithium space? Dr Mayfield: The UltraBattery that you mentioned, which is a CSIRO invention, is a lead acid technology. We did that in the last 10 years. That's in commercial production. In terms of lithium batteries, we have done research around novel lithium chemistries, so new chemistries involving sulphur and oxygen, which is probably the next generation of batteries, but we haven't had any great success. That effort has probably been wound back. We have done some work with batteries with regard to military applications. I'm not that familiar with the specifics of that. I couldn't answer your question too directly. Most of our work these days is more about how you integrate these batteries into energy systems. That's where our efforts are primarily. Senator PATRICK: Obviously there are multiple stages, the third one being electrochemical, and then development of anodes and cathodes</p>	Spoken	123-124	31/05/2018 0:00
52	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Breakthrough program	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What's involved with this Breakthrough Listen project? Dr Williams: The breakthrough program is a philanthropic program funded by an American billionaire. It's full scientific backing of senior astronomers around the world. He has agreed to buy time on the Parkes telescope to search for extraterrestrial life. He has also agreed to buy time on other telescopes around the world. Senator KIM CARR: Who's the person who is funding this? Dr Williams: I'm trying to remember his name. Dr Marshall: Yuri Milner. Senator KIM CARR: So it's a 60-day project; is that right? Dr Williams: No, it's a five-year project. It's using about 25 per cent of the observing time at Parkes. Senator KIM CARR: What's the value of that? Dr Williams: I'll take on notice to give you the exact value. Dr Marshall: I believe he donated roughly \$10 million, but we'll give you the exact number.</p>	Spoken	125	31/05/2018 0:00

53	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Animal Health Laboratories	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much, Dr Marshall, in the past the animal health laboratories have received NCRIS money. Dr Marshall: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: Are you surprised that you're not receiving it now? Why shouldn't this be funded out of NCRIS? It's a national facility—national infrastructure. Ms Weston: We need to take that on notice because my recollection is that it was only a very small amount, not a large— Ms Bennett: Correct. Only a small amount of capital has been received from NCRIS. Most of the original funding of the AAHL was by the government but not through NCRIS. It predated NCRIS. Subsequently, there have been other capital upgrades—a small amount through NCRIS; other amounts CSIRO has put forward. Senator KIM CARR: Okay. Perhaps my memory is incorrect and it's only a small amount, but the principle remains the same. This is a national facility. This is a biosecurity facility for the whole nation. Why is the CSIRO required to fund that project when you are custodian of the project? Why are you required to fund it from your own resources? Is that not a question for you? Ms Weston, what's the answer to that question? Ms Weston: As Ms Bennett, has mentioned, it does predate NCRIS. There was a funding agreement for Agriculture and CSIRO to be the funders of that, as I recall. Dr Williams: And that agreement called for the costs of operations to be shared between what is now Agriculture and Water Resources. Senator KIM CARR: How much is Agriculture putting into this revamp? Dr Williams: Well, let me finish. When it was created, the original agreement on the operations and running of AAHL was that the cost of operations would be shared between the department and CSIRO and that CSIRO would be responsible for the capital maintenance. Senator KIM CARR: Which department are we talking about? Dr Williams: Currently, the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources. Senator KIM CARR: How much money is the department of agriculture putting into the refurbishment? Dr Williams: They're not putting anything in because the original agreement said that CSIRO would look after the capital refurbishment. Senator KIM CARR: Forever? Dr Williams: When the animal health lab was established, that was in the original agreement to establish it. Senator KIM CARR: What year was</p>	Spoken	127-128	31/05/2018 0:00
54	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Redundancies in manufacturing fabrication engineering	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The CEO has indicated that the number of redundancies in manufacturing is now at 23 and in minerals the number of redundancies is at 32. What's the situation in regard to the fabrication engineering team? Is there a number of redundancies there? Dr Hill: Bear with me while I find that information. Dr Marshall: Senator, if you want to go to specific programs— Senator KIM CARR: I'm really interested in sites. I have asked you a previous question, A159. You said the headcount for manufacturing business unit fell from 414 to 391. Is that still the case? I've probably made it a bit difficult if Dr Hill's looking for the answer to my last question. Dr Hill: And I cannot find fabrication engineering, so let me take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Well, tell me this: is the manufacturing business unit headcount to fall from 414 to 391? Dr Hill: Yes, 391 is the correct number.</p>	Spoken	128	31/05/2018 0:00

55	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Fabrication and engineering team at Waurm Ponds	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Question on notice No. 59 refers to fabrication and engineering capabilities. Dr Hill, do you see there in the answer, in the first paragraph, it talks about fabrication engineering comprising CSIRO industrial-scale fabrication facilities supporting research through design and design prototyping machines, instruments in assistance for application and research and/or industry. This is A158. That may be easier. If I give you the right number, that will help you a lot. I would like the detail of that. It is obviously quite important to have. It is a relatively new facility. I don't know if you know the history of this. I have taken some interest in this for some time. Dr Hill: I do. Senator KIM CARR: Given what happened with the textile labs, can you explain to me what that means for fabrication engineering capabilities to be reduced. Dr Hill: I will take on notice what is happening to the fabrication and engineering team at Waurm Ponds.</p>	Spoken	129	31/05/2018 0:00
56	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Travel costs for Space Agency ERG members	<p>Senator KETTER: Were the members of the ERG remunerated? Mr Power: I'm not sure. I'll get you an answer on that. Senator KETTER: Whilst you're checking that, could you tell me if their travel costs were covered by the department. Mr Power: On the previous question, the chair was remunerated but not each of the members. Senator KETTER: Were travel costs covered by the department? Mr Power: Yes, they were. Senator KETTER: On notice, could tell me how much that was and how many departmental staff were attached to working with the ERG.</p>	Spoken	54	5/06/2018 0:00

57	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Breaches of Defence Trade Controls Act	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course you don't should hope so, so you have not had a problem with the Department of Defence in terms of the Defence Trade Controls Act? Has there been any suggestion that you are breaching that? Ms Bennett: No. Senator KIM CARR: No difficulties? Ms Bennett: Dr Williams is more involved in the export act, but to my knowledge, no. Senator KIM CARR: You've never had a query raised about the Defence Trade Controls Act? Ms Bennett: I will just consult with my colleague. Dr Williams: I've no record of anything being raised directly with CSIRO. Senator KIM CARR: I have been pursuing these matters with a number of agencies because I am concerned about the reputational damage that is done to our research agencies by these sorts of claims. Ms Bennett: Agreed, Senator. We are very concerned when our name is used in the media. Senator KIM CARR: I have no doubt that would be the case, and you would have every reason to be. The Australian Research Council has told me there was no incidence of noncompliance with the act. Does that accord with your experience? Ms Bennett: Yes. We are not aware of any incidents of noncompliance. Senator KIM CARR: In estimates the other, the Department of Defence gave me exactly the same evidence. Does that accord with your experience? Ms Bennett: Yes, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: Are you intending to make a submission to the review of the Defence Trades Control Act? Ms Bennett: Sorry, Senator; I have been advised that at some point in the past we have had an issue with Defence export but not relating to China. We would have to— Senator KIM CARR: Oh, who have you had a problem with? Ms Bennett: I've just been advised with a note. I think we'll have to take the details on notice. Senator KIM CARR: We do export research materials to a range of countries, don't we? Ms Bennett: We do science. Senator, that's the only information I have. I don't even know the date. If I may, I will take it on notice and give you the full information. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. But there is a range of collaboration with research materials that have military applications? Ms Bennett: Indeed. Senator KIM CARR: And not just the Chinese? Ms Bennett: Indeed, and we are very aware of our obligations and our scientists are well schooled in— Senator KIM CARR: And you are saying that you've had one incidence</p>	Spoken	132	31/05/2018 0:00
58	Griff, Stirling	Office of the Chief Scientist	Gender and Diversity	<p>1. Do any key performance indicators of the Office of the Chief Scientist relate to gender and diversity? If so, what are they? 2. For at least 20 years, more than 40% of Australian PhDs in the natural and physical sciences have been awarded to women. However, the number of female scientists employed at senior levels in Australian universities and research institutes remains at less than 20% and, according to the Australian Academy of Science, men still hold 80% of the tenured STEM faculty positions in Australia. What is “the progress” that the Chief Scientist was referring to in his comments recorded on ABC Background Briefing “A Standard Deviation: Sexual Harassment in Australian Science” that was aired in March 2018? 3. Were any complaints received regarding the Chief Scientist’s comments about gender issues on the ABC Background Briefing show aired in March 2018? Has the Chief Scientist subsequently made any statement regarding his comments? If so, what did he say?</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00

