

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Thursday, 23 July 2015****ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chair:**

Ms F.E. Bedford

**Members:**

Hon. J.M. Rankine

Mr J.P. Gee

Mr M.R. Goldsworthy

Mr S.K. Knoll

Mr A.S. Pederick

Ms D. Wortley

*The committee met at 09:31**Estimates Vote***DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONS, \$104,085,000****ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONS,  
\$4,099,000****Minister:**

Hon. L.W.K. Bignell, Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr S. Ashby, Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr S. Johnke, Director, Finance and Prudential Management, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr D. Frater, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Prof. M. Doroudi, Group Executive Director, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr A. Johnson, Group Executive Director, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Prof. P. Mooney, Executive Director, South Australian Research and Development Institute, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Dr R. Paskin, Chief Veterinary Officer, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

**The CHAIR:** The estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions, although I do remind members that normal standing orders for conduct in the chamber remain in place. I understand that the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition have agreed an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments, which will facilitate a change of departmental advisers. Can the minister and lead speaker for the opposition confirm that today's timetable for proceedings, previously distributed, is accurate?

**Mr PEDERICK:** It is 2½, is it?

**The CHAIR:** As we have printed here.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, thank you, Chair.

**The CHAIR:** Changes to committee membership will be notified as they occur. Members should ensure the Chair is provided with a completed request to be discharged form. If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than Friday 30 October 2015. This year, estimate committee responses will be published during the 17 November sitting week in corrected daily *Hansard* over a three-day period.

I propose to allow both the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition to make opening statements of about 10 minutes each should they wish. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on about three questions per member, alternating each side. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule. A member who is not part of the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identifiable or referenced at the beginning of each question.

Members unable to complete their questions during the proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the House of Assembly *Notice Paper*. There is no formal facility for the tabling of documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution to the committee. The incorporation of material into *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the house, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length. All questions are to be directed to the minister and not the minister's advisers. The minister may, of course, refer questions to advisers for a response.

During the committee's examination, television cameras will be permitted to film from both the northern and southern galleries. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements, Volume 4. I now call on the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries to make a statement if he wishes.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Good morning, Chair and committee members. It is my pleasure to provide information about the programs and work conducted by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA).

I would like to introduce the members of the department who are with me today. Firstly, on my immediate left is Chief Executive, Scott Ashby and Stephen Johninke, Director, Finance and Prudential Management. Professor Mehdi Doroudi is the Group Executive Director, and behind me is Don Frater, Deputy Chief Executive, and Andrew Johnson, Group Executive Director.

Let me start with an overview of our industries. The quality and yield of South Australian crops during last season's grain harvest generally exceeded farmers' expectations. PIRSA's final crop and pasture report for the 2014-15 grain cropping season put the crop at 7.7 million tonnes, with a farm gate value of around \$2 billion. After generally adequate opening rains, seeding of a similar area of grain crop is now close to complete; however, cold conditions are slowing pasture growth, particularly in the South-East, with farmers in some areas handfeeding stock to supplement paddock feed availability.

South Australian gross food and wine revenue has continued to grow, with an \$834 million, or 5 per cent, rise to reach a record \$17.1 billion, with significant increases in revenue generated by the horticulture, livestock and grain industries. Finished food and wine values have also grown by \$836 million, or 13 per cent, to reach record levels of \$7.46 billion due to increased investment in processing facilities and strong growth in meat, horticulture, dairy and grain processing.

Total overseas exports of food and wine increased by \$469 million, or 11 per cent, to reach a record \$4.8 billion, or 42 per cent, of total merchandise exports. Finished food and wine exports increased by \$308 million, or 13 per cent. Early information indicates continued export growth in 2014-15 for South Australian food and wine.

The state government made premium food and wine from our clean environment and exported to the world one of our 10 top economic priorities which the Premier announced in August last year. Our vision through this priority is for more premium South Australian food and wine to be consumed locally and exported around the world. It is about ensuring our agriculture, food and wine

industries continue to grow through opening the door to new ideas, new opportunities, new people and new businesses.

It builds on the work that has already emerged during the past two years from our premium food and wine from our clean environment strategic priority and seeks to secure our position as a producer of premium food and wine from our clean water, clean air and clean soil, capitalising on the increase in global demand for high-quality food and wine.

Therefore, let me tell you about the major projects PIRSA has been working on for the past 12 months. The \$265 million South Australian River Murray Sustainability program is funded by the Australian government and being delivered by PIRSA, with program implementation to be completed by 30 June 2018. SARMS comprises two main areas of investment: \$240 million for the Irrigation Industry Improvement Program and \$25 million for the regional economic development suite of programs.

Under the National Partnership Agreement for SARMS, South Australia is required to return 40 billion litres, or 40 gigalitres, of water to the River Murray. After two funding rounds, we have already delivered 34 gigalitres back to the river, so to be within six gigalitres of this target is an excellent achievement.

To further protect South Australia from the threat of fruit fly we are building a national sterile insect technology facility in Port Augusta. The design and building plans have been completed and building is expected to commence in September, with the facility to be completed by July 2016. Development of a sterile male-only line of Queensland fruit fly is well underway, with SARDI scientists and partners in a national \$22 million research and development program to develop the sterile fly and then mass produce them in the new SIT facility for release in horticultural production regions across Australia.

Much of the excellent work by PIRSA in biosecurity is focused on preparedness and surveillance. The value to the state of a good biosecurity program cannot be underestimated. If some of these pests and diseases were to become established, our access to local and export markets would be severely impacted. The government will continue to invest in biosecurity as part of our national commitments.

Emergency management and response is also an integral part of PIRSA's service to the community. PIRSA staff responded to the Sampson Flat bushfire earlier this year and assisted primary producers affected by the fire. Many livestock had to be euthanased and disposed of due to serious injury and healthy animals moved to markets because of a lack of feed. Some horticultural producers were also affected by fire and smoke taint, and these producers received support where requested.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the staff from PIRSA who worked in horrific conditions to help their fellow South Australians deal with the aftermath of a devastating bushfire. This dedication and commitment was, as always, outstanding.

In October 2014, PIRSA took the first important step in redeveloping the Clare research centre as the national research development and extension hub for grains in South Australia. PIRSA purchased a property to establish a new improved office building, laboratory and storage facilities. Concept design and works have already commenced, and a new building will be constructed and completed by September 2016.

Efficiencies have already been achieved through the relocation of vehicles and equipment from other sites to the new Clare site. On 14 April 2015, I was pleased to announce, together with the Almond Board of Australia, the establishment of the National Almond Centre of Excellence, to be located at the redeveloped Loxton Research Centre. The National Almond Centre of Excellence will ensure future innovation and technology advances for almond growers in South Australia and around the nation. The centre will also showcase the Australian almond industry and its products and production practices to export buyers from around the world.

On 26 June 2015, I signed the deed of agreement and stage 1 funding deed with the Almond Board of Australia to formalise our agreement, with the first payment of funds being made to the board. During the past 12 months, we have continued to deepen our relationship with China, and

Shandong more generally, to deliver greater export opportunities for South Australian businesses. Most recently, we were part of the Premier's mission to Shandong, leading an agribusiness delegation of nearly 60 members spread across our wine, horticulture, grains and seafood sectors.

As a side trip to this mission, I led a citrus market access delegation to participate in high-level meetings with the Chinese central government in Beijing to progress negotiations in recognition of South Australia's fruit fly free status. We have deepened our technical collaboration with a number of outbound missions focused on South Australia's biosecurity, sustainable productions, fruit fly management and integrated pest management systems.

We have also held a number of very successful high-profile events in Hong Kong, highlighting our premium food and wine and attracting positive media attention. We also welcome any delegations to South Australia and continue to highlight the state's premium food and wine products and encourage introductions to South Australian businesses.

The high-value food markets in Asia and Australia offer significant opportunities for South Australia's food industry. PIRSA is leading the Functional and Luxury Food project to help realise these opportunities, and PIRSA is using expertise from across the globe, including the VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, the ESSEC Business School from Paris and Singapore, and Frost & Sullivan Australia, as well as the Food Innovation Centre of Mondelez Australia. This project supports the premium food and wine from our clean environment exported to the world economic priority.

I wish to conclude by reiterating that the government recognises the contribution primary industries make to this state's economy, prosperity and wellbeing. It does not matter where you live in South Australia, we all prosper thanks to the hard work of those people in our regions who do so much in growing produce that is then used here but also exported to the world. PIRSA's role in supporting this sector remains vital, and the government will continue to work side by side with agriculture, aquaculture and fishing sectors to ensure growth for them, which will lead to growth across the whole state.

**The CHAIR:** The member for Hammond, do you have a statement?

**Mr PEDERICK:** No.

**The CHAIR:** We will go straight to questions.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you. Minister, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 12, and I note the objectives of the agency, which largely reflect those of the previous budget. Specifically, though, the objective of attracting investment into agribusiness, which appeared in last year's paper, has been removed. Can the minister confirm that the mandate of the department has now changed, in that there is no longer a focus on attracting an investment into agribusiness and, if so, which agency is now assuming that role?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for Hammond for the question and well picked up. There has been a change, because we have established the investment attraction agency under the Department of State Development. They will look at a range of different things, including agribusiness, but in no way are we diminishing what we do in trying to attract investment in our agribusiness sector. In fact, we think it is a really important sector and we want to increase that involvement. PIRSA will still play a very important role in supplying technical advice and also offering leads to the investment attraction agency to try to get more investment into South Australia.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Are you suggesting there is an open door and no barrier between your department and the Department of State Development, because sometimes we see silos appear between departments.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, exactly, member for Hammond. This is all about breaking down those silos, so that when we have ministers, public servants or anyone else going in to an overseas country they have a list of many different prospective investment opportunities, whether they be in mining, the agribusiness sector, tourism or any other sector.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 12. In the agency's objectives I note the commitment to the department's role in the government's strategic priority of premium food and wine from our clean and green environment. Certainly the minister has constantly stated his

commitment to promoting South Australian food under this banner, and often that has not been divorced from his very vocal position on keeping South Australia GM free. I further note that there is a target to grow the contribution of the South Australian food industry to \$20 billion by 2020. Therefore, the objective of keeping this sector globally competitive is implicit. My first question is: given the minister's very vocal stance against GM crops, what quantifiable economic data does he have to confirm that remaining GM free delivers an economic benefit to South Australia?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I do not think we have all the evidence in at this stage, but what I know from my travels around the world and talking to people in—let's just focus on China for a start. When we go into the China market and we explain that we are phylloxera free, we are fruit fly free and we are the only mainland state in Australia where it is illegal to grow GM crops, the Chinese people are very interested in that, and not just the government people but the people who are importing food from around the world. It gives us a real selling point that we are different to other states of Australia and we are different to many jurisdictions right around the world, particularly if you are looking at North America. So it is a huge selling point for us.

We are trying to work with the grains industry to see whether we can change the marketing focus to ensure that they not only promote the grain as being an Australian grain, but if they could break that down and sell it as a South Australian GM free grain we think that will then result in the sort of premiums that we know are possible. In China, the importers we have spoken to there say it is much easier to get things through their customs if they are GM free; it is a much quicker process. They are keen to look at what we have to offer from South Australia.