59	Griff, Stirling	Office of the Chief Scientist	statistics of career prospects for STEM graduates	The Productivity Commission report released in 2016, 'Digital Disruption: What do governments need to do?' found "relatively high underemployment of STEM graduates and apparent underutilisation of STEM skills". Can the office please provide the most recent statistics of career prospects for STEM graduates, including STEM PhDs, in Australia.	Written	12/06/2018 0:00
60	Griff, Stirling	Office of the Chief Scientist	STEM PhDs	The effect of section 569 of the Social Security Act 1991 means that a person who has completed a PhD is, for the rest of their life, unable to receive government assistance to retrain, including in circumstances where that person cannot get a job, either in an area relevant to their PhD or otherwise. Does the Chief Scientist consider there is a responsibility to caution those who may be contemplating doing a STEM PhD to not make this decision lightly? Has the Chief Scientist ever issued a statement of caution in this regard?	Written	12/06/2018 0:00
61	Griff, Stirling	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	GIF Charter	1) Dr Paterson has stated in reference to the GIF Charter that "it was one of my proudest moments as the CEO of ANSTO to sign that agreement". Noting that the GIF Charter was signed by Dr Paterson "for Australia" and that at the time it was signed in June 2016 the government was in caretaker mode, on what and/or whose authority did Dr Paterson sign the GIF Charter? 2) The preamble to the GIF Charter states that signatories to the Charter recognise that "nuclear energy will be needed" in order to meet increased global energy demand because of "growing awareness about global warming, climate change issues and sustainable development". Noting that the GIF Charter was drafted about two decades ago and since then, there have been major advances in energy technologies, does the preamble provide an accurate reflection of the current state of affairs in the energy sector? 3) Was Dr Paterson advised prior to signing the GIF Charter that it is the position of the government that a consequence of global warming, climate change issues and sustainable development is that nuclear energy will be needed to meet increased global energy demand? 4) Paragraph 13 of the "National Interest Analysis" ([2017] ATNIA 13) states that in signing the Charter, ANSTO became Australia's "Implementing Agent" to the GIF. Was signing the Charter a pre-condition to Australia's Instrument of Accession being accepted for the purposes of the GIF?	Written	12/06/2018 0:00

62	Griff, Stirling	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	Intermediate level waste	<p>1) How much intermediate level waste does ANSTO currently generate that will need to be managed in Australia? In answering please state the rate at which the waste is generated in terms of both the volume and activity. Please also provide a table detailing and identifying the actual or estimated activity of each of the 10 most abundant radioisotopes that are in the intermediate level waste and the actual or estimated activity of each of the 10 radioisotopes with the longest half-lives that are in the intermediate level waste. 2) What proportion of the intermediate level waste that is currently generated can be attributed to the production of isotopes for nuclear medicine? 3) How much additional intermediate level waste is projected to be generated by ANSTO in the expanded production of isotopes for nuclear medicine over the next 20 years? 4) How does ANSTO determine the cost of final disposal of intermediate level waste for the purpose of including this cost in its pricing for nuclear medicines? In answering, please identify each of the variables that are taken into account and the assumptions that are made.</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
----	-----------------	--	--------------------------	--	---------	--	-----------------

63	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	<p>1. Does the NAIF use a garden service for mow or cut of 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 from 1 July 2017 to present? 2. 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 from 1 July 2017 to present? 3. What was the total cost of all subscriptions by the NAIF to online news services, newspapers, magazines, journals and periodicals from 1 July 2017 to present? a. What are these services / newspapers / magazines / journals / periodicals? 4. What was the total value of all gifts purchased for use by the NAIF from 1 July 2017 to present? a. What were the gifts purchased? i. Who were they gifted to? ii. What was the cost of the gift? 5. 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 from 1 July 2017 to present? 6. 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 from 1 July 2017 to present? 7. How much was spent on the following services from 1 July 2017 to present? a. Taxi hire b. Mousine hire c. Private hire care d. Hire car rental e. Ridesharing services f. Chartered flights 8. How many media or public relations advisers are employed by the NAIF? 9. 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 from 1 July 2017 to present? 10. 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? 11. How much did the NAIF spend on Facebook advertising or sponsored content from 1 July 2017 to present? 12. How much did the NAIF spend on Twitter advertising or sponsored content from 1 July 2017 to present? 13. How much did the NAIF spend on LinkedIn advertising or sponsored content from 1 July 2017 to present? 14. How much has the NAIF spent advertising for recruitment in Sydney, Brisbane and Northern Australia,</p>	Written	12/06/2018 0:00
64	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia and Major Projects	NAIF Austender notice	<p>1. Please identify each Austender notice related to the NAIF by contract notice ID. a. What was the purpose of each notice?</p>	Written	12/06/2018 0:00
65	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Consultation of NAIF	<p>1. Why has the Department not published submissions received during the consultation phase of the NAIF's design? 2. Will the Department publish these submissions? a. If no, why not?</p>	Written	12/06/2018 0:00

66	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO Staffing and Gender Balance	<p>2. Excluding employees appointed on clause 11 contracts, what is the total number of research staff appointed at levels CSOF8 and above? 3. Regarding Table 1 and Table 2 of CSIRO's response to question on notice AI-75, please provide a breakdown of the numbers provided in those tables into the constituent categories of Research Managers, Research Consultants, Research Scientists/Engineers and Research Project Officers. 4. When did Dr Marshall become a "Male Champion of Change"? 5. Given that for the past decade, fewer than 10% of research staff employed at level CSOF8 and above have been women, why has the total number of female research staff at level CSOF8 and above been allowed to decrease from 29 to 23 individuals during Dr Marshall's tenure as CEO of CSIRO? 6. Can appointments at CSOF8 and above be made without the express approval of Dr Marshall? 7. Noting that for at least 20 years, more than 40% of Australian PhDs in the natural and physical sciences have been awarded to women, why are less than 20% of CSIRO's senior research staff (i.e. CSOF7 and above) female? 8. Noting that the minimum classification for a postdoctoral employee is CSOF4.2 and there are 6 increments between this level and level CSOF6, why has the proportion of female research staff employed at CSOF6 stagnated for the past 6 years at approximately 23%? 9. Noting that ASX 200 companies have managed to achieve nearly 30% female directors on boards, how long, at the rates of progression that have occurred under Dr Marshall's tenure as CEO, will it take for CSIRO to achieve 30% of women amongst its ranks of senior research staff (i.e. CSOF7 and above)? 10. What year has CSIRO set as the target year by which time it will have a minimum of 30% women employed as research staff at all CSOF levels? If CSIRO does not have such a target, why not? 11. Are any salary bonuses of executive staff tied to improving gender diversity in CSIRO? If so, have any staff members received a decreased bonus over the past 3 years due to failure to improve gender diversity? If not, why not? 12. Over the past 10 years, what is the number of women employed under the Research Scientist/Engineer classification whose employment with CSIRO has terminated (for any</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
----	-----------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---------	--	-----------------

67	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Bullying Complaints and Investigations	<p>1. Noting that in response to AI-75 (question 5), CSIRO states that it adopted and in 2014 implemented all recommendations made by Prof Pearce, can CSIRO confirm that it has established a centralised database for recording both informal and formal complaints of workplace bullying and unreasonable behaviour? If not, why not? Assuming CSIRO has established such a centralised database: over the past 10 years how many staff who have complained about harassment, bullying or other inappropriate behaviour by another staff member have left CSIRO? In answering, please include all staff whose complaints have been recorded on this database and not just the staff whose complaints were the subject of a formal investigation. Please also break this information down by gender. 2. In response to AI-75 (question 4e), CSIRO has chosen to limit its answer to matters that were the subject of a formal investigation and has also chosen to limit its answer to the number of respondents that currently remain employed by CSIRO. Please advise: How many alleged perpetrators of inappropriate behaviour have remained employed at CSIRO after the complainants left? In answering, please do not limit the answer to matters that were the subject of a formal investigation, and do not limit the answer to persons who currently remain employed at CSIRO. Please include the number/s of any alleged perpetrator of alleged inappropriate behaviour recorded on the centralised database that continue to be employed at CSIRO for any length of time after the complainant ceased being employed by CSIRO. Please also provide a breakdown of this information by gender.</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
68	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Editorial Boards	<p>1. In response to AI-75 (question 7), CSIRO states that it is aware of the gender imbalance on some of its journal editorial boards and that "current compositions reflect the relative proportions of male/female scientists at the top of their respective subject fields". Noting that CSIRO's editorial board appointments are not limited to experts based in Australia, please provide the international statistical data that CSIRO's assertion is based on for each of the subject fields represented in journals owned by CSIRO. 2. What is the process used by CSIRO for appointing a member of an editorial board for CSIRO owned journals and what determines the length of tenure of an appointee? Has CSIRO asked any of the men on the more highly inequitable editorial boards whether they are sufficiently embarrassed at the inequity that they will stand aside to allow their place to be filled by an equally qualified female colleague?</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
69	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO Executive Management	<p>Please provide data showing the gender composition of the executive management and, where relevant, the boards, of each of the companies that CSIRO currently invests in.</p>	Written		12/06/2018 0:00

70	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Claims under the Safety Rehabilitation and Compensation Act	What is the current number of active claims under the Safety Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988 in respect of CSIRO employees that CSIRO is aware of?	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
71	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Accidents involving CSIRO vehicles	Please provide a breakdown by year of the number of accidents involving CSIRO vehicles that have occurred over the past 5 years	Written		12/06/2018 0:00
72	Griff, Stirling	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Legal representatives	Please provide details as to the number of matters over the past 5 years where CSIRO has engaged one or more legal representatives in excess of the daily rate specified by the Legal Services Directions. Please also advise what proportion of matters engaged in by CSIRO during the past 5 years that this number represents.	Written		12/06/2018 0:00