If we look at the example of KI Pure Grain where they get a \$60-a-tonne premium on their canola, it is because the Japanese want the very best they can get and they want canola that they can pitch as being GM free, and they know they have that security with what they are getting from KI Pure Grain. It is a very important part of the story that we get to tell.

The reason we are phylloxera free is because some people who came before us in this place worked with the wine industry in the 1880s. They heard tales coming back from people travelling out here from Europe about this terrible pest that had gone through and eaten the roots of vineyards right across Europe and destroyed vineyards in France, Italy, Germany—right across Europe it had wiped them out.

The wine industry here, which was only fledgling (obviously the colony formed in 1836), worked together with the legislators of the day to come up with the phylloxera act. It meant heat treating root stocks as they came in here, and it now means that we have some of the oldest lines in the world. If you go to the member for Schubert's electorate you can see vines that date back to the 1840s, and you do not find them just anywhere in the world. We must congratulate those who went before us. I hope that in many years to come people look back at this era, with successive agricultural ministers and premiers who have maintained that moratorium on growing GM crops in South Australia. Do we have the decisive edge right now? No, not necessarily, but I think it is coming.

When I was in Rotterdam in the Netherlands in April, I spoke to Viterra's parent company, Glencore, and explained to them that, if there is any way they can help us market South Australian grain in a different way, it would be very advantageous. I also met with Glencore International's CEO, Mr Ivan Glasenberg, in Zurich, and he was very interested in the possibilities to help spread the word about South Australia's GM credentials. We know that it is not just about the grain industry either. It is about companies that produce finished products here who can then put on their labels that it comes from South Australia, the only mainland state in Australia where it is illegal to grow GM crops.

A company like Bickford's has 150 different lines of produce. I caught up with Angelo Kotses in Shanghai last year at a big SIAL conference. I had just finished making a speech about our credentials of being fruit fly free, phylloxera free, and GM free, when he came up and said, 'Now it makes sense.' He said, 'We should be using that in what we sell, whether it's our lime cordial or it's our water products or anything else that Bickford's is selling into the Chinese market, and we should be using that.' We are seeing more and more food manufacturers looking at the advantages that they can get out of it. We need to take a wider view of the advantages that come from it. It might not necessarily be grain at the moment, but I hope that over the next few years we can work with the

grain manufacturers and make sure that they can do the same sort of marketing that we are seeing with food producers.

If we look at the small seed market and lucerne, 50 per cent of the world market will not accept GM products, hence, we can access 100 per cent of the market and not have limited access; so we have some real advantages here. To change the way we do things is to let the genie out of the bottle, and we know that once that genie is out you cannot put it back in. We should probably have a good conversation about where we can go with this and how we can all prosper. Even in the grain community the thoughts are split. I hear from farmers who are totally pro GM and who want us to lift the moratorium, and I get correspondence from farmers who congratulate us on maintaining the moratorium, telling us how beneficial it will be for them.

I do not like to see division in any sector or community, but I think all the discussions so far have been very civil and I would like to keep it that way, but I really would like to hear some contributions from people. If we look at it and say, 'This is what we've got. Rather than keep fighting for something different, why don't we work with what we've got and see whether we can convince the marketers, the exporters, to try to go out and get that premium for the farmers?' I think our grain is some of the best grain in the world, but often it is seen as a commodity instead of the premium food that it is. In some instances the farmer feels that they have lost control of it once it leaves their property, and they do not feel as involved in the marketing process as perhaps a winemaker may, who may grow their grapes, turn it into wine and then put what they would like on the labels and take a point of view in marketing their produce.

To get back to your question, our stance on South Australia remaining GM free and maintaining that moratorium through to 2019 (and I hope beyond 2019) continues to be a major selling point for us. It is not just about getting a premium for our food across, as I said, not just the grains but all of our other foods and wine that are produced in South Australia, but it speaks to who we are. It tells a story to people from overseas that, when we can get up and say, 'We are phylloxera free, we are fruit fly free, we are GM free', we are not any of those three things by accident. We are those three things because we have a government that gets involved and works side by side with the agricultural community and works on things like biosecurity for the good of the whole agriculture and food manufacturing sector here in South Australia.

**Mr PEDERICK:** So, for the whole time that you have been minister and the time you have been very strongly advocating GM free, you cannot identify a single premium for South Australian farmers in remaining GM free?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a work in progress. I can come back to you with some more facts, but off the top of my head I have given you the example of the KI Pure Grain canola where they are getting a \$60-a-tonne premium. I have given you the example of food manufacturers who are getting a premium because they can point to the credentials of this state. I met with the Viterra people in Rotterdam. They say that what they see in the US is the market is looking more and more to have more GM-free produce in their market. We think that the future is very bright and the fact that we remain GM free will help us, not just in the short term but I think in the long term the real benefits will flow as well.

**Mr PEDERICK:** But, minister, this flies in the face of the fact that the chair of Grain Producers South Australia, Garry Hansen (who happens to be my neighbour, just to declare my full interest), is advocating for farmers' choice and also the fact that large importers like both China and Japan do import GM produce.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I hear that, and while he may be advocating for farmers' choice, once you lift that moratorium on GM, you take away the choice of every other food producer, food manufacturer, wine producer and wine manufacturer to be able to go out and use the claim, quite correctly, that South Australia is the only mainland state in Australia that is GM free. We are GM free because this government has taken a view that that is a good place for us to be and that is a good place for our food producers, wine producers and food manufacturers to be.

As I said before, I think what would be really helpful is if we could all just work together and get Grain Producers SA involved in that as well to see how we can come up with a concept and a project where we can have the value add for the agricultural produce that we have here, not just for

food manufacturers but for our grain growers as well. As I said before, there is a split in the farming community—people who grow grain. There are people who come to me and applaud the fact that we have a moratorium on the production of GM crops in South Australia and there are others who have a different point of view.

**The CHAIR:** Before we go on, can I just ask if we have any questions on the right-hand side? Member for Torrens.

**Ms WORTLEY:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 26-27, Rural Services. Minister, how are the New Horizons demonstrations helping Australian grain growers increase production levels?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and I thank the member for Torrens for her question. New Horizons is a PIRSA initiative and is being delivered in collaboration with Farming Systems Groups, the University of South Australia, the University of Adelaide and the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. Existing trial sites are located at Karoonda in the Mallee, Brimpton Lake on Eyre Peninsula, and Cadgee in the South-East.

I must say that last year I went to see the Karoonda site, and in December I was over on Eyre Peninsula and saw the Brimpton Lake trial sites. The difference is extraordinary, Madam Chair. To see crops that are grown in the usual way against these New Horizons crops is like you are looking at something that has come from vastly different parts of the state. For people who can get the chance to get out and have a look at these trial sites, it is a terrific thing to do. I know we have also had field days over at Cleve last year and then again down at Lucindale earlier this year. It was terrific to see PIRSA's New Horizons team down there showing farmers what the potential is for this amazing technology.

Our new site is at the PIRSA research centre at Struan, also in the South-East, just near Naracoorte. That site will look at managing the more cost-effective treatments and specifically determine the benefits of sourcing locally available organic matter. By looking local, we will support suppliers of organic material, such as chicken litter, grape marc and biosolids. New Horizons has shown soils can be dramatically improved and crop production increased through managing the top 50 centimetres of soil, rather than the traditional top 10 centimetres.

A program such as New Horizons is more than a revolution in dryland agriculture: it means jobs in our regions for farmhands, business advisers, accountants, bankers, farm consultants and machinery suppliers, and will significantly increase demand on our transport services. All this creates spin-off benefits for local communities, with increased patronage at sporting clubs, hotels and retail outlets.

There is a tremendous opportunity to develop the agriculture equipment required for a statewide uptake of New Horizons practices for engineers, manufacturers and maintenance workers. To progress this, we are collaborating with the University of South Australia's Agricultural Machinery Research and Design Centre. Their experts will look at current machinery available to our farmers and then design, build and test engineering machinery necessary to deliver the New Horizons practices.

In the first trials we have seen, I think the average was around a 70 per cent improvement in yields. If you could get that work right across all these same soil types across the state, we would be looking at a massive increase in our harvest each year and an economic benefit to the state of around \$800 million. We know that we have to move from this small-scale production to larger scale, and then keep proving it up year after year to make sure that we can convince farmers that it is going to be worth the investment, not only in money but also in their time and their hard labour, so that we can actually convince people that this is a good thing to do.

People have been adding organic matter, going deeper and putting clay into soils around the state for quite a few years, but I guess this is the first time we have brought different groups of people together to do the science. It was interesting being down in the Mallee last year because I think there were two or three different people there, and one was saying, 'It's all about the organic matter,' someone else was saying, 'It was because we go so deep,' and someone else was saying it was the clay.

It was great to see three different groups who had been working on their own scientific experiments and trials having that sort of debate with each other. As a layperson, having a look at the trial sites, the one that looked the best to me was the one that had a bit of everything in it. It is something that is good in that it does not require a lot of addition chemicals or anything like that. It is quite a natural system and way of increasing productivity.

To that end, the government has provided a \$200,000 grant to UniSA for machinery development. The purposes of this project is to benchmark the current subsoil, improving technologies, and identify the performance limitations that need to be addressed in order to increase the effectiveness and reduce the cost of subsoil modifications. It is also to develop the concept solutions that can be engineered to form the basis of improved prototype technologies and to design, build and test a specific engineering solution addressing at least one priority problem area.

**Ms WORTLEY:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 30, entitled South Australian River Murray Sustainability. Minister, can you provide a progress update on achievements to date regarding the South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program Irrigation Industry Improvement Program?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The \$265 million South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program (known as SARMS) is funded by the federal government and being delivered by Primary Industries and Regions SA, with program implementation to be completed by 30 June 2018. SARMS comprises two main areas of investment: \$240 million for the Irrigation Industry Improvement Program and \$25 million for the regional economic development suite of programs. The \$240 million 3IP is a competitive grants program which supports the restoration of a healthy Murray-Darling Basin environment by aiming to recover 40 gigalitres of water across entitlements from participating irrigators and, in turn, provides them with access to industry assistance funding.

Successful projects for 3IP round 1 and round 2 were announced on 21 July 2014 and 20 May 2015 respectively. The total investment on offer through 3IP round 1 and round 2 equates to \$170 million, with a total of 34 gigalitres of water to be returned to the river. South Australia is well on track to return the 40-gigalitre return target required under the National Partnership Agreement. Achievement of the National Partnership Agreement (NPA) milestones are on track, with 20 gigalitres of water returned to the river by the end of 2014-15 and more than 100 projects well underway. 3IP round 1 projects are driving the following changes in the region:

- approximately 1,300 hectares of crop plantings, including both new plantings and crop conversions;
- a significant increase in almond plantings;
- a shift towards more commercial varieties of wine grape and citrus varieties;
- more than 20 new processing, packing and cold storage facilities, adding to the efficiency and end product value for farms; and
- an increase in employment as a result of implementing 3IP round 1 projects is already being seen, with 250 jobs to be created in 2015-16 and an estimated 500 long-term jobs as a result of 3IP implementation.

The economic flow-on effects as a result of the implementation of the 3IP will travel throughout the South Australian River Murray region and broader South Australia. Through the program's exemplary implementation and by staying true to the original design request by industry, it continues to garner the support of community and industry.

SARMS is also a private sector award winner, having recently received the 2015 Water Industry Alliance SA Water Leadership Award for the implementation of 3IP round 1 in which PIRSA demonstrated leadership at both the state and national level to deliver the program which is meeting industry needs. The \$25 million Regional Economic Development program forms the other part of the \$265 million SARMS Program. Funding for the SARMS program was formalised under the SARMS National Partnership Agreement in which I, as the Minister for Agriculture, have overall responsibility in terms of intergovernmental governance, management and dispute resolution.

In forming the new government, it was agreed the Minister for Regional Development would have oversight of the \$25 million RED program of SARMS, given its focus on regional development. The RED program features a suite of regional development research and innovation sub-programs, including:

- \$12.5 million for the Regional Development and Innovation Fund, a competitive grants program for non-irrigators;
- \$7.5 million for the redevelopment of the Loxton Research Centre; and
- \$5 million for the industry-led research sub-program, a competitive grants program for registered research service providers.

The \$12.5 million Regional Development and Innovation Fund is providing funding to non-irrigators within the South Australian River Murray region through a competitive grant application process. Funds are being made available to a diverse range of projects which support regional development, employment opportunities and/or economic diversification in the region. Round 1 of the fund closed on 19 September 2014, with a total of \$4.8 million of successful projects co-announced on 24 March 2015 by the Minister for Regional Development and the federal Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development. A review of projects from round 1 demonstrated there would be benefit for calling for smaller innovative projects as well as the larger projects requested through round 1.

As such, a dual focus on smaller and larger-sized projects to capture the best ideas for the River Murray region has now been offered through rounds 2 and 3 of the RDIF. Round 2 focuses on larger value projects over \$500,000, which will have an immediate impact on economic development in the region and the creation of new employment opportunities. Round 2 of the RDIF opened on 7 April 2015 and closed on 18 May 2015; 20 applications were received in round 2.

Round 3 focuses on projects between \$200,000 and \$500,000 to deliver economic diversification and innovation which will foster future economic development in the region. Round 3 of the RDIF opened on 13 April and closed on 25 May 2015; nine applications were received in round 3. Announcements of successful applicants for rounds 2 and 3 of RDIF are anticipated in late September this year.

During Murray-Darling Basin Plan discussions Riverland businesses and community leaders prepared a proposal for a Riverland and Mallee primary producers business centre. The \$7.5 million redevelopment of the Loxton Research Centre (LRC), along with the associated research and regional development funding, is delivering on this locally-led proposal.

The Loxton Research Centre redevelopment is providing new opportunities for collaboration between industry and researchers at a national and international level and supporting South Australia's reputation and market edge as a leader in premium food and wine production from our clean environment. In August 2014 the final redevelopment plan for the Loxton Research Centre was approved by the federal government. The redevelopment is currently in the design and documentation phase, with development approvals and tendering for contractors expected to be completed in 2015 and construction commencing in 2016. Completion of construction of the Loxton Research Centre is expected by the end of 2016.

The \$5 million Industry-led Research Sub-Program (IRSP) is an industry-led applied research grants program designed to improve South Australian River Murray regional productivity and innovation. This is funding research projects which address identified industry research priorities, with a particular focus on gaps in research not presently funded by federal, state or private investment.

Projects will be aligned with the objectives of the redeveloped LRC. Round 1 of the IRSP closed on 27 July 2014 with a total of five proposals totalling \$1.8 million announced on 29 October 2014. Round 2 is being offered at two funding levels, with stream 1 projects seeking funding of up to \$100,000 and stream 2 projects seeking funding between \$100,000 and \$500,000. Round 2 of the IRSP opened on 20 April 2015 and closed on 29 May 2015 with six applications received. Announcements of successful applicants for round 2 of IRSP are anticipated in late September 2015.

Finally, on 14 April 2015 I was pleased to announce, together with the Almond Board of Australia, the establishment of a centre of excellence for the Australian Almond industry to be located at the redeveloped Loxton Research Centre. In recognition of South Australia's unique capacity to foster growth of and innovation in the almond industry, the Almond Board has agreed to partner with the South Australian government to deliver a suite of initiatives which will see the establishment of the inaugural centre of excellence for the Australian almond industry in the Riverland.

The centre will ensure future innovation and technology advances for almond growers in South Australia and around the nation. The centre will also showcase the Australian almond industry and its products and production practices to export buyers from around the world. The agreement includes a state government commitment of \$1 million in funding per year for four years for research, with further contributions from industry and the federal government. The agreement comprises:

- expanding the South Australian Research and Development Institute's scientific capacity supporting the industry's research program;
- PIRSA to establish a new research site to enable semi-commercial scale assessment of new varieties from the Adelaide University's plant breeding program;
- a new experimental orchard for research into new production systems and enhanced land and water management; and
- Almond Board staff to be based at the redeveloped Loxton Research Centre, together with officers and laboratory facilities.

This work will result in more than \$1 billion of economic activity being generated in the region. I look forward to seeing the implementation of the significant suite of projects being delivered to the South Australian River Murray region.

**Ms WORTLEY:** I refer to budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Program 1, pages 24 to 26. How are the South Australian Research and Development Institute scientists helping Australian grain growers to better manage the snails damaging their crops?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Once again, I thank the member for Torrens for this question. Snails are the cause of significant losses to South Australian grain growers. These losses are due to feeding damage on the grain, the cost of controlling the snails in the paddock, additional costs during harvest and devalued and rejected grain at the silos. They also threaten access to important export markets. South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) entomologists are working with the grains industry to develop better management options for snails.

The Grains Research and Development Corporation is providing funding of \$1.2 million over three years to SARDI to lead the national snail control program. These snails are exotic pests, they are invasive and are expanding their footprint across southern Australia's grain growing regions. Bait control is often unreliable. As a consequence, farmers have had to resort to burning for snail control in autumn, which in turn has negative impacts on soil conservation.

To date, SARDI has identified the two snail species, the common white snail and the small pointed snail, which pose the greatest risk of further spread across southern Australia and has revised recommendations for baiting rates to maximise kill rates and the persistence of different bait types in the field. Research is continuing to find the optimal timing and densities for the different types of bait. The new findings will be conveyed to growers and consultants during the next 12 months through workshops in affected districts and through the media.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 14, Ministerial office resources. The ministerial office budget for 2015-16 is \$1.468 million and last year it was \$1.536 million. Last night, we saw on *Today Tonight* that in the last year you have spent \$170,000 on travel. Did the full \$170,000 come out of your ministerial office budget or was any portion taken from the direct PIRSA budget?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for his question. I am advised that the entire cost of any travel done by our ministerial office was all taken from the budget allocated to our ministerial office and not from the PIRSA budget.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Same budget reference. The PIRSA executive director of strategy and engagement, Jo Collins, attended the Chinese food and beverage show SIAL in May of this year. What was her purpose in being there? How long was she present at the show? What was the cost of her trip and did this come from the PIRSA or ministerial budget?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for the question. Ms Collins' travel was paid for out of the PIRSA budget. SIAL is a very important event. It has about 40,000 to 50,000 buyers go through it over a two or three-day period. It is held in Shanghai each May. I was there last year for it and, as I mentioned in one of the earlier questions about GM, there are South Australian food producers like Bickford's, who were there, tuna producers, canola oil producers and many other South Australian businesses who are trying to increase their market share or get their foot in the door in China.

I know that this year David Ridgway, the shadow agriculture minister, also went to SIAL and I think it is a really good thing to see bipartisan involvement. I had spoken to Mr Ridgway about SIAL, and certainly since he has been back I have asked him how it went and congratulated him on going over there, because we are not going to sell too much if we stay home here in South Australia.

What we need to be doing is getting out there and letting the world know what South Australia has to offer. We have premium food and wine from our clean environment and we have things that the rest of the world really desires once they know about us, but it is a little bit hard to sell a secret. We actually have to go to places like SIAL in China and really put ourselves out there and stand shoulder-to-shoulder with those food companies looking to export, whether it be into China or any other market.

I have stood up in here before and made the offer to people on both sides of the chamber that anyone who is travelling overseas should contact us and we will give you some tips on things you might be able to follow up on behalf of the government or on behalf of certain industries because we are all in this together. We all want to grow the economy. We all want to grow jobs, and one of the fastest ways we will do that is by increasing the amount of food and wine that we can export to the rest of the world.

Food SA coordinated the Australian stand. That was something that I offered up at the federal ministerial council to the agriculture minister, Barnaby Joyce, because last year when I went there, I walked in and South Australia was over in one corner and then tucked away somewhere else was Victoria, and New South Wales had a small presence somewhere else. Getting in there and actually seeing it firsthand, it looked really disjointed and I thought, 'This needs some national leadership.'

Mexico had all come in under the one banner, as had Canada and the USA. So many other countries were in there fighting under a national banner and we were split and divided. I understand from talking to David Ridgway that things worked a lot better this year and it was because of that leadership we had shown, from something that I had picked up and seen and then came back and brought up with Barnaby Joyce and other ministers from other states and territories. Ms Collins went to represent South Australia and to report on the success. The travel value of her trip was under \$7,000 and she was there from 6 to 8 May.

**The CHAIR:** Does the member for Wright have a question on this?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Yes, I have. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Program 1, page 19, dot point 5. Will the minister inform the committee about the benefits of the trading relationship between China and South Australia and the outcomes of the Premier's trade mission to China in May this year?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for her question. In May 2015, the Premier led South Australia's largest international trade and investment mission to Shandong Province. Shandong is our sister state and an important agricultural producer and food processing hub in China. This mission was aimed at building on the strong relationship we have developed over many

years with Shandong Province. The mission included eight sectors, with the agribusiness delegation of approximately 55 representatives being the largest.

Key elements of the mission included agriculture, food and wine round tables, wine buyer tasting events, the South Australian Investment Roundtable, citrus market access mission meetings, off-site horticultural visits and participation in the Wine Australia roadshow. It built on the crucial government-to-government relationships we have developed with the Shandong provincial government to deliver greater export opportunities for South Australian business. China, including Hong Kong and Macau, is South Australia's number one agriculture, food and wine export destination. It is in our top three export destinations for field crops, meat, livestock, wine, seafood and dairy. It is one of our leading destinations for food commodity and finished food exports with canola, wheat, sheep, lamb meat, beef and abalone.

During the mission, the Shandong government expressed strong interest in research and development technology transfer, horticulture, meat, seafood and wine. A number of significant memorandums of understanding were signed during the mission by South Australian agribusiness companies. PIRSA and the Shandong Provincial Department of Agriculture reviewed the MOU signed in June 2014 on a framework for communication and cooperation and signed a new MOU to continue high-level agricultural dialogue.

PIRSA also signed a MOU with the Shandong Provincial Oceanic and Fishery Department to pursue a framework of collaboration for mutual growth in the following areas: trade and investment opportunities in seafood, fisheries and aquaculture; strengthen exchanges and collaboration between research institutes, universities and industry in areas of common interest to enhance outcomes and commercialisation; and promote the sharing of fisheries, aquaculture and marine sciences information and policy through exchanges of technical and other personnel. Other significant transactions involved Seppeltsfield signing a deal to supply 1.5 million litres of wine to their Chinese partner, and the Stehr Group signed its first deal to export 40 tonnes of tuna to China.