73	Bartlett, Andrew	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Gene Drives	<p>2) How much is the CSIRO being funded by the US military's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) as part of the Genetic Biocontrol of Invasive Rodents (GBIRd) project to develop gene drive mice? a. What specific research or purposes has the funding been allocated to CSIRO for? 2) FOI documents reveal that the GBIRd project is also seeking funding from the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA). a. How much funding has GBIRd sought from IARPA? b. How much of this funding would be coming to CSIRO? c. What are these funds intended to be used for? 3) CSIRO's role in GBIRd, as outlined in the project's Memorandum of Understanding includes: "Develop and implement an Australian Stakeholder/Community/Public Engagement Plan to evaluate the potential for social acceptance of this technology." According to the FOI documents "Community engagement is planned by CSIRO in Australia as part of a wider effort to gain social license for environmental applications of synthetic biology technologies." a. How much funding has CSIRO or GBIRd sought from DARPA for CSIRO's planned community engagement work? b. How does CSIRO intend to spend the \$3.5M it has allocated for community/stakeholder research related to synthetic biology? c. Has CSIRO developed a plan as to how it will spend this money? d. If yes to a) please table this document. 4) Freedom of Information documents reveal that CSIRO scientists have been "spruiking the rodent gene drive technologies to various government agencies and other stakeholders". CSIRO scientists are also investigating the commercial application of gene drives in agriculture. a. Would you agree that CSIRO has a serious potential conflict of interest if it has a commercial interest in gene drives and is promoting them whilst being tasked with conducting a risk assessment on them at the same time? 5) FOI documents reveal that GBIRd has already identified 6 potential offshore islands in Western Australia for the potential release of gene drive mice. a. How many of these meet GBIRd's selection criteria of being closed to the public; Mus musculus are the only rodent species present; and the island is greater than 1km from other land masses? b. How did GBIRd arrive at the 1km criteria when clearly mice have</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
74	Patrick, Rex	Geoscience Australia	Geoscience Australia Travel Expenditure	<p>For FY 16/17: 1. Please provide details of the Qantas/Virgin split for official travel in terms of: a. Total number of tickets b. Total value spent for official travel? 2. In the event there is a disparity of greater than 65/35 in the split (either way), please provide a detailed reasons for the split in the context of a lowest practical fare policy. 3. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only the Qantas Chairman's Lounge? a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin? 4. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only Virgin's The Club? a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin? 5. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from both the Qantas Chairman's Lounge and Virgin's The Club?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00

75	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Discretionary Grants	Please update the discretionary grants spreadsheet provided in response to Question on Notice no. SI-126 from the 2016-17 Supplementary Budget Estimates, to provide budget, committed and non-committed funding from 2009-10 to 2021-22 for all identified programs and any other discretionary grant programs that may be established.	Written	13/06/2018 0:00
76	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Industry Growth Centres Initiative	<p>In relation to the Industry Growth Centres initiative, please advise: 1. How much new funding has the Industry Growth Centres received? 2. What measures were put in place to achieve self-sufficiency when the program commenced? a. How have those measures changed – what is the process now to make sure the Growth Centres are self-sufficient in the next two years? 3. Answer to QON AI-26 details the AMGC’s initial membership model, whereby tier 1 members contribute \$100,000; tier 2 contribute \$50,000, tier 3 - \$10,000 and tier 4 - \$1000. How long was this model in place? How many members did the AMGC attract for each tier during this initial stage? 4. One of the AMGC’s KPIs is to “increase followers on social media by 10 per month”. Please advise: a. How this number was determined by the growth centre. b. How many followers the AMGC has managed to attract in each month since November last year. 5. QON AI – 26 revealed that a post-commencement evaluation of the growth centres was undertaken in mid-2016. Please advise: a. The outcome of that evaluation. b. Some of the key areas of concern. c. The recommendations that were made. d. Whether any concerns were raised relating to the capacity of the centres to achieve self-sufficiency? e. Whether this been made public? If not, please table. 6. Please advise the total cost of promoting the six growth centres since their establishment, including but not limited to: media and communications team salaries, advertising, benchmarking research, consultants, service providers and contractors, social media budgets, conferences, mail outs. Please provide a breakdown per year, and include a forecast for this next financial year. 7. Please table a copy of the final Woolcott report. 8. Please advise whether the Department plans to commission any further research on how the growth centre initiative is tracking after the \$450,000 advertising campaign. If not, please advise how you will measure the impact of that expenditure.</p>	Written	13/06/2018 0:00

77	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Entrepreneurs Programme	<p>1. The research undertaken by Woorol into the Growth Centres initiative revealed that only 9 per cent of 229 business respondents who were aware of government programs that provided support or funding were aware of the Entrepreneurs' Programme. Please advise whether this information has or will be shared with the Industry Partners of the Programme? What measures – if any – will be introduced to rectify this? 2. Please advise when the contracts for the Business Advisers and Facilitators expire? What criteria are used to determine whether they are re-engaged or terminated? 3. Please advise how many positions have been outsourced as a result of the establishment of the Entrepreneurs' Programme? How has outsourcing the Entrepreneurs' Programme staff positions improved the return on investment regarding funding of this program? 4. Please advise how many people who were contracted by the Department under previous programs received a payout for the remainder of their contract with the Department? a. Of those who were paid out, how many were reemployed by Industry Partners shortly after? b. What rules exist preventing a person who receives a payout as a result of their contract being terminated early by the Department from being immediately re-engaged by an Industry Partner, who is contracted by the Department? c. If there are time limits, can you provide the details? 5. Please advise the level of staff turnover in each division of the program. Specifically, how many days have advisor/ facilitator / Director positions been vacant in Perth, Sydney and Geelong? 6. Please advise how many times have advisor and facilitator positions been re-recruited in last three years in location NSW? How does this differ to positions in Geelong? Are there any positions in Wollongong, Kiama, Illawarra or the south coast? If not, why not? 7. Please advise how Director positions were advertised before 1 July 2015. How does this compare to how Director positions are advertised now? Please also advise when the last recruitment round of Directors was publically advertised. Please provide a copy of those advertisements. 8. Please advise how many women applied for those positions and how many were appointed? Please outline the processes in place that aim to improve gender equity across Business</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
78	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Australian Industry Participation Plans	<p>In relation to Australian Industry Participation Plans please advise/provide: 1. How much funding has been allocated to Australian Industry Participation Authority over the forward estimates? Please provide a yearly breakdown. 2. How many FTE staff are currently employed by the AIP Authority? Will this number remain consistent in 2018-19? 3. How many AIP plans have been approved by the AIP Authority this financial year? Can you please provide a breakdown for each category? 4. A list of projects and procurements determined to be exempt from the AIP requirement because they are doing a state or territory participation plans instead. 5. An update on the progress of the (state/territory/Commonwealth) review of the Australian Industry Participation National Framework. 6. What happened to the Department's commissioned (Ernst and Young) report into the 'appropriateness' of AIP's in 2014? Did the report recommend that only successful tenderers for government procurement be required to submit an AIP plan?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00

79	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Industry Growth	<p>Please advise whether an audit of Commonwealth building compliance with the National Construction Code has been undertaken; the results of that audit; what action has been taken to remediate those buildings. 2. Regarding the Building Ministers' Forum expert report by Professor Peter Shergold AC and Ms Bronwyn Weir, please advise: 1. Whether a formal response to each recommendation will be provided. If so, when that is expected. 2. The reason underpinning the difference in contract value between Ms Weir (\$310,000) and Professor Shergold (\$75,000); whether the contracts were paid by the Commonwealth; if not, how much did each state/territory contribute. 3. Answer to QON AI-13 suggests that audit results for Queensland, ACT and NT have not been completed. When are the results of those audits expected? 4. The communicate from the April 17 Building Ministers Forum states: "Ministers have asked the Senior Officers' Group to report on existing responsibilities of parties to meet the cost of rectification of non-compliant use of combustible cladding and remedies, including the rights of parties to recover costs from those responsible. The SOG will report to a future BMF meeting" Please advise what action has been taken to address this point; who the Building Ministers considered responsible for remediation at the last BMF meeting; the date of the next Building Ministers' Forum. 5. The Building Minister's Forum Communique also states that SOG (Senior Officers Group): "Will be consulting with industry on possible options for a new system of permanent labelling for cladding products. Ministers agreed that given the urgency of this issue, the consultation will be undertaken during May and June 2018, with a report of the consultations and the preferred approach to be provided to Ministers at their next meeting." Please advise: where that process is up to; what consultation has occurred; whether this process will be concluded by June; whether the consultation includes trade unions and workers' representatives in the construction industry. 6. Regarding the brief that was provided to the BMF by Mr John Murray AM on the national Review of Security of Payment Laws: Building Trust and Harmony, please advise whether the review that was publically released reflected what was presented to the BMF by Mr</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
80	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Automotive Transformation Scheme	<p>In relation to the Automotive Transformation Scheme, please advise: 1. How many firms are registered? 2. How many ATS participants have indicated that they will continue to draw upon the scheme? Please provide a breakdown between the different elements. 3. How many companies have been deregistered by the Department and how many have sought deregistration voluntarily. 4. How many national interest waiver applications have now been received and approved? Please provide a breakdown by sector. 5. The level of FTE staff in the Department who are responsible for the delivery of the ATS and how many policy staff work in that area.</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00