It was very encouraging to see the Chinese participants in the agriculture, food and wine round tables eager to commence detailed discussions as well as their particular interest in our meat, livestock, seafood and wine industries. PIRSA also led a citrus market access mission to Beijing for meetings with high-level officials on the technical issues related to recognising South Australia's fruit fly free status. Discussions went well and it is hoped continuing negotiations will see the signing of a proposed MOU in the near future and recognition of our fruit fly free status.

In recent years the growth of South Australian food exports to China has been dominated by grains and meat. From 2012-13 to 2013-14 livestock volume increased by 8.5 million kilograms, an increase in value of more than \$70.5 million. Total livestock value for 2013-14 was in excess of \$168 million. In the same period, the volume of field crops increased by 227.8 million kilograms, an increase in value of more than \$127.4 million. Total value of field crops for 2013-14 was \$174.8 million.

Wine exports in 2013-14 were \$179 million, dairy \$2.4 million, horticulture \$11.5 million, seafood \$35.7 million, and other exports \$30.3 million. South Australian 2013-14 food exports represented around 9 per cent of Australian food exports to China and Hong Kong, and South Australia's total food and wine exports to China and Hong Kong were \$602 million, an increase of \$155.9 million from 2012-13 to 2013-14.

PIRSA will continue to work closely with all stakeholders and our counterparts in Shandong to develop and promote mutual investment opportunities for the benefit of South Australia. Further to this, the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement allows us to explore new markets and export opportunities for all South Australian producers. Through the state government's premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world economic priority, we are looking to increase our international exports which will benefit our state.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, minister. That was really interesting and encouraging to hear how—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** You will have your turn. It was interesting to hear how our exports have increased so massively. Can you also tell us how you are helping to expand the nation's oat growing industry?

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! The minister has a response? I just remind all members that standing order 142 still applies. Member for Schubert and member for Wright, we are listening to the minister's answer. Thank you.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank the member for her question. The South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) leads Australia's national oat breeding program, which has, and continues to deliver, new and improved varieties of oats for both grain growers and hay producers. The national oat breeding program is jointly funded by the Grains Research and Development Corporation, the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation and the South Australian government. Oats are known as nature's functional food. The health benefits of the grain, such as beta-glucan, which is effective in lowering blood cholesterol levels, is an important point of differentiation for Australian companies producing food products from our oat varieties.

Consumer demand for milling oat is increasing on average by 5 per cent each year, both nationally and in our Asian markets. This increase in demand is directly linked to benefits to human health and wellness. To keep up with demand, SARDI is developing new oat varieties with improved productivity, improved disease resistance and milling and eating quality. A new early maturing oat variety suitable for growing in low rainfall regions is being developed at SARDI to assist the industry expand its production base and thereby meet the increasing demand for oat products. This new variety will be named and launched in 2016.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Wright, one more?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I do have one more, thank you, Chair. Same budget paper, page 24: can you also tell us what is being done to promote the ethical production of both wool and sheep meat?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Again, I thank the member for her question. The South Australian wool and sheep meat industries are important to the state, with a joint farm gate value of around \$679 million per year. The health and welfare of the animals in these industries is a major concern to the producers and consumers alike. South Australian Research and Development Institute scientists, in collaboration with researchers at the University of Adelaide, have recently developed the novel wool cortisol assay, which may revolutionise the way sheep welfare is assessed.

The wool cortisol assay indicates the health status of the sheep by measuring key chemicals in the wool which provide a reliable indicator of the stress the animal has experienced over the past couple of months and can be used as a measure of the health of the animal. This will enable producers to provide early intervention to improve the health of the animals or to identify poorly performing animals which can be removed from the flock, ensuring the overall performance of progeny improves over time.

Another potential use for the assay is to identify sheep susceptible to fly strike. Fly strike costs the South Australian wool industry approximately \$15 million per annum. The ability to develop flocks which are not susceptible to fly strike should be a major cost saving to the industry. Overall, better management of sheep health and welfare during production has the potential to add \$6 million to the net farm gate value by improving meat quality. Testing of the assay will continue into 2016 and if successful it is expected to be available for adoption by 2017.

SARDI scientists are also working with the Sheep Cooperative Research Centre on developing a wellbeing index for sheep which can be used by farmers to assess the welfare of their sheep. The index will be multifaceted and will include measures of behaviour, physiology and health.

**Mr KNOLL:** Just to clarify the answer in the previous set. Obviously, your travel would relate to different portfolios within your ministry.

**The CHAIR:** What page are you on?

**Mr KNOLL:** We are dealing at the moment still with Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 14, when we look at the \$1.468 million provision for ministerial office. Some of your travel would come out of each portfolio: there is sport and there is tourism. Are you saying that that is not segregated at all, that it all comes out of the ministerial office; there is no other departmental line where that budget comes from? To further that, how much of this last year's budget in 2014-15 was spent then on travel by you or your staff?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** All the money that is spent on travel comes from the ministerial budget. I do not have the figures here of how much of our budget was spent on travel but, as I have said, it is an important thing for us to do, to be out selling South Australia and its produce, whether it is for tourism, our wine industry or our food industry. A lot of the travel, too, is throughout the regions. I spend a lot of time travelling throughout South Australia and, as members here would attest, they have seen plenty of me over the past 2½ years since I have been a minister.

I am constantly out on the road in South Australia, and I am on the road interstate and overseas. I think it is a really important part of our job to be out there because we are up against other states in Australia and we are up against other countries, and everyone is vying to get into the market and increase their share. What I find is that the better your relationships with potential customers, particularly when you are dealing with the China market, the better you will do in terms of selling our wonderful produce.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 14 again. The 2015-16 budget for ministerial office resources shows that there will be eight FTEs in the Minister for Agriculture's office, and the associated cost is budgeted at \$1.468 million. Last year, the provision was for nine full-time equivalents, with a \$1.536 million budget. It is apparent that an FTE on \$68,000 per annum has been removed from the office. Can the minister confirm who that staff member was, what their title was and what the circumstances were around the reduction of the FTE—for example, resignation, sacking, transferral. Also, how is that role now being absorbed by the office?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Point of order, Chair. It has been a convention, as I understand it, that it is inappropriate to name people in ministerial offices.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have not named anyone.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** You asked for who it was.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** What the position was.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have not named anyone.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have asked who it was, but I have not named them.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** That's right; you have asked the minister.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK:** He can answer how he likes; I am sure he is big enough.

**The CHAIR:** He will then in that case.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, I think he can handle it.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK:** You are shielding him enough. I think he can handle it.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Hammond.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** I will have to suspend the committee for five minutes if you cannot obey the standing order. I want everyone to acknowledge that standing order 142 is in force.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I am quite happy to have a cup of coffee with the member for Wright.

**The CHAIR:** I think your behaviour is outrageous.

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK:** Chuck her out.

**The CHAIR:** No, I will chuck you out first. Honestly, members, the minister is getting his advice and we do not need a running commentary while he is getting his advice; it is quite silly.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. We are just trying to get an answer. We think it might be the fact that last year we had a parliamentary secretary, Kyam Maher, who was attached to our office, and a staff member was assigned to him as an adviser. Of course, Mr Maher is now minister Maher, and I would say that is the reason for that position not being there now.

**Mr KNOLL:** Can I again clarify, and I am trying to get a specific answer here, minister, whether the travel expenditure you have talked about within your ministerial budget covers the travel for your tourism adviser or does that come from the separate departmental budget? Does that travel come out of the ministerial office or does it come under the tourism budget?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, sorry, I thought I explained it before. All the travel from our office, whether it is for me or advisers, comes out of the ministerial office budget and not directly from PIRSA.

**Mr GEE:** I refer the committee to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 27 to 29, Biosecurity. Will the minister please provide an update on the progress of the Sterile Insect Technology facility in Port Augusta and how this new initiative will contribute to maintaining South Australia's fruit fly free status?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for his question. The Sterile Insect Technology (SIT) facility build will commence in September this year. I am hoping that we will have a couple of people from the other side coming up to the announcement, which I think will be on 3 September, and it would be terrific to have some people from the opposition with us.

**Mr PEDERICK:** We will be there.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That's terrific. I am pretty sure that Senator Anne Ruston is going to come along as well. It is something that is very important for the state. Final architect drawings for the facility have been completed, and the building tender closed on 17 June. Tender evaluation is still underway, and the tender will be awarded shortly. The design and specifications are state of the art and have included input from international organisations, including the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), which has assisted other countries develop SIT facilities for the management of Mediterranean fruit fly.

Our new facility in Port Augusta will be the first purpose-built factory for the production of sterile male-only Queensland fruit fly (known as Q-fly) in the world. This week, this development is a step closer, with the state government signing an agreement with Horticulture Innovation Australia to build and manage the facility. Horticulture Innovation Australia is contributing \$800,000 to this venture on top of the \$3 million state government commitment. This is a great development and means this is now a truly national facility. HIA is in the process of appointing a program director who will be responsible for ensuring the delivery of high-quality research and appropriate outputs and outcomes. It is anticipated that this national facility, once fully operational, will employ up to 10 full-time equivalent positions.

The SIT facility is supported by a national research development effort, SITplus, which now has a combined program budget of nearly \$50 million. This research is focused on producing a fit, male only line of Q-fly for production in the new facility. Other projects being undertaken by this national consortium include the development of new Q-fly traps, lures and surveillance and monitoring techniques. Research and development partners in the SIT facility and the national program are: Horticulture Innovation Australia Limited, the CSIRO Biosecurity Flagship, Plant and Food Research Australia, the New South Wales Department of Primary Industries, and Macquarie University.

At full production, the Port Augusta facility design will provide for 50 million sterile Q-fly per week. Once the new facility is completed, it will require a period to commission the factory. It will ultimately provide Q-fly pest solution packages to all affected horticultural regions across Australia. For South Australia, the factory will supply sterile male-only Q-fly to assist with eradication efforts whenever isolated incursions are detected in the Riverland, metropolitan Adelaide or other growing areas.

The SIT facility will also assist in protecting the Riverland from the increased threat of Q-fly from areas in Victoria where the pest is now unfortunately endemic. Improved area-wide management of Q-fly proposed by the Victorian government in the Sunraysia region, along with access to a significant number of sterile male Q-fly from the Port Augusta factory, will reduce the pest pressure on the South Australia-Victoria border. It is hoped over time that the pest pressures can be relived and Q-fly pushed out of the major production areas in Victoria.

Members may be aware that a number of effective fruit fly horticultural chemicals have recently been removed from various uses by the Australian Pesticide and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) due to human health and environmental concerns.

**Mr KNOLL:** Point of order, Chair.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, member for Schubert.

**Mr KNOLL:** Am I given to suggest that the standing orders apply in their entirety—well, only suspended to the extent that we can have this committee—

**The CHAIR:** I will have to check exactly what you are getting at.

**Mr KNOLL:** Because the minister's statement relates to the press release he put out on 22 December 2014.

**The CHAIR:** I am sure it will be significantly different, but I will check on that for you, member for Schubert. The minister can continue.

**Mr KNOLL:** If it is publicly available information—

**The CHAIR:** Order! The minister can continue.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Growers need to move from the old solution in a can to a more sustainable integrated pest management regime. Sterile insect technology is an important component of this pest management strategy and establishes South Australia as a leader in sterile insect technology in this country.

**Mr GEE:** I refer the committee to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Program 1, statement page 28. Will the minister provide an update on the programs within Primary Industries and Regions South Australia which protect human health?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank the member for his question. Biosecurity SA has a range of programs which assist our industries to comply with Australia's food safety standards. They help our industries maintain market access and minimise the negative impacts from food-borne pathogens. The programs are a key component in the state government's strategic priorities, in particular 'premium food and wine from our clean environment'. The food safety program is an example of one of the programs used to achieve this important strategic priority.

The food safety program is a regulatory program which applies to citrus packers, shellfish growers and harvesters (for example, oyster growers), egg producers, poultry growers, seed sprout producers, meat processing—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —production of smallgoods—sorry, it is hard to concentrate with the member talking to himself.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, I am sure it is.

**Mr KNOLL:** If I could raise the point of order again: this information is all very clearly—he is actually reading a list from his own website. If in question time on a normal basis we are allowed to question whether information is publicly available, surely that applies to estimates in the same way, given that the standing orders still apply.

**The CHAIR:** I am sure it is much more lengthy than a press release, whatever it is.

**Mr KNOLL:** There is certainly no new information in the first couple of minutes.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Let's just finish it off and then you can have some questions.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —production of smallgoods, storage and transportation. Dairy production and processing is regulated in the same way, but by the Dairy Authority of South Australia. The regulations require relevant businesses to hold accreditation or have an approved food safety arrangement and comply with national food safety standards. There are approximately 1,600 accredited businesses under the regulatory program, which includes those businesses regulated by the Dairy Authority.

To ensure businesses comply with food safety standards, they are audited. Businesses are either audited quarterly, every six months or annually, depending on the type of business. The audit frequency is based on the food safety risk, where higher-risk businesses are audited more frequently. The audits are mostly conducted by highly qualified Biosecurity SA staff, Dairy Authority staff or other approved external auditors. To ensure efficiency and reduction of red tape, businesses audited by approved external auditors are not audited by Biosecurity SA auditors, therefore avoiding duplication of audits and unnecessary costs.

More than 1,600 food regulatory audits were performed by Biosecurity SA in the 2014-15 financial year. Biosecurity SA's Food Safety Program also includes the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program, which manages the food safety risks associated with growing and harvesting shellfish. The program monitors water and shellfish for harmful substances such as biotoxins and pathogens. South Australia's shellfish growing areas are located in pristine waters, which greatly reduces the food safety risk; however, vigilance is required to ensure shellfish have not been contaminated by food-borne pathogens.

Technical support is provided to higher-risk businesses such as those which make ready-to-eat smallgoods. The support includes validation of processing protocols to ensure processes consistently produce safe products. Also, targeted environmental and product testing is used to verify regulatory controls are effective.

Biosecurity SA works in partnership with SA Health, the agency responsible for administering the Food Act in South Australia, and the lead with respect to food safety. An example of the partnership is the collaborative arrangements associated with the investigation of food poisoning outbreaks, where Biosecurity SA assists SA Health to determine the cause. If illness is associated with primary food production, Biosecurity SA will assist in investigations and/or actions to ensure the outbreak is contained.

**Mr KNOLL:** Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 14. On 5 and 6 October 2014, you travelled to and from Sydney, where you spent \$739.09 on a limousine service, which included, but was not limited to, a \$426 charge for the vehicle to take you to the NRL grand final, wait in the car park while you watched the game, and then returned to your accommodation. Do you think that this is a reasonable use of taxpayer funds and, if so, what value did the South Australian taxpayer derive from this expense?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for the question. There were four separate car journeys there, and, while you might you want to refer to it as a limousine, it was a Ford or a Holden sedan, and—

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** It wasn't a helicopter?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It wasn't a helicopter, no; it was a Ford sedan or a Holden sedan. I was invited to an official function where the Prime Minister and other ministers from around Australia were in attendance. The reason I was there does not really relate to the agriculture sector, but I am happy to explain. We saw, on Monday night, Liverpool playing at the Adelaide Oval with

53,000 people there. The day before that, there were 54,000. So, we had 107,000 people at the Adelaide Oval over the space of 24 or 25 hours. That is what we want to see as much of as possible. You do not get people to come and play their events—

**Mr KNOLL:** That's why you had the car to wait in the car park.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —in your state, in the best stadium in Australia, if you do not have relationships and you do not go out there and you do not go after these events. For much of the NRL grand final I was talking to the people from the National Rugby League about our desire here in South Australia to host an NRL match, and those discussions are ongoing. I do think it was worth the visit. We have established some key contacts now within the NRL, and we will continue to work with them so that we can get more events to South Australia. When we have more events, we know we get more tourists.

For the Liverpool example from Monday night, we had 10,000 people come here from interstate and overseas. It injected \$10 million into our economy. I think the return on investment will be great. I think, as I have mentioned before, part of our job, on whichever side of the house you sit, is to be out there promoting South Australia, looking for opportunities where we can increase visitation to our state, increase the exports that come from our state and really sell what we have here in South Australia, and to go out and try and get new events here. We are not going to do that by sitting at home. We have to be out and about, in the marketplace, having conversations with the decision-makers at the national and international level.

**Mr KNOLL:** My second question relates to the same budget line and, given the minister's answer about promoting South Australia and coming from a wine region myself, I think this question is quite pertinent. On 24 July 2014, you travelled to Glasgow for the Commonwealth Games. While stopping over in Edinburgh, you dined at the Rutland Hotel and purchased a £55 (which is about \$130) bottle of Catena Alta Malbec Argentinian wine. What value did the taxpayer get from this \$248.77 meal and, as a South Australian minister who has spruiked representing the South Australian food and wine sector quite strongly, did you not see it as more appropriate to purchase maybe an expensive South Australian bottle of wine, as opposed to an Argentinian bottle?

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Members, order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I dined in restaurants where we had the £1 roll and tattie, I think it is called. That is a bit of a Scottish delicacy. On some occasions, rare occasions, there are some restaurant bills that are higher than others. Anyone who has travelled will know this: a lot of times you grab a sandwich along the way somewhere. I think on this particular night we had arrived and went looking for somewhere open and this is the place we found. We went in and found they had an extensive South Australian wine list, which was terrific, and I spoke to the manager of the establishment and encouraged them to get even more South Australian wine and told him about our 18 wonderful wine regions. As you know, I am always out there spruiking South Australian wine.

The thing we do not get a lot of in South Australia is Argentinian wine. The thing that other markets have is competition. The Australian wine industry is up against Argentina, Chile, France, Italy, US and South Africa. I do not know of too many places in South Australia where you get Argentinian wine. What I know is that, if you are in business, in politics or in sport, you always want to know the measure of your opponent. If our opponent is Argentina, I want to try their wine, because it is pretty easy to discount what your opponent is all about.

I tried that wine and it was actually a good wine. Argentina is producing good wine. We cannot go out there and say that Argentina has crap wine and it is really bad if they actually have good wine because it points to our own credibility by our talking it down. That is the reason I went for an Argentinian over a South Australian wine, but I can tell you that when I was talking to the manager of the establishment I was definitely spruiking South Australian wine and congratulating him for the list that they had, which was very extensive.

**Mr KNOLL:** My third question relates to the same budget line. Did you have any ministerial or departmental staff present whilst you visited Edinburgh from 27 to 29 July 2014? You stayed at

the Radisson Blu Hotel in Edinburgh, where it appears that you were charged £412 for the two nights in a single room. Were there any other charges in Edinburgh for accommodation of your accompanying staff?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I was travelling with a staff member. There were two rooms booked, there were two rooms used and I do not know why there was only one room on the account. Sometimes that happens. We pay with one credit card as we book out and sometimes hotels just pile it all onto the one and we pay for that bill. Either that, or the documents you are referring to you are not in possession of.

**The CHAIR:** Are there any other questions on my right?

**Mr GEE:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 18 to 20. How is the government assisting with market access support and opportunities for the food and beverage industry?

#### **Membership:**

Mr Treloar substituted for Mr Knoll.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for the question. The 2014-15 state budget delivered on the election commitment 'Premium Free Range Food'. In December 2014 cabinet approved an approach which delivers across four key program areas, and since this time has seen Primary Industries and Regions South Australia:

- establish a Seafood Credentials Grant Program to co-invest and assist business and industry raise standards, and attain third party certification for particular credentials required to access new markets or contribute to premium prices;
- undertaking projects which will promote South Australian government credentials, such as the state's non-genetically modified status and rigorous biosecurity measures by working with specific industries and sectors to identify key barriers to entering or expanding in export markets, as well as enable businesses to verify particular credentials to customers;
- increasing the use and consumer recognition of the state brand through greater uptake and utilisation by the food and beverage industry;
- investigating opportunities with the wine industry and tourism groups for Adelaide to join the Great Wine Capitals of the World network and the potential of marketing this as a key feature of the state's wine and tourism offering.

South Australia produces a diverse range of high quality food and beverage products. Building South Australia's Premium Food and Wine Credentials Grant Program will continue to support this growth now and through to 2017-18 to further assist these South Australian products with premium positioning in key identified local, national and international markets. Highlights include:

- Seafood Industry Grants Program. In the first year of the grant program the government supported six seafood organisations by providing assistance with attaining third party certification, such as the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), Friend of the Sea (FoS) and the Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) to contribute to South Australian premium seafood market access expansion. The backing of an achieved certification provides customers with assurance about the products they are buying; this in many instances can improve access to new higher value markets and support price premiums being received. Following the good response from the seafood sector in 2014-15, it is planned to expand the grants program to be available to a broader range of food and wine businesses in 2015-16.
- PIRSA has established a collaborative working relationship with Brand South Australia and together have implemented targeted food and beverage sector strategies and initiatives to increase use and viability of the state brand across these sectors. This has

led to an accelerated number of business registrations to use the brand—an increase of 8 per cent overall in the last month to reach 287 businesses. In coming months we will be expanding our targeted program with each of the food and wine sectors to further accelerate uptake of the state brand for use in marketing materials and on wine and food packaging.

I want to congratulate all those great South Australian companies that have been using the state brand. It is terrific to walk down the aisles of the supermarket and even into the wine shops to see the South Australian brand there. The brand has been an enormous success, and I must congratulate our Premier, too, for seeking out a new look for South Australia. It is something that we could really identify ourselves with and that all South Australians could get behind.

It was a long process and I know there was a lot of consultation right across the state, with lots of forums where all sorts of people had all sorts of views and they put them forward. I think the design they came up with has been excellent and I think the implementation has been terrific by those in Brand SA and the many government departments who have picked up and run with the state brand. I think the food and wine sector has been one of the leading sectors in private enterprise to use the state brand as something in their marketing. There is nothing as simple as a well designed brand mark that can point to where something comes from.