81	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	Innovation and Science Australia	<p>1. Please advise the current funding package for Innovation and Science Australia. Has there been any increase on last year's funding package? Is there likely to be any change in average staffing levels? 2. Please advise whether the proposal for a sliding scale intensity measure was raised by the Department, Treasury, government or stakeholders during the 2030 Strategic Plan development process. If not, when did ISA first learn of the measure as announced in the Budget? 3. In evidence to Additional Estimates in March (Attachment B), Mr Day said "amongst the top 1,000 companies around the world, R&D intensity is typically closer to three to four per cent". Given that the most globally innovative companies' R&D intensity reaches only 3 - 4 per cent, what is the likelihood of Australian companies reaching the last two tiers of the intensity requirements? 4. As part of the 2030 report development process, did ISA encounter any R&D tax incentive regimes where the benefit was as low as 4 per cent? If so, please provide examples. Please also advise whether 4 per cent is globally competitive. 5. Please advise how the cuts to the R&D tax incentive will improve our position in relation to our global peers. 6. The Treasury Fact Sheet issued with the 2018 Budget Papers provides ISA with new powers to "produce public findings similar to the ATO, and provide more effective, binding guidance on the scope of what is eligible R&D". Please elaborate. a. Will it require any legislative change? b. Will ISA receive any extra funding or staff to undertake this new responsibility? c. When do you expect you will be able to issue new guidance? What will be the process? 7. Please outline the role of Innovation and Science Australia in the Early Stage Venture Capital Limited Partnerships program? What powers does ISA have in relation to that program? a. How many firms have been registered by ISA to date? How many partnerships have been lodged? Please provide examples where possible. b. How many times has the Committee declined to register a partnership? c. Under what circumstances is the Board able to exercise discretion to allow an investment partner to exceed the investment limit of 30 per cent total committed capital? How many times has the Board exercised this discretion? If none, why?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
82	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Director General for IP Australia	<p>Referring to recent reports in The Mandarin on 07 June 2018 regarding the recruitment of a new Director General for IP Australia: a) If applications close in June, when do you expect the new Director General will be appointed? b) What is the remuneration package for the Director General position?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00

83	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	IP Australia total resource reductions	<p>1) The 2018-19 Portfolio Budget Statement shows that between 2017-18 and 2018-19 there will be a reduction in total resourcing for IP Australia of \$10.23 million. Please outline the nature of these reductions, why they have occurred and what actions IP Australia has taken to meet this reduced departmental budget. 2) Budget Paper no.2 indicates the provision of \$600,000 to modernise IP Australia's patents management system but advises this measure "will be met from within the existing resources of IP Australia." a) Will IP Australia have to stop or reduce any activities to internally fund this modernisation project? b) When will the new patents management system be rolled out? c) What are the key features of the new patents management system?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
84	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Innovation Patent System on SMEs	<p>1) In responding to Question on Notice AI-86, IP Australia has stated that "The Government has decided to undertake further industry consultation targeted at further understanding the needs of innovative SMEs before the phase out of the innovation patent occurs." With regards to those further industry consultations: a) What consultations have occurred, with whom, when and where? b) What further consultations are planned, with whom, when and where? c) Are individual SMEs able to participate in these consultations or make submissions to this process? d) How are stakeholders and SMEs notified of those sessions? e) What have been the main themes to emerge from those sessions? f) Has there been opposition to the decision to phase out Innovation Patents and if so, on what grounds? g) What ideas have been put forward by stakeholders and SMEs in the context of phasing out Innovation Patents? 2) With the phase out of Innovation Patents and some Australian SMEs having to move to the standard patents regime, will those SMEs face higher regulatory costs as a result of higher fees and greater proof requirements? If so, is anything being done to alleviate those pressures?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
85	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Australian Intellectual Property report 2017	<p>In response to Question on notice AI-40, IP Australia provided performance and outcome data for 2016. Following the release of 'Australian Intellectual Property Report 2017', please provide data updated for 2017, including changes between 2016 and 2017?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
86	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	IP Rights applications	<p>In relation to IP Australia's performance criteria, Timely processing of IP Rights applications, on page 174 of the 2018-19 Portfolio Budget Statements: how is the organisation tracking? What is considered timely? What is the average time for different IP Rights applications?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00
87	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	IP Australia 2018-19 Corporate Plan	<p>I note that the purpose of the agency has changed from 2017, which was to "Deliver improved IP rights administration and professional registration" to 2018, "Ensure Australians benefit from great ideas". Please outline the basis for this change. How will these changes be reflected in the 2018-19 Corporate Plan?</p>	Written		13/06/2018 0:00

88	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	IP Australia's operating loss	I understand IP Australia is budgeting for an operating loss of \$5.0 million for 2018-19, which is \$1.0 million higher than the loss reported in the 2017 18 Portfolio Budget Statements. A further operating loss is projected in 2019-20 with a return to surplus forecast in 2020-21. What is the basis for the operating loss? Does the forecast loss indicate inadequate funding for IP Australia	Written	13/06/2018 0:00
89	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Software Patents	1)Please provide an update on recent decisions by the court in relation to Software Patents, including: a)A brief outline of the issue relating to RPL and Research Affiliates. b)Has there been a ruling that has been interpreted as deeming certain kinds of software related inventions unpatentable? c)Has this interpretation led to a significant number of applications being rejected? d) How is IP Australia dealing with this issue? 2)What is IP Australia's view on the patentability of software enabling new and innovative operations on a standard general purpose computer or in a standard networked computer environment? What is IP Australia's view on the patentability of software enabling new and innovative operations on single purpose hardware such as embedded systems?	Written	13/06/2018 0:00
90	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator	1.What vetting or due diligence is done by NOPTA with or for the Joint Authority to ensure a company is a safe operator before it is awarded a title, in particular what due diligence was done before awarding BP, a company that was in the middle of the worst oil disaster in US history, was granted a permit? 2.What conversations did NOPTA or the joint authority have with the Norwegian Petroleum Safety Authority and/or what independent investigations were done before awarding the Great Australian Bight petroleum exploration title transfer from BP to Statoil in June this year to ensure that Statoil was a safe operator? 3.We understand Equinor has asked for an extension on its work commitment to allow for 'operational flexibility'. Can NOPTA confirm the reasons behind that request? 4.How is a decision to allow an extension made? What advice has NOPTA given to the joint authority so far on whether to accept the extension request? 5.How many companies in the Bight have requested extensions on their work commitments or cancelled their plans and what reasons have been provided - is it simply that it is too difficult to drill safely there or is it for economic reasons that companies are varying and delaying their plans? 6.It seems like an unusually high rate of abandonment or postponement and there are now no supermajor oil companies with plans to explore. Is it unusual for titleholders to delay or extend their plans in a basin to this extent? Can these simply be extended indefinitely or is a company required to give up their titles at some point?	Written	14/06/2018 0:00

91	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Kimba Community Consultation	<p>1. The Department of Industry conducted a 120-day community consultation process in 2016 in Kimba. What was the conclusion of this process? 2. Do you believe there are any risks, or any costs, associated with this nuclear waste facility? If so, what are they? Have these been communicated to residents? 3. Have you engaged in any community consultation throughout this process? a. On balance, recognising that there are costs and benefits to any policy proposal, how much of the information you have provided the community would you characterise as positive, and how much would be negative? Do you think you have given equal weight to costs as you have the benefits? 4. Do you think it's accurate to say that this waste dump will guarantee the ongoing sustainability of the Kimba community for 300 years? Community members are under the impression that it will. Has ANSTO suggested anything that would lead a layperson to this conclusion? 5. Post construction, what is average annual economic value of the nuclear waste management facility for the community? What is this figure based on?</p>	Written		14/06/2018 0:00
92	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	ANSTO contamination accident	<p>background, there was an accident leading to contamination of a worker at the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO), specifically ANSTO Health on 22 August 2017. The accident occurred during a routine quality control procedure and caused radiation exposure of the skin of the hands. The radiation dose was significantly underestimated in ANSTO's initial assessments. However it was acknowledged in the ANSTO report that the radiation dose could lead to tissue reactions. The scene of the accident was not preserved by ANSTO, which means that important information on contamination levels on personal protective equipment, which could further have informed the dose assessment, had not been gathered. Tissue reactions that subsequently developed on the worker's hands are compatible with a radiation dose about 40 times higher than the statutory annual equivalent dose limit to the skin. 1. What was the person's role? 2. What was the level of radiation this person was exposed to? Is this level considered dangerous? 3. Was that person's safety at risk as a result of this incident? 4. The report to the Parliament from February 2018 says that the person was "a quality control analyst." The National Radioactive Waste Management Facility publication, Jobs at the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility, page 2, does not feature any jobs within the proposed organisational structure titled "quality control analyst". Which of these titles in this organisational structure would a "quality control analyst" fall under? 5. Under the proposed nuclear waste dump facility organisational structure, would a quality control analyst be a local? 6. Residents are quoted in the media as being informed that there are no safety risks associated with the nuclear waste disposal facility. Are they right? 7. Have residents been provided any information about this incident? Can you table this information? 8. A group of 11 Kimba residents visited the Lucas Heights site on 16 October 2017. This visit was characterized as an opportunity to assess the risks and benefits of the nuclear waste dump. 9. At any point on this tour, were the residents made aware of the August 2017 incident? 10. ANSTO has publicly quoted a figure of 45 jobs associated with the proposed radioactive waste facility. Has there been any modelling associated with this</p>	Written		18/06/2018 0:00

93	Hanson-Young, Sarah	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	<p>1. What impact would a potential oil spill have on local industry within the Bight? 2. What impact would World Heritage Listing have on NOPSEMA's assessment process? 3. Does NOPSEMA have the specialist expertise it requires to undertake robust assessment of Environment Plans in-house, or does NOPSEMA work with other experts or organisations to assess EPs? (If so, can NOPSEMA provide a list of organisations and individuals that provide any such advice on a regular basis, are contracted to do so, or have been asked to provide any advice to NOPSEMA over the past 2 years.) 4. What processes or procedure, if any, are no longer followed by NOPSEMA that would have been part of the approvals process under the pre February 2014 arrangement when sole responsibility was held by the Environment Department and Minister? 5. Is it commonplace for NOPSEMA to seek independent expert advice or advice from other government agencies, for example on matters of a highly specialised nature like assessing toxicity of particular substances that may be present in the environment as a result of an oil or gas activity or the potential impacts of marine noise, or does NOPSEMA have all the expertise it requires in-house?</p>	Written		14/06/2018 0:00
94	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	Leigh Creek	<p>1. Has the Department had any involvement in any stage of the approvals process for the Leigh Creek project? 2. What is the Department's view of the merits of the technology? 3. Is the Department of the view that its oversight of the Linc Energy project was adequate? 4. If something goes wrong with Leigh Creek, will the Department have any monitoring or oversight? 5. How will the Department know if problems develop with the project, such as those that developed with Linc Energy?</p>	Written		14/06/2018 0:00
95	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	Resources 2030 Taskforce	<p>1. Is the Department supporting the Resources Minister's Resources 2030 Taskforce? 2. On what criteria were the members of the taskforce selected? 3. Has the Department received any FOI requests in relation to the taskforce? If so, how many?</p>	Written		14/06/2018 0:00

96	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Radioactive waste storage facility ballot	Minister Canavan has announced that starting August 20 the AEC will conduct a community ballot designed to elicit 'an unambiguous view from voters on their support for hosting the Facility'. 1. Did the Minister secure Council(s) support or formally consult with LGAs before announcing the ballot? 2. The ballot process has a constrained timeline in order for people to register (especially relating to inclusion on the CEO's roll – a mechanism for non-resident ratepayers to vote which closed at the end of May) which could restrict some people from participating. What steps has the Department taken to address this? 3. What steps has the Department taken to identify the sufficient level of project detail required for the community to make an informed decision? 4. How is the wider Aboriginal community perspective to be reflected in the ballot process? 5. What ballot result will constitute "broad community support"? Has the Department provided the Minister with any options to consider? If so, please table a copy of these options, along with any supplementary materials.	Written		14/06/2018 0:00
97	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Radioactive Waste Management Framework	1. What is the status of moves to advance the proposed RWMO? Please detail, including in relation to composition/role/resources/legislative framework/timeline/accountability. 2. What public or independent input has there been in the process to date? Will there be any opportunity for public or independent contributions into the design/development of this proposal? 3. In the Framework there is reference to various international agreements and instruments that Australia is party to that relate to radioactive waste management, yet there is no reference to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Why was this reference omitted?	Written		14/06/2018 0:00

98	Patrick, Rex	Resources	Offshore South East Australia Future Gas Supply Study and retention lease decisions	<p>Senator PATRICK: Moving to the southern basin, the last time we talked there was a review going on in respect of the— Senator Canavan: The south-east. Senator PATRICK: South-east—where is that up to now? Senator Canavan: I might ask Mr Taylor if he would like to go through the details of the results of that review. My recollection from it is that there are remaining resources in southern Australia, but they're not of a significant size and they have more challenges in terms of being developed. There have been some retention lease decisions that I've recently made in those areas, and we're still considering the next steps we might take in Bass Strait and southern south-east Australia to encourage further development. I do welcome the fact that the Exxon Mobil-BHP joint venture is doing a lot more development at the moment in some new areas. They're quite excited by those, so we're hoping to see perhaps some more supplies coming on board. However, they often make the point that these new areas are less prospective. They've obviously gone to the more prospective areas first. Mr Taylor, do you have anything to add in terms of the results of that review? Mr Taylor: NOPTA was a contributor to the south-east gas review, but offshore resources branch is probably in a better position to comment on that. Ms Schofield: The south-east gas study has been completed and key aspects of that have been published. Essentially, what the minister said is right. There are known gas reserves of about 3.8 TCF that are available in the south-east. As the minister said, the quality of that remaining gas isn't as good as the quality of the gas that has been produced thus far. Senator PATRICK: When you say 'quality' are you talking about quality in terms of quantity for production or the actual quality of the gas? Ms Schofield: How contaminated or dirty the gas is, it needs more processing to be able to— Senator Canavan: Mercury, carbon dioxide—more cost. Ms Schofield: There is a similar amount of gas available beyond that in the sort of contingent reserve piece, but it needs more exploration to confirm that that's there, and it would be of even lesser quality than the amount that we know of. At the moment, based on that, without the further exploration that the minister flagged a couple of companies are looking at, production or supply will continue at</p>	Spoken	7-8	5/06/2018 0:00
99	Patrick, Rex	Resources	Pipelines	<p>Senator PATRICK: Moving to pipelines. Last estimates you talked about a Tennant Creek to Moomba proposal? Can someone advise where that might be up to? Senator Canavan: I haven't seen the results of that. That is primarily in the energy department's space. Ms Schofield, do you have any— Ms Schofield: No. Senator Canavan: I don't think it has been finalised, but you would have to put that directly to— Senator PATRICK: I guess that is the same story for the east-west— Senator Canavan: Yes, they are both being held by the energy department. I'm happy to take those on notice and we will work with the energy department and get back to you.</p>	Spoken	8	5/06/2018 0:00

100	Patrick, Rex	AUSI - Business Services	Gas Acceleration Program	<p>Ms Facey: We have announced five successful applicants under the gas acceleration program, which is a \$26 million program. Those contracts are currently being negotiated. Under those agreements we will ensure that the gas supply does flow to the east coast gas markets. There was an issue with a pro forma contract being cited as being the type of contract we would be entering into, but that is not the case. The agreements will have firm milestones that will need to be achieved relating to the supply of gas. Payments will not be made unless we're assured that is the case. Senator PATRICK: Are these five programs with larger companies or smaller gas companies? Ms Facey: The five companies that were funded are Armour Energy, WestSide Corporation, Adelaide Energy, Tri-Star Fairfields and Australian Gasfields Limited. Senator PATRICK: Are they on a website somewhere that I could go to? Ms Facey: They are. The details are on business.gov.au. There are project descriptions and so on. We can send you the link. Senator PATRICK: Yes, that would be fantastic. Senator Canavan: We will take that on notice to provide it.</p>	Spoken	9	5/06/2018 0:00
101	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Director of Corporate Affairs and Communication	<p>Senator KETTER: In subsequent questions, you failed to provide details relating to how much it cost to employ your director of corporate affairs and communication. Can you advise me now what the cost is? Senator Canavan: I think we'll take that on notice, given that it goes to someone's personal salary arrangements. Typically that would not be provided publicly unless there was a strong public interest. We'll take that on notice and see what we can get back to you, Senator Ketter.</p>	Spoken	21	5/06/2018 0:00
102	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Shepherd review	<p>Senator KETTER: Can I ask what advice you provided the minister regarding the changes proposed by the Shepherd review? Ms Walker: I don't— Senator Canavan: Senator, as you know, the Shepherd review consulted with a wide range of bodies including the NAIF, so their input was reflected in the Shepherd review. Following the Shepherd review, we provided a copy of the report to the NAIF, and I had a discussion with the NAIF and the NAIF's board in regard to their views on that matter. Then, of course, the government made decisions in regard to the report itself. Senator KETTER: Can you tell me when the NAIF provided the advice to you? Senator Canavan: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KETTER: And was it via a meeting or a briefing note? Senator Canavan: I'd have to take it on notice, but I believe it was through discussions. But I'll take it on notice.</p>	Spoken	22-23	5/06/2018 0:00