Darren Thomas, who is on our Economic Development Board, and of course has Thomas Foods, one of the leading agricultural businesses in South Australia, played a leading role in the development of the brand. As I said, every time I walk into a supermarket or open up my fridge and see all these little state brands peering out at me it is with a terrific sense of pride that I hope all South Australians have in knowing that when they take the lid off or open the packet that they are having great South Australian produce. It is something that we should all be very, very proud of.

In terms of promotion of government credentials to benefit the industry, two key projects have commenced which are looking at opportunities to enhance South Australia's market position. The first is a market research project to further enhance and differentiate South Australia's products based on our non-genetically modified status. The second is the One Biosecurity pilot program, which will enhance South Australia's biosecurity position for livestock, an essential factor in maintaining and growing market access for South Australia's meat products.

**Mr GEE:** I have one follow-up question. Can the minister explain or expand on the One Biosecurity on-farm animal biosecurity trial?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Again, I thank the member for his question and his interest in this very important subject. To meet future consumer expectations, livestock product must meet food safety, animal welfare and auditable traceability requirements along the whole product chain. Market access is vulnerable to incursions of exotic diseases unless mitigation measures are in place. One Biosecurity offers a new integrated approach to disease risk management, focusing on on-farm biosecurity, and will give South Australian producers a competitive advantage over other states.

The value of the livestock industry in South Australia is estimated at \$6 billion; however, market access of livestock and livestock products is dependent on maintaining a favourable animal health status. The continued recognition of South Australia as a source of premium animal products faces pressures from consumer expectations and an increasing threat of introduction of devastating exotic diseases, such as foot and mouth disease, due to increased international movement of people and goods.

One Biosecurity is a new risk management approach which shifts attention from dealing with individual diseases to a more integrated approach, focusing on disease pathways which address multiple threats. By raising awareness of on-farm biosecurity, One Biosecurity aims to build a culture of good practice which will result in the prevention of disease incursion, as well as improved early detection of potential exotic diseases. The expected result is reduced risk of endemic and exotic disease, reduced potential impact, increased resilience and better carcasses throughout the production chain.

The project is designed to pilot the governance and implementation of the One Biosecurity approach, develop appropriate documentation and stakeholder consultation. A rigorous audit process will assist compliance with herd and flock disease status, reporting on cattle health

statements and sheep health statements. The program will empower producers to adopt safe practices whilst reducing the regulatory burden and red tape of endemic disease control.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Another question in relation to European travel. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 14. While you were in Frankfurt, on 28 July 2014 you spent almost \$500 on a single limousine service. Was it necessary to use such a service, and where did you go and who did you visit?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We flew direct into Frankfurt. Again, you refer to them as a limousine service: it was a sedan. I cannot remember the make of the sedan, but it was a normal car that you get around in with a driver. We had flown directly into Frankfurt, and the car picked us up and took us into the city of Frankfurt. We had meetings with Austrade and the South Australian Tourism Commission representatives there, and we had meetings with Tourism Australia and Singapore Airlines' German operation. As you can see, it was a fair bit of running around.

I think the plane got in early afternoon, and we got straight off the plane and went straight into meetings. There was not a minute wasted in getting to work, in trying to talk to people from the other side of the world about what we have to offer here and about how we can work with them on marketing South Australia. Every time we go on a trip, it is about building our exports or building visitation to South Australia. I have to say that, when we got off the plane and into that car and went to those meetings, that was exactly what we were focused on. The meetings were terrific.

We found out the latest about what was happening in terms of flights in and out of Frankfurt. We had had Qantas pull out of Frankfurt, and I think one of the other airlines, Malaysia, might have come a little bit after that. Just to give a little bit of intel, Frankfurt is the biggest European port for us in terms of bringing people from Europe down to South Australia, other than, of course, out of London; it is Frankfurt if we are talking mainland Europe. We had very good discussions with them. We had great discussions with Singapore Airlines, and that was around the time when a day or two later we announced that Singapore Airlines would fund 300 travel agents throughout Europe coming down here to South Australia, which they did in April this year.

It was terrific to sit down around the table with those people and have the discussions and to talk to Tourism Australia. Obviously, they are trying to sell all of Australia to the people of Germany, and we wanted to make sure that South Australia gets more than its fair share. We were able to brief them on what we have to offer and on some new tourism experiences we have here, including some touring routes. We know that European tourists love to partake in self-drive travel and that the self-drive market is worth 24 per cent of South Australian tourism revenue, which we are trying to grow from \$5.2 billion a year to \$8 billion a year by 2020.

You do not do that unless you go out and get more people coming here. If we have the same number of people coming here as we had last year and the year before, it is going to stick on \$5.2 billion. As much as you want to sit around and talk to people in South Australia about how you want to improve tourism, you are not going to improve it unless you go out there and sell what we have to offer to people interstate and to people overseas, and that is exactly what that was all about.

The other part of that journey was, I think, about 50 or 60 kilometres from Frankfurt to the town where we were staying. Frankfurt Airport sits in between Frankfurt and towns like Mainz and Wiesbaden. We were staying in Mainz, which is the head of the world Great Wine Capitals for Germany. Mainz is the city, like Adelaide wants to be the city, so we stayed in Mainz and, as I said, I think it was about a 40 or 50-kilometre trip. All up, we probably had the car for five hours. We did a fair few kilometres from the airport into the city, around the city and then back out to Mainz. That is where that cost was incurred.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I now refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 23. I note the 2015-16 target to finalise and implement a new management plan for the commercial Lakes and Coorong Fishery. The minister would be aware that I first called on the government three years ago to implement an overabundant native species management plan to tackle the New Zealand fur seal problem, which has now become a crisis. Does the new management plan noted in the targets include such management of fur seals? Has the minister received any advice from his department on precisely what measures will be used to tackle the fur seal problem and has he offered any assistance to the Lakes and Coorong fishers?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I share the concerns of the member for Hammond and I share the concerns of the industry about the problem we have with this native animal. I think they call it the short-nosed—

**Mr PEDERICK:** Long-nosed.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is the long-nosed fur seal now, as opposed to its former name of the New Zealand fur seal, and I guess that is to indicate that it is actually a native species. I think there are about 100,000 of them, and they are growing at about 5 per cent a year, so it is obviously a very big problem for the fishers and for other people upstream, but there is probably no easy solution.

One thing that we have ruled out is a cull. We will not be involved in a cull, but pretty much every other option is out there and we want to hear from anyone who has any good ideas. I know there are some acoustic deterrents out there at the moment that hope to scare them away, but it is a real problem and something we are working on with the Department of Environment as well. For a deeper understanding and explanation of the issue, and what we are doing about it, I might ask Professor Mehdi Doroudi, the group executive director, to give more detail.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** We have recently had meetings with the industry association, and Mr Gary Hera-Singh and Mr Neil McDonald attended. We asked for a proposal from the association in terms of what measures could be taken and put in place to help resolve the pressure on fishermen in the Lakes and Coorong. We came up with a number of measures, some short to mid-term and some longer term.

To start with, in collaboration with the environment department we came up with about a \$100,000 cash investment to investigate modified gear and technologies that could address the issue by separating seals from attacking the fish tangled in their mesh nets. That is a process we have already talked to the relevant experts and consultants about. If I am correct, my understanding is that next week the fieldwork is going to be done in the Lakes and Coorong, but obviously that is going to be a long-term solution.

How we can help to assist fishermen with the pressure they are under is that we have come up with some regulatory measures that are in place and looked at how we could lift some of those measures temporarily under some exceptional circumstances that this group are under. For instance, we have a policy of owner-operator in marine scale fishery where you need to own the licence to be able to operate on the boats. Very recently, last year, we came up with about 28 days of relief for masters. We are in discussion with industry to increase that to about three months for the Lakes and Coorong because one of the ways that they can better address their fishing activity is if they could have relief masters and get inspections of their nets quicker than the normal way they do; therefore, they can collect the fish and harvest the fish before they are damaged by seals.

The other measure we are looking at is using drum nets. At the moment, the problem is with mesh nets, and not every licence holder in the Lakes and Coorong has drum nets on their licence. Again, in a temporary way, we believe we can do something so that all of them have access to this until the longer term when the issue is addressed to be able again to revoke that additional year from their licences, because it is a matter of equity, really, when it comes to the fishery.

They discussed with us relief of fees. That is a matter that is under consideration, and we are looking into that. They have suggested that if people are prepared to shelve their mesh net and not work on that at all, is there any possibility of withdrawing their fees and stop them from paying that. That is a matter that needs further discussion with the Treasury and we need to look into regulatory aspects to see how we can help them.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you. I just have a back up for that. There are a couple of things around that. Of that \$100,000, what is PIRSA paying? Also, when this fishery is decimated, and I believe it will be, because this is just ridiculous how slowly any action needed is taken, will the minister buy out licences and fully compensate fishers—I am not saying if—when this fishery is decimated?

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Well, you have a look; you go down there and have a look.

**The CHAIR:** Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

**Mr PEDERICK:** They are already getting their licences paid out.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and I thank the member for the question and acknowledge his long-term interest and passion for this particular subject and this problem for the fishery down there. The cost is being shared on a fifty-fifty basis and in relation to the buyout we are not ruling anything in or out. As I said earlier, the only thing we are ruling out at the moment is a cull.

**Mr PEDERICK:** So have you supplied time payment licence relief? I also frame in the question huge support for my motion in regard to an overabundant native species management plan including a sustainable harvest of New Zealand/long-nosed fur seals, and note that Coorong council has unanimous support for my motion and certainly the Ngarrindjeri, through the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority, have full support for getting rid of this feral pest out of the waters of the Coorong, Lakes Albert and Alexandrina, and the River Murray.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** To talk about the cull, we all remember the images out of Canada a few years ago of fur seals.

**Mr PEDERICK:** It did not stop tourists going to Canada, minister.

**The CHAIR:** Order, the member for Hammond! Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We do have premium food and wine from our premium environment exported to the world. What we know with koalas on Kangaroo Island and other—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! Member for Hammond, please.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —native species that breed up into abundance is that the answer is not to cull, because you might reduce the numbers, but you will create more problems in other areas. I think it would be very hard to sell us as premium food and wine from our clean environment if we are out there—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —killing fur seals. I might hand over to Professor Doroudi for a little more information.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** In relation to fee relief, the example of that was with St Vincent prawn. When we closed the fishery, we exempted them from paying the fee altogether. No doubt there were costing pressures on the operation of the fisheries division of the department, but we managed that. At the moment, we are convinced that there has been a loss of production, and fishermen are not making the revenue that they used to. In their proposal, they ask for this relief fee and we are looking into that. I am positive that we could address that to their expectation and satisfaction.

In terms of the buyback, they put that request in their correspondence with the department as well. That is like any other fishery and the matter that if a public good policy is involved with the matter if there is any legitimacy of taxpayers' funds to go and buy back. It would be very early for me to make any suggestions on that, whether that needs to happen or not, because we are hopeful that by changing the gear and technology that they have we may be able to address the issue.