102	Ketter, Chris Hume, Jane	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Projects	<p>Senator KETTER: Okay, at the last hearing, you identified that there were 23 projects in due diligence. You say there are now 17. Ms Walker: Yes, that's right. Senator KETTER: What about the number of inquiries? Last time, there were 194. Ms Bellettini: Currently, there are 216 inquiries. Senator KETTER: And now we have 97 active projects. Last estimates, there were 82. Can you give me a rough idea of the total value of those projects which are in due diligence? Ms Bellettini: We'll take that on notice. Senator KETTER: And the total value of the inquiries which are active? Ms Bellettini: We'll take that on notice as well. Senator KETTER: How many of these projects, roughly, would you say weren't able to be financed under the old investment mandate? Ms Walker: Again, there could be all sorts of reasons. They mightn't have been ready. They mightn't have had all that foundational work that I've talked about—the business case, the equity, the offtake parties. There are various reasons why a project might be active in terms of our engaging with the client and giving them feedback as to what we would need. There'd be various outcomes to that answer. Senator HUME: Can I provide a supplementary question to that one, rephrased slightly differently. How many projects are now in due diligence as a direct result of the changes to the investment mandate? Senator KETTER: That's a very similar question. Senator HUME: Yes. Ms Walker: I'll have to take that on notice. Senator HUME: You said there are 17 projects now— Ms Walker: There are 17 in DD. Senator HUME: and there were 13 at the last estimates. The IM has changed in the meantime. Is it four? Is it that simple or is there something a bit more complicated to it? Mr Lawson: Perhaps I might be able to help. One thing to note is that the projects don't come into due diligence as a finalised project. There's a sort of negotiation, a working-through. For example, the change to increase the amount of debt that can be carried will open up those projects and make them more likely to come to conclusion. But to say whether a project could or could not be approved under the old investment mandate prejudices that that project and its financing are immovable objects, and that's not correct. They do change over the process. Senator Canavan: Can I just add, while Ms Walker is taking that question on notice, that I'm</p>	Spoken	23-24	5/06/2018 0:00
-----	-----------------------------	--	---------------	--	--------	-------	----------------

104	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Beef Week	<p>Senator KETTER: The questions need to be asked, though there could well be a perception. Ms Walker, you indicated that the speaking spot had come up. Would I be correct in saying that it was NAIF that approached the proponent to allow this project to be announced for the benefit of the speaking spot you had at Beef Week? Ms Walker: I would need to check that, but the speaking spot had been locked in for some months. The timing of the event coincided closely to when the investment mandate changes were made. That particular project will definitely benefit from the investment mandate changes, because it is an abattoir, it's a processing plant. There were all sorts of good reasons. As the minister said, Beef Week is an audience that's there, and we want the message out there as to how our mandate works. It's a case-by-case basis. This is a business that was happy to make the announcement. I'm not sure that it is relevant where the initiation of the discussion came from. Senator KETTER: Could you take that on notice for me? Ms Walker: I could take it on notice, but the fact is that the client consented and was there at the event. Senator KETTER: I'm asking you to take on notice at whose instigation. Senator Canavan: We'll take it on notice. Senator KETTER: Mr Lawson rightly points out that we are dealing with taxpayer money. There is a tension between commercial in confidence and the fact we have taxpayer funds, and there needs to be transparency. Ms Walker: I'm happy to take it on notice, and there is that balance that we always have to manage, but could you help me with the issue that is concerning you? If the client consents and NAIF is also consenting— Senator KETTER: Because 16 other projects are in due diligence, plus 200 are in the pipeline. We're dealing with taxpayer funds, so there's an issue of transparency here. The perception could well be this was a cheap political stunt at Beef Week. The government is under incredible pressure to announce a Queensland project under the NAIF and this is that, so the proponent is approached to facilitate this. Senator Canavan: We'll take it on notice, but once again, I think it was perfectly right and proper for the NAIF to seek to promote its activities in Beef Week. We'll take the question about the process on notice.</p>	Spoken	28	5/06/2018 0:00
105	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia and Major Projects	Process of establishing the NAIF	<p>Senator KETTER: I just have one further question, and it's for the department. It goes to the issue of the consultation for setting up the NAIF in the first instance. I understand there were submissions sought from interested stakeholders in the process of establishing the NAIF. I understand those submissions have not yet been publicly released. Is that correct? Senator Canavan: Just to clarify, you're speaking of the process which occurred before the legislation was passed in the parliament, before it was established? Senator KETTER: Yes. Senator Canavan: That would have been, I think, early 2016 or late 2015—around that time. Mr Lawson: We'll have to take that on notice. I can't quite remember whether we had advised people that we would be intending to have a process that led to publication of things. So we'll just take it on notice. Senator KETTER: Okay, take it on notice. I am interested in obtaining a copy of the submissions. Thank you.</p>	Spoken	33	5/06/2018 0:00

106	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	Great Australian Bight	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: With reference to the two new spots in the Great Australian Bight—obviously quite concerning to me as a South Australian—areas S181, a highly controversial area for oil exploration, how many stakeholders made submissions in relation to those two? Ms Schofield: I might need to take the exact number on notice. I'm just not sure if I have it in my papers, but I think there were over 3,000 comments that came back on the acreage release process as a whole. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: But you can't tell me now how many submissions were made in relation to the two spots in the Great Australian Bight? Ms Schofield: I don't think so, but I'll take it on notice and I'll see if I can find it in my papers. If I've got it, I will come back to it. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like to know how many stakeholders made submissions, which, if any, were consulted prior to the release of those two release areas and what the general substance of those contributions was. Ms Schofield: We'll take that on notice. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Does or can the department, on request, publish its assessment of that consultation or provide a statement of reasons for the acreages? As a matter of course, if you release these 21 places, is there a requirement or is there a process which then allows you to say, 'The reason why these 21 acreages have been released is that we received these submissions, or these are the arguments'? Is that done in any way, or is there any consideration by the department of doing that in terms of this campaign towards transparency? Ms Schofield: We don't do that at the moment, other than in the feedback that the department provide upon release of the acreage. When we release the acreage, obviously the minister releases that acreage at APIA. The department also provide additional information and talk to industry and others about the acreage that been released. When we do that, we talk at the moment in high-level terms about the sort of feedback that was received through the process and the fact that that was considered before decisions were made. I think, as I flagged, one of the decisions that the minister made at the end of last year around increasing transparency did go to consultation on acreage release, and that's certainly one of things that we're looking at and thinking about how we can improve our engagement on acreage release,</p>	Spoken	35	5/06/2018 0:00
107	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	Energy Security	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: In thinking about this issue of energy security, and understanding that we're talking at least a decade into the future, what types of projections has the department done around when the government expects global oil demand to peak? Senator Canavan: That might be a question for previous— Mr Lawson: The department of energy. Senator Canavan: Yes, probably the department of energy. We do our own resource assessments but typically not on global energy demands. Why don't we take that on notice and see what we can provide? Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes, you can do that. The obvious next question is: when does the government expect that the Australian oil demand will peak? Senator Canavan: It's probably more a question for the department of energy but we'll take that on notice. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you.</p>	Spoken	36-37	5/06/2018 0:00

108	Ketter, Chris	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	MoU with AMSA	<p>Senator KETTER: I do have to step out at 12.30 for a very brief meeting; Senator Carr will continue questioning, and then I'll come back. I'll start with the relationship you have with AMSA, the Australian Maritime Safety Authority. Do you currently have a memorandum of understanding with them? Mr Heiden: Yes, we do. Senator KETTER: Can you tell me what it provides for? Is it possible for it to be tabled? Mr Heiden: I'll ask my colleague, Mr Grebe, if he has any further details on that. Mr Grebe: Yes, we can certainly make it available and table it. Senator KETTER: Can you tell me a little bit about it? Mr Grebe: If your question is about the relationship with AMSA, NOPSEMA engages with AMSA directly, agency to agency. The amount of engagement we have is predominantly focused on offshore issues and the National Plan for Maritime Environmental Emergencies. We also engage them on offshore safety regulation, particularly the interface, and have done so for a number of years. The MOU is about formalising the relationship between the two organisations. I think we'd observe that the strength of the organisation and this relationship is about people interacting with each other. The MOU is a document, not a relationship. Senator KETTER: Does it provide for joint vessel inspections? Mr Grebe: I will have to take that on notice. I'm sorry.</p>	Spoken	37	5/06/2018 0:00
109	Ketter, Chris	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	NOPSEMA Investigations	<p>Senator KETTER: The next questions are about some of your investigations. Can you tell me how many workplace health and safety investigations you've conducted each year since it replaced NOPSA? Mr Grebe: We can. Just bear with me while I go to some figures on those. Mr Heiden: Sorry, was it investigations or inspections? Senator KETTER: Investigations. Mr Heiden: I've got 2017 figures here. We conducted 342 investigations into notifications and incidents that were reported in the calendar year 2017, and they range from the very minor types of incidents that were reported to us. If there were major ones, we would have investigated those as well. Senator KETTER: Can you give me, on notice, the previous years as well? Mr Heiden: Yes, from 2012, when NOPSEMA came into effect. Senator KETTER: Thank you. How many of those investigations identified noncompliance? Mr Heiden: We'll have to take that on notice year by year. Senator KETTER: Okay. What was the nature of each instance of noncompliance, and what enforcement actions were taken in each case? Mr Heiden: We will take that on notice as well. Senator KETTER: Okay. How many enforcement actions has NOPSEMA taken in each category? Mr Heiden: In each category of enforcement action? Senator KETTER: Yes. Mr Grebe: In a particular year or in each year? Senator KETTER: I'm sorry? Mr Grebe: In each of the years since 2012 or a particular year? Senator KETTER: In each year. Mr Heiden: We can take that on notice as well.</p>	Spoken	37-38	5/06/2018 0:00

110	Carr, Kim	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	NOPSEMA Benchmarking	<p>Senator KIM CARR: It says here that NOPSEMA lags behind comparable international regulators. Is that true? Are you disputing it? Mr Heiden: I'm not aware of it. I'm aware that there is a submission made by APPEA for the inquiry that's currently underway. We consider that we benchmark very well from an international perspective. Our CEO is currently— Senator KIM CARR: So APPEA's assertions and their submissions on pages 10 and 13 are not correct. Is that what you're saying? Mr Heiden: I'm not saying that. I'm not sure of the basis upon which they're making those claims. But, from a NOPSEMA perspective, we consider that we do benchmark well internationally. Senator KIM CARR: Can you provide the committee with the basis upon which you make that assertion? Mr Heiden: Yes. We can provide on notice some benchmarking, yes. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much.</p>	Spoken	40-41	5/06/2018 0:00
111	Ketter, Chris	Geoscience Australia	Information on Resource Deposits	<p>Senator KETTER: What does Geoscience Australia do with the information it collect on resource deposits? Does it sell the information to resource companies? Dr Johnson: No, we don't sell the information. We make it freely available to everyone—either across the web or, if it is a big dataset, we charge just for the cost of the transfer of that dataset—such that it is a level playing field for the entirety of the industry. Senator KETTER: Have you ever done any estimates as to the value of that data? Dr Johnson: Not to my knowledge. Mr Lawson: Some years ago, policies were taken by government to make data more available and not to charge for it. Because it is a public good, making the information has been a bit of a strategy of bipartisan government. Dr Johnson: We have a range of case studies that go by individual surveys as to the dollars expended by us on precompetitive geoscience and the benefit to the nation from that. For example, in the Great Australian Bight expenditure of around \$6 million has leveraged well over \$1 billion of committed work programs. The biggest example I can think of in terms of the leverage of government funds is the INPEX example, the Ichthys field in the Browse Basin. I think back in the day the expenditure by the government was in the order of \$3 million—if you want to know the exact amount I am happy to take that on notice—and that is now a \$40 billion development in Darwin which will lead to something like \$70 billion in export earnings over the next 40 years. In case study terms, yes, we can certainly talk about the value; but if you are talking about an estimate of the value to reacquire the data, no, we haven't done that sort of work. Senator KETTER: I am not quibbling about the value of it. It is obviously important work. Dr Johnson: I can provide more examples.</p>	Spoken	45	5/06/2018 0:00

112	Ketter, Chris	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Sea Sim funding	<p>Senator KETTER: Will the sea sim be receiving any funding from the government's Research Infrastructure Investment Plan? Mr Mead: It's our understanding that it is in the 10-year investment plan program. Senator KETTER: So when will that funding be coming through? Mr Mead: I might ask Clare McLaughlin to answer that. Mrs McLaughlin: The government's Research Infrastructure Investment Plan includes additional funding of the sea sim but beyond the forward estimates. Senator KETTER: Can you tell me how much and when? Mrs McLaughlin: I'd have to take the details of that on notice. Senator KETTER: So the \$440 million grant to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation is a six-year program, as I understand it. Dr Hardisty: That's correct, yes. Senator KETTER: So the upgrades to the sea sim won't happen till after the six-year program? Is that right, Ms McLaughlin? Mrs McLaughlin: The Sea Simulator is operating effectively at present. The upgrades that are planned as part of the Research Infrastructure Investment Plan, as my colleague said, are to expand the capacity of it to be used as a national research infrastructure facility. The funding for that will be provided immediately, I think, after the forward estimates. As I said, I'll provide the details on notice, but that should be able to be implemented, I believe, quite quickly once that funding is available. Senator KETTER: All right. Thank you very much. Good luck with all that.</p>	Spoken	52	5/06/2018 0:00
113	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Launch services	<p>Senator KETTER: The reference group noted that there may be unmet demand for launch capacity for the CubeSat and nanosatellite market in emerging areas such as space tourism. Are you aware of groups in Australia working towards developing proposals for launch services? Mr Power: Yes, we are. My division manages applications and approvals for launch certificates that are required. So we have a number of people who approach us from time to time in preparing for those applications. We are in the expert group in its consultations around the country. We've had a lot of discussions around the concept of launch and also with entities that were looking for potential launch sites. So we are well aware and it was a topic of discussion and was addressed in the report. The report from the expert group noted the importance of launch generally but also noted how the launch market globally is maturing and there are spaces, generally, on launch vehicles. The report really talked about the importance of having the right regulatory environment here in Australia so that, when those applications come forward, they can be assessed quickly and provided forward to the market should they go ahead. Senator KETTER: Can you tell us who the groups are that are working towards proposals for launch services? Mr Power: No, not off the top of my head. Senator KETTER: Could you take it on notice? Mr Power: I'm happy to.</p>	Spoken	57	5/06/2018 0:00

114	Patrick, Rex	Industry Growth	Advanced manufacturing projects	<p>Senator PATRICK: This won't take very long. The department's very used to me asking these questions! Going to the increased investment and that advanced manufacturing project that was set up in last year's budget, I just want to confirm that there was a \$24 million funding for the vast manufacturing research projects, and I think last time you said it was \$20 million that had been allocated already. I presume that's the end of that now? You did send me some details on that. Mr Power: Dr Richardson can take you through that. Dr Richards: The \$20 million element of that was CRC projects, which were committed to and announced on 6 December, so they're progressing. There was an additional \$4 million in the Small Research Grants administered through the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Centre. Senator PATRICK: And you said that was just about to be announced. I think at the last estimates you said it would open in the next week or so. Dr Richards: And it was a little longer than the next week, but we are open and two projects have been approved already, to the value of around \$544,000, and there's a pipeline of additional projects. I think the value of those is around another \$400,000 for this year. Senator PATRICK: And you said that's going to be an ongoing process until the money runs out. Dr Richards: Yes, open until the money's expended. Senator PATRICK: Is there some easy way for me to get access to what projects have been funded? Dr Richards: Yes. They'll be announced through the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Centre, as per government grants. But we can take on notice to provide the details.</p>	Spoken	60	5/06/2018 0:00
115	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Growth Centre self-sufficiency	<p>Senator KETTER: Can you tell me which growth centre is closest to achieving self-sufficiency? Mr Lawrence: I'd have to take that on notice. The growth centres are working towards self-sufficiency and looking at strategies to do that, but at the moment most of them are prioritising their value proposition to work with stakeholders and to attract necessary funding. ... Senator KETTER: Can you give us a breakdown for each growth centre detailing the progress towards self-sufficiency? Mr Lawrence: We would have to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	62	5/06/2018 0:00

116	Ketter, Chris	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Entrepreneurs' Program contracts	<p>Senator KETTER: The Entrepreneurs' Program—let's talk about that. Your answer to question on notice AI-27 indicates that the contracts for the industry partners expired in June 2018. Can you tell me what the process is for engaging new partners? Ms Clough: The contracts for the industry partners—and there are 10 of them in the program—expire at the end of this financial year. We're in the process of renewing those and extending those for a further year to 1 July 2019. At the moment, there's an extension process underway. Senator KETTER: When will the tender process commence? Will it commence at the end of that 12-month period? Ms Clough: We've only run one tender process, and that was a few years ago when we established the 10 industry partners that we have at the moment. So, over the next few months, as we get into the next financial year, we'll be looking at what we do post July, end of June, in 2019, and one of those considerations will be starting to develop a new tender process. Senator KETTER: What about the contracts for the business advisers and facilitators? Do they expire at the same time? Ms Clough: The business advisers and facilitators are contracted—this is under the business management element of the Entrepreneurs' Program—by the industry partners, and their contract terms vary, depending on the industry partner. It's a little bit different, because there are a fairly large number of them and there's more flux with regard to them coming on and off throughout a financial year. Overall, it's pretty stable, but there is a bit of movement, and if a business adviser decides to not renew a contract or not extend or to leave for some reason, then the industry partner will go to market to recruit another one. Senator KETTER: So the contracts for these people expire at different times, do they? Ms Clough: They will be generally the same, but over time there will start to become differences in contract times because of the ons and offs that have been occurring over the past few years. Senator KETTER: At the present time, what is the expected date for the expiry of these contracts? Ms Clough: I don't have the exact—there are about 80 business advisers and I don't have the specific details of all of those at hand, so I might have to take that one on notice. Senator KETTER: Okay, thanks. Can you tell me what</p>	Spoken	63-64	5/06/2018 0:00
-----	---------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--------	-------	----------------