**Mr PEDERICK:** We will see how we go next year.

**Ms WORTLEY:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 18 to 20, titled agriculture food and wine. How is the government using the concept of co-innovation clusters to support regional organisations through the 'premium food and wine from our clean environment' strategic priority?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for Torrens for the question. The Premium Food and Wine Co-Innovation Cluster Program is a state government initiative supporting local regional agriculture food and wine businesses to become more collaborative, productive and globally competitive. The initiative is based around the government's strategic priority of 'premium food and wine from our clean environment' and is overseen by the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Innovation clusters are a widely recognised concept used worldwide as an effective means to stimulate urban and regional economic growth. It is now widely accepted that the productivity and competitiveness of industries which participate in such an initiative improves significantly. Clusters initiatives are usually projects organised as collaborations between a diverse number of business groups and associated organisations. These groups may include private businesses, government agencies and academic institutions.

There is an important role for government in assisting with the establishment of industry-led innovation clusters, particularly during the development stage. We have budgeted \$2.67 million for the cluster program over the first five years. The cluster program is being piloted by PIRSA in the Murraylands, Riverland and Limestone Coast regions, with a total of around \$500,000 allocated to various cluster groups annually.

Although this program is being piloted in the Murraylands, Riverland and Limestone Coast regions, it is anticipated the knowledge and experience from the pilot program will be shared with other regional areas. Grant funding for seven projects at a total of \$487,000 has been approved. The four successful applicants from the Limestone Coast are, firstly, Coonawarra Grape and Wine Incorporated. Funding will aim to accelerate the activities of the already existing Coonawarra Grape and Wine Incorporated industry cluster, incorporating the Coonawarra Vignerons Association and the Coonawarra Grape Growers Association. This aims to promote the wine, region and brand, and to encourage collaboration, improve profitability of wine and wine grape production, and engender a sustainable Coonawarra wine industry through environmentally friendly initiatives and sustainable business practices.

The project aims to ultimately build capacity for wine companies to more effectively compete in the Chinese market, leveraging the benefits of being part of a larger group. It was terrific to be in Qingdao just a few weeks ago with the Coonawarra wine cluster. It was their first real foray into China where they grouped up, instead of going over there as individual wineries, which is always pretty hard to do. To bulk up and go into the Chinese market selling some of the best wine produced anywhere in Australia—and I have to say that the very high-end people that they engaged with in Qingdao were very impressed with the wines.

If you look at the Halliday rankings and the five-star rankings that he gives to wineries, there is no other wine region in Australia with as many five-star rated wineries per the amount of wineries in a wine region than Coonawarra. It is only 27 kilometres long and it is two or three kilometres wide, so it is not as vast as McLaren Vale, the Barossa or the Riverland but, gee, it punches well above its weight.

However, when you have a smaller region sometimes you do not have the capacity to be able to get out there and get into an important market like China. So I think we will see the stocks of Coonawarra wine really improve in China. It was great to have Mr Halliday there as well to host a masterclass of Coonawarra wine and to be present at a lunch that I was fortunate enough to be at as well. Once again, it is about getting out of South Australia and selling our fantastic produce to the world.

One of the other recipients of the project is the Naracoorte Lucindale Council. Funding aims to develop collaboration across the red meat value chain to create a deeper understanding of the industry, its barriers and inefficiencies. It will also help to understand the economic impact of potential collaborations and establish a collaborative culture to drive innovation and build capacity for increased sustainable profitability across the red meat value chain.

Regional Development Australia Limestone Coast was another recipient. Their funding aims to progress the formation of an industry cluster to determine opportunities and establish a model for the retention of the cold storage facilities on the Limestone Coast to secure the economic viability of the region's potato industry, following the closure of the McCain group's South Australian fries factory

in December 2013. It is great to see new life being pumped into that facility. It is an amazing facility and one that I toured back in January this year on one of my many trips to the South-East and, of course, I was there again yesterday in my role as forestry minister. It is very important to get out into the regions and travel a lot. This project will also enable the development of strategies to meet a number of requirements of a cold storage and transport logistics initiative.

Dairy SA is another funding recipient. The money that goes to them is aimed at enhancing collaboration between the processing and pre-farm gate sectors by developing a results-driven plan which will enhance profitability, drive production and increase confidence in the SA dairy sector. This project reflects the 'grass to glass' value chain of the state's dairy industry and will collaborate across the two pilot regions of the Limestone Coast, the Murraylands and Riverland.

The three successful applicants from the Murraylands and Riverland region and their projects include Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland. Funding aims to advance the Murraylands food group, which includes major food production and processing companies from across the region to work together and, with relevant government organisations, to achieve goals which cannot be achieved as individuals. The group's focus is on mapping capability and forming identity, and will explore brand and market development, capability development and production sustainability.

Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland is another applicant. Their funding aims to support the overarching initiative of building and exploring a portfolio of activities to link and leverage many of the underlying activities and opportunities currently available in the Riverland. The project aims to coordinate local businesses in the sharing of ideas, the co-definition of solutions and in testing delivery. The third applicant is the Southern Mallee District Council. Funding aims to support the Southern Mallee cluster in its efforts to drive better value at the farm gate through more efficient and effective farm practices. The cluster group aims to build long-term sustainable agricultural and horticultural structures and will work with experts around issues such as land management, soil management, farming technologies, farm practices, crop management and seed technologies.

I would like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate the Southern Mallee District Council on the outstanding work that they are doing in looking after the farmers in their community. Last year in May, I was in Shanghai, and the farmer group led by the Southern Mallee council was over there having very good discussions with people who want to buy the premium quality produce that is produced in the Southern Mallee. I know that the local member for Hammond is very proud of the produce that comes from his area. It was terrific to see these people, councillors and farmers, heading to Shanghai. They had some great meetings and they got out and met with a lot of different people to further their knowledge and understanding of the Chinese market. They then came back and got to work on making sure that they could do more in the China market.

I was back in China again in about March this year again with representatives from the local council, the Southern Mallee council. We sat around the table at Tsingtao Brewery, where 16 to 17 per cent of the barley that goes into every glass or every bottle of Tsingtao beer comes from South Australia. It was terrific to sit there alongside these representatives to really push our credentials, our GM free credentials. It was something that the Tsingtao Brewing Company was very interested to hear when it comes to the barley that they need to go into their produce. Right from President Xi down there is a very keen interest in food safety and food security in China. As the biggest beer exporter out of China, Tsingtao takes that stuff very seriously and is keen to get as much produce as they can out of South Australia and, in particular, the Southern Mallee District Council. Again, I congratulate the council on their fine work.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Minister, I just want to take you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 21. I note in the 2014-15 highlights for the aquaculture sub-program that the four-year cost recovery agreements were established with various sectors. I have been advised that the western zone abalone did not agree to four-year cost recovery agreements. The zone refused to lock the existing recovery in for any more than one year due to ongoing issues they had with transparency and accountability. Can the minister confirm in fact that the western, southern and central zones did not agree to the four-year term?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The short answer is that abalone is fisheries, not aquaculture, but I can get—

**Mr TRELOAR:** I take your point. It is the case that only land-based abalone, which of course would be aquaculture, have locked into that four-year agreement—that is correct?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Correct.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Again, on the topic of cost recovery, I am informed that Deloitte has recently conducted an independent review of cost recovery. Was the industry consulted throughout the preparation of the report, because I am informed that it was not consulted throughout the preparation of that report, and have you or your department considered that report and its recommendations?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Once again, I thank the member for Flinders for his question and also acknowledge his great interest in fisheries, aquaculture and of course all the great crops that come from over on Eyre Peninsula as well. I might ask Professor Doroudi to provide a little bit more information.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** Thank you, minister, and thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, we had Deloitte involved with an internal review of cost recovery procedures. I need to say at the outset that it was not a review of cost recovery policy; it was a review of the administrative processes that we have internally within the department, including the costing model, the time sheet, and the integrity of that program and level of transparency that we have.

The first actual review of cost recovery policy was conducted by Deloitte, but in 2009, and that was work of the Fisheries Council. The Fisheries Council commissioned Deloitte to independently review the cost recovery policy. This recent exercise was an internal exercise for us. In terms of identifying the robustness of our system, like many other audits or reviews that we may have along the different functions of the department, yes, there have been sets of recommendations. I will read that out if you are okay with that.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Perhaps, Professor, those recommendations and which ones have been adopted.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** Sure. I will go through them. The first one was to include a principle relating to transparency and accountability to the actual policy. We have already done that. It means we have included the wording of 'transparency and accountability' there. It was about that we include every document that we have from every sector of Fisheries on our website. In the past, we just dealt sector by sector about their work plan, their program, costing associated with that, and we never shared that information with any other sectors. One recommendation was that it may be better in terms of transparency to put the detail of those documents, sector by sector, on the website.

The third one is to adopt those measures for the aquaculture industry as well, which we are going to do. I have to say, the documents have not gone up yet on our website, but we are currently in the process of adding them to our website.

The reason for the delay from the time that Deloitte finished its work, which was a report perhaps submitted to us around a few weeks ago, was the fact that we get all the documents associated to each sector's work plans and costing models up to the present time to be able to add them to our website.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Minister, just further to that and on the same budget line, Volume 4, page 21, have there been any studies conducted in the past few years, or even decade, to assist the efficiency and cost effectiveness of actual service delivery of either SARDI or PIRSA?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Once again, thank you to the member for Flinders for the question, and I will ask Professor Doroudi to explain that.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** May I just clarify something I said previously? The Deloitte report which goes on our website said that the process we are running is already transparent, but the word 'transparency' was not in the policy, and that needed to be included.

In terms of the previous reviews, the last review goes back to the 1990s and happened to be on SARDI's costing model. We internally review that every year, based on discussions that we have

with the industry. In 2009, as I said, Deloitte—there is a comprehensive report about it and it is on our website as well—looked into every aspect of the departmental costs associated with Fisheries' cost recovery. They are the only previous reports that we can say were in the system.

You need to know that, in discussions with western zone abalone—because that sector obviously still had concerns and issues with cost recovery, and they clearly raised those concerns with us this year—an offer was made by the department, that we are prepared to review costs associated with compliance and SARDI if they wish or are willing for that review to take place. We have not heard back from them since the last meeting we had with them.

The other thing I can add is that the rock lobster industry sector has been in touch with the department in terms of being willing to run an independent or third-party review of their costs associated with research for SARDI's programs. We accepted that and will be working closely with them in relation to that review.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Minister, the professor mentioned the western zone abalone sector. You would be aware, through the professor, that they have records and are suggesting a discrepancy. I would ask you for an explanation for charging the western zone abalone sector for 80 days of education, when in fact only 2.4 hours were involved in 2014. The discrepancy is around those hours because they have been charged for 79½ full-time equivalents and there have been no new education requirements anticipated there.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you again for the question. We have sat down with the western zone abalone people around the table. We do not agree on everything they put forward as being 100 per cent true, and I guess they do not agree with everything we say either. What we are trying to do is actually come up with something that we can all live with.

I think if you look at the cost to western zone abalone, those costs have come down markedly in recent years. We are happy to keep working with them, but what we will not do is reduce anything that will put that fishery at jeopardy, and that includes surveillance. Surveillance is a really important part of the integrity of the industry and so we want to have people out there doing the policing of the industry.