117	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Industry Growth Centres Initiative study	<p>Senator KETTER: I might put the rest of those on notice. I want to talk about the \$78,000 Woolcott Industry Growth Centres Initiative study. Are you able to advise, on notice if necessary, the total cost of promoting the six growth centres since their establishment, including the media and communications team salary, advertising benchmarking research—like the Woolcott report—and money spent on consultants, service providers and contractors? Mr Power: We have an officer here who is able to give us that information, and hopefully he'll come back to the table in a minute. If you have other questions, we might be able to come back to that one and give you some of that information. Senator KETTER: Sure. I understand the department provided us with a draft copy of the Woolcott analysis last week? Mr Power: Yes. Senator KETTER: We appreciate that. You advised last week that a final copy would be ready this week. Has it been completed? Mr Lawrence: Yes. The department has received the final report. Senator KETTER: Has the final report changed much from the draft that was provided to us last week? Mr Lawrence: I believe there is one additional page that's all. Senator KETTER: Can you tell us more about that? Mr Power: I'm not sure we've had a chance as yet to look through the details of what exactly has changed. Mr Lawrence: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KETTER: Mr Lawrence, perhaps you can help me with the earlier question about the total cost promoting the six growth centres. A lot of that you'd have to take on notice, as it is a fairly detailed question, but for now can you advise how much was spent on promoting the growth centre initiative this financial year to date? Mr Lawrence: I'd have to take that on notice, because my figures are about the grouped up on the individual elements not breakdown by the financial year. Senator KETTER: On page 12, Woolcott notes that, 'Only nine per cent of the valid sample that were telephoned completed the survey'. That's a fairly low portion of business engagement with this process. How does that compare to your other engagement processes? Would you agree that it's a low level of engagement? Mr Lawrence: The sample chosen by Woolcott was based on 100 firms for five of the growth centres and only 30 firms for the cybersecurity growth centre given that that</p>	Spoken	64	5/06/2018 0:00
118	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Industry support programs external analyses	<p>Senator KETTER: Have any other industry support programs been the subject of similar external analyses and received comparable findings? Mr Lawrence: I'd have to take that on notice, but not that I'm aware of.</p>	Spoken	65	5/06/2018 0:00
119	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	ANAO Buildings	<p>Senator KETTER: So, you can't tell me whether there are any Commonwealth buildings that are potentially non-compliant with the National Construction Code? Dr Byrne: At this stage, I can say that the evidence we have is that buildings are compliant. That said, the audit process continues and, should it become apparent there are issues of non-compliance, I'm confident that rectification activity would be undertaken. Senator KETTER: Do you know if any of the ANAO buildings have been identified as potentially non-compliant? Dr Byrne: I would need to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	70	5/06/2018 0:00

120	Ketter, Chris	Industry Growth	Cladding consultation	<p>Senator KETTER: When you do that consultation, will that include the union movement as well? Dr Byrne: That's a good question. Could I take that on notice. Senator KETTER: Yes. Dr Byrne: I think we certainly would expect to consult with all parties with a relevant interest, but I would like to check. Again, this is a cross-jurisdictional process; it's not something the Commonwealth owns. So I just need to check. But, as I said, all interested parties, I think, would have an expectation to be consulted.</p>	Spoken	71	5/06/2018 0:00
121	Ketter, Chris	IP Australia	Consultation with SMEs	<p>Senator KETTER: In responding to question on notice AI-86, you indicated the government has decided to undertake further industry consultation targeted at further understanding the needs of innovative SMEs before the phase out of the innovation patent occurs. In relation to those further industry consultations, as at 29 May what consultations have occurred, with whom, when and where? Ms P Kelly: Consultations are being led by the department. They were opened on 25 May with an online call for submissions and input and they are open until 3 August. The department is proposing to follow up those online consultations with some face-to-face meetings with key interested stakeholders. Senator KETTER: I take it that none of the consultations had started by 29 May? Ms P Kelly: Only insofar as it had been launched online. I don't think anybody had actually put in any input at that point. Senator KETTER: Could you take that on notice, just to be clear about that? Ms P Kelly: Yes, certainly.</p>	Spoken	73	5/06/2018 0:00

122	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Data 61	In reference to the role Data 61 will play as the Commonwealth's Data Standards Body which is being established to support the government's Consumer Data Right: 1. What will be the role of the advisory Committee? 2. How will advisory committee members be appointed and who will approve the appointments? 3. How will the Data Standards Body work to review international regulation trends and standards? 4. Given the global nature of the internet will it be necessary for Australia to adopt standards that are aligned to, if not compliant with, for example, the EU's General Data Protection Regulation? If not, why not? 5. Has Data 61 examined the circumstances reported in which health consumers were re-identified in releases of Medicare Data? 6. Has Data61 been involved in setting standards for release of Government data? 7. Has Data61 done any work in relation to the re-identification of citizen or personal data? What are the implications of this sort of work for the Consumer Data Right Agenda? 8. Is Data61 aware of a recent report that the Victorian Privacy Commissioner considers that '...publishing de-identified citizen records is a risky enterprise'? 9. Does Data61 consider consumer consent to be an important standard in the use of citizen or consumer data? 10. How is Data61 advancing the use of consent in its own data practice? 11. Does Data61 consider that the use of consumer data in commercial settings should align with the use in Government settings? 12. Does Data61 believe that the consumers have a 'right to own their own' data in commercial and government settings?	Written		19/06/2018 0:00
123	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Property investments	1. Page 205 of Budget Paper 2 mentions that the investments planned into property come from property sales and from within CSIRO's existing resources? What are these resources? 2. Can you provide a funding profile of the proceeds of property and "other resources"?	Written		19/06/2018 0:00
124	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Portfolio Appointments	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 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		19/06/2018 0:00
125	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Australia-India Strategic Research Fund	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		19/06/2018 0:00

126	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Australia-China Science and Research Fund	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	19/06/2018 0:00
127	Carr, Kim	Strategic Policy	R&D Tax Incentive Registrations	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	19/06/2018 0:00
128	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Inspiring all Australians in STEM	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	19/06/2018 0:00
129	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Single Business Service	How many calls have been made to the Single Business Service since 2013? Please to the extent available report on the number of calls by federal electorate by calendar year.	Written	19/06/2018 0:00
130	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Cooperative Research Centre Program	Please list for each CRC: (a)The federal electorate of its headquarters (b)Each university partner for each CRC	Written	19/06/2018 0:00
131	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Entrepreneurs Program services	For each federal electorate please list: (a)Number of business/management services/grants in 2017-18, and 2016-17 (b)Number of Accelerating Commercialisation services/grants in 2017-18, and 2016-17 (c)Number of Innovation Connections services/grants in 2017-18, and 2016-17 (d)Number of Incubator Support Services services/grants in 2017-18, and 2016-17	Written	19/06/2018 0:00
132	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Automotive Diversification Program	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	19/06/2018 0:00
133	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program	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	19/06/2018 0:00
134	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Global Innovation Strategy	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	19/06/2018 0:00
135	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Tasmanian Jobs and Investment Fund	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	19/06/2018 0:00

136	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Advanced Manufacturing Growth Fund	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		19/06/2018 0:00
137	Dodson, Patrick	AUSI - Business Services	Lowitja Institute	Can the Department confirm that the current five year CRC grant for the Lowitja is expiring in 2019?	Written		22/06/2018 0:00
138	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Staffing and Facilities	1. Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of Department facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL 2. Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of CSIRO facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL 3. Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of ANSTO facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL 4. Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of AIMS facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL 5. Please provide, by federal electorate, a list of IP Australia facilities, and staff at each facility by headcount and ASL	Written		19/06/2018 0:00
139	Bartlett, Andrew	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF - Northern Territory projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the current pipeline of NT projects? Can you break down, in terms of projects and value, by area? • Specifically, are there any energy projects in the NT? Can you give any indication (by number and/or by value) how much of that is renewable and how much is fossil fuel? • NAIF has previously said it is looking at gas pipelines. Are you currently considering gas pipelines? If so, how many, and are they in 'due diligence'? • Are there and projects in support of the production or distribution of gas in the NT in your pipeline? • Polls have shown there is widespread concern about fracking across the NT. If you assess a gas pipeline in the NT, how would you take into consideration the views of Territorians? You are required not to damage the Commonwealth's reputation. Are community views about fracking something you would consider here? • NT is able to veto proposals, just as the Queensland government vetoed the Adani loan? • Can states and territories veto a whole range of projects in advance of consideration? • If the NT wrote to you to indicate it intended to veto any projects relating to gas production or transportation, would you decline gas related projects and focus on other industries? • The NT has to diversify across the jurisdictions. If a gas project in NT is offered a lot of money to fund a big gas project, does this mean, broadly speaking, that NAIF has less money to give less money to other projects in the NT? • But it the other way, if the NT rejects gas projects, does this free up money for other projects in the NT? If not, can you explain how you prioritise diversification if it does not limit potential funding within a jurisdiction? 	Written		26/06/2018 0:00