I might again hand over to Professor Doroudi to expand a little bit on what it is that we do with the western zone abalone people. As I said, it is an important industry. About 95 per cent of abalone ends up in China and Hong Kong. It is a tremendous part of our export industry. I remember the SIAL dinner in China last year, and the Chinese were glowing in their praise of our abalone. It is not really my favourite food, but it is a good thing if we can export 95 per cent of it to people who do appreciate it.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** I definitely say that there are disagreements between the sector and the department in terms of cost recovery. There are views in the sector that there is no need for that level of compliance because it is about just 22 divers and we would not need, to the best to my calculations, around a 26 per cent reduction that we implemented in their costs over the last few years. It was not really practical to go anything beyond that by not dropping, again, the integrity of the service that you provide.

The compliance program is divided into three elements: education, deterrence and enforcement. The time sheet that we have, that every single officer is following in terms of the time that they put in, came to be translated to that number of days of that program. I am still not convinced and do not understand where Mr Coates from the western zone abalone sector is coming from by saying that was just a 2½ hour education program. I believe he may be referring to 2½ hours of perhaps officers having interaction on certain matters with divers, but these programs go way beyond that.

The thing that I always discussed with western zone abalone is that, if there is any idea or initiative so that we can reduce our costs without adversely impacting on the management of this resource, by all means, bring it to the table. We are prepared to do that. On the record, we have shown with a number of sectors that we have been negotiating, discussing and reducing costs wherever it is possible. The act provides for the end user and beneficiary of this resource to be charged the fees associated with the management of the sector. Ninety-nine per cent of abalone is

dedicated in the management plan to the commercial sector. We do not have much of a recreational activity side or public side associated with that.

On the illegal part of it, the state Treasury contribution that we have in fisheries section is a spending of significant amounts on an annual basis in addressing poaching and illegal activities in abalone, and none of that cost has been shifted or referred to the commercial sector. Again, we are waiting to hear from them. As far as I am concerned, we told them if they want a formal review to happen, we are prepared to open that formal review for the cost of compliance and SARDI research.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 22 and the financial commentary for the fisheries sub-program and, specifically, the 2014-15 estimated result versus the same period's budget. In that period, \$3.3 million over and above that budgeted is estimated to have been spent on the purchase of commercial fishing licences and entitlements under the SA Marine Parks: Commercial Fisheries Voluntary Catch/Effort Reduction Program. Can the minister provide a general update on the marine parks buyback, specifically, how much effort has been taken and across which sectors, and how far that buyback has progressed? If it is not completed, then when is completion scheduled for?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thanks again, Madam Chair, and to the member for Flinders. Again, Professor Doroudi has some more in-depth information that he can supply the committee.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** The figure in the budget is associated with the last sector, which was central zone abalone, \$3.3 million. That was the last sector to complete the buyback program. Due to the difference between this sector and other sectors, in other sectors we did have provision of buying a complete licence or complete licences. In this sector the fairest way to go was to go pro rata and reduce the amount of quota that was calculated as reduction effort to be taken from each of the six licence holders.

On its own that took some time to get to that point. There was additional matter to it, and that was the fact that we had discrepancies between what they wanted to be reduced and what SARDI's calculation was saying to be reduced. We got to a landing on that and increased the level of purchase, but at the end we completed that sector. All the six sectors were affected by implementation of sanctuary zones and marine parks, their relevance calculated, and estimated licences were purchased in all those sectors. I would be happy to provide further detail on those sectors and number of licences, if you require.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I refer to the same budget line and the same page (page 22, Volume 4). What conversations have taken place, if any, in the previous financial period between your department and the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery with regard to the future viability of that fishery?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Again, thank you to the member for Flinders for the question. There has been a lot of discussion going on with the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. It has been good to see the prawn fishery come closer together and having the one voice rather than several separate ideas. It was also good to see that the fishery was reopened this season with some very good results there. Hopefully, that all bodes well for a bright future for that fishery, which was, of course, dramatically overfished.

In terms of the various discussions that the department has had, I will ask, again, Professor Doroudi to go over some of those meetings they have had and where they are at at the moment.

**Prof. DOROUDI:** The fishery was closed for a period of time—near to two years—for biological and economical reasons. We know that. There are issues associated with that fishery. On request of fishermen—10 licence holders—the fishery was closed. During that time we worked on implementing a new method, which is trading nights of fishery. This is an input control fishery. This is not based on quota. Therefore when you do not have quota what we could do is to introduce a system that is going to be tradeable between the 10 licence holders. It took some time obviously to develop that, and it took time for the industry to re-create its association.

At the moment my latest understanding is that seven out of 10 of them have joined to become members of the association. We worked very closely with the association. There are other members of the industry who have obviously different views. What we did through all those programs and surveys that we ran is we got to a point where that fishery could be opened. The fishery was opened

in the last season. We have been advised that the average catch has been more than a tonne per night. It is a good amount, a significant amount.

We recently had a meeting with the industry association executive officer Neil MacDonald, who provided some feedback on the season for us. It looked like six licence holders picked up the method that we introduced and rather than utilising six boats they utilised three boats during the activities they had. There were other operators who decided to go out with their own boat. More than 300 tonnes was caught. There are two schools of thought within the industry, I need to say, the majority who are a member of the association. They believe fisheries bounce back and would be good and continuing transferrable knowledge may get us to a point where over a couple of years, according to Cartwright and Morgan's review, we may be able to introduce a quota for this fishery. In that way an internal adjustment could happen if that process could get to that point and implement it.

There are others in the industry who strongly believe that the fishery will go back down again after a couple of years of catch and until at least half of these boats are not purchased out and licences surrounded there would not be a future for this fishery. We have to work with what is available to us, the best science that comes to us. In terms of the science of that also, I need to say that has been recently reviewed by CSIRO and further comments and input were provided for us to improve our stock assessment program and the science that we can deliver for this fishery.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I will just read in the omnibus questions and if I have any more time I will have another question, thank you, Madam Chair.

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 in 2014-15 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

2. For each department or agency reporting to the minister in 2014-15, please provide the number of public servants broken down into heads and FTEs that are (1) tenured and (2) on contract and, for each category, provide a breakdown of the number of (1) executives and (2) non-executives.

3. In the financial year 2014-15, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2015-16?

4. Between 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more—(1) which has been abolished and (2) which has been created?

5. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, please provide a breakdown of attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors in the years 2013-14 and 2014-15.

6. For each year of the forward estimates, provide the name and budget of all grant programs administered by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister and, for 2014-15, provide a breakdown of expenditure on all grants administered by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister listing the name of the grant recipient, the amount of the grant and the purpose of the grant and whether the grant was subject to a grant agreement as required by Treasurer's Instruction 15.

7. For each year of the forward estimates, provide the name and budget for each individual program administered by or on behalf of departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

8. For each year of the forward estimates, provide the name and budget for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

9. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, what is the budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for the financial years included in the forward estimates by year and how are these packages to be funded?

10. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2015, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices and ministerial liaison officers?

**The CHAIR:** Really quickly.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Really quickly. Minister, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 21, with regard to cost recovery and agreements around cost recovery. I have had a little bit of a history with this. Fishing is one of the most, if not the most, highly regulated industry in South Australia and it is a world regarded fishery in how it is managed. I think there are some issues around what some in the fishery see as the reporting back and the transparency of PIRSA documentation around cost recovery. In that light my question is: is there genuine cost recovery around each sector or is there a targeted budget amount that PIRSA has to recoup from each individual fishing sector?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thanks again for the question, member for Hammond. Cost recovery is something that we discuss a lot with all the individual fisheries. In most cases there is agreement. We always listen to the suggestions as to how things can be done better. In some cases fisheries ask for us to put up their costs because they want to implement a different program or go down a different line or something like that. So, it is a matter of us, on a case by case, fishery by fishery basis, working with those various groups to make sure that we come up with the best possible system.

We do not want to have any huge financial burden on them, but it is an activity-based costing and if the work is being done then it is appropriate that the industry pays for it. There are so many different aspects to it as well. One of the things that we have a great reputation for, around Australia and around the world, is the food safety around our fisheries. So, I guess that is one aspect of it.

In the time that I have been in this role I must applaud everyone in PIRSA and in particular Professor Doroudi and Sean Sloan and the other people involved because they very much have an open door policy and they listen to what people in the sector have to say. I think they are very well respected by the fisheries as well, by all the different fisheries around the state. You are always going to get some level of disagreement here and there but I think that 99 per cent of the time we can come to an agreement where we are both happy with what is being delivered and what is being paid for.

*Sitting suspended from 12:02 to 12:15.*

#### **Membership:**

Mr Bell substituted for Mr Goldsworthy.

#### **Departmental Advisers:**

Mr S. Ashby, Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr J. Coleman, Acting Chief Executive, ForestrySA.

Mr S. West, Executive Director, Forestry, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr D. Frater, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Mr J. Zwijnenburg, Acting Chief Financial Officer, ForestrySA.

Mr S. Johnke, Director, Finance and Prudential Management, Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

Ms R. Skewes, Manager, Cabinet and Ministerial Coordination.

**The CHAIR:** I call on the minister in his role as Minister for Forests to introduce his new advisers and make an opening statement.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The government's interests in forestry are managed by both PIRSA and ForestrySA. I would like to introduce the members of the department and ForestrySA who are here today. To my right is Jerome Coleman, Acting Chief Executive of ForestrySA. On my left is Scott Ashby, Chief Executive of PIRSA, and Stuart West, Executive Director, Forestry, PIRSA. Behind me are Jeroen Zwijnenburg, Acting Chief Financial Officer, ForestrySA, Don Frater, Deputy Chief Executive, PIRSA and Stephen Johninke, Director, Finance and Prudential Management, PIRSA.

PIRSA is responsible for providing policy advice to the government in relation to the forest and wood products industry, including associated environmental matters, and for developing the industry in this state. ForestrySA has responsibility for the day-to-day, on-the-ground management of the state's forests. Yesterday I was in Mount Gambier to announce the agreement between the South Australian government and OneFortyOne Plantations Proprietary Limited to assume full responsibility for managing OneFortyOne Plantations in the South-East. The transfer of responsibilities is expected to occur by October this year, pending no unforeseen delays.

This agreement between the government and OneFortyOne simplifies the forest management of the estate and will create certainty for existing ForestrySA employees currently employed to assist with the management of OneFortyOne Plantations. It will also create certainty for the South-East forest industry as a whole. During the transition period, both ForestrySA and OneFortyOne will be conducting a business-as-usual approach. Due to the close working relationship both organisations have developed over the past 2½ years, disruption to business and services is expected to be minimal.

After the transition period, ForestrySA will continue to manage ForestrySA's existing softwood plantation operations in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Mid North forests; community service functions, including the fire management of non-OneFortyOne forest estates; management of 23,000 hectares of native forests in the South-East, Mount Lofty Ranges and the Mid North; public access of forest reserves in the South-East, Mount Lofty Ranges, Mid North and the OneFortyOne leased plantation area; and forest industry development activities.

There are no changes to forest management arrangements in the Mount Lofty Ranges or the Mid North. ForestrySA will retain staff in the Green Triangle who were not predominantly involved in providing services to OneFortyOne under the original management agreement. I would also like to reassure everyone that there will be no changes to the present fire management levels as a result of this latest agreement. ForestrySA will retain responsibility for fire protection and management outside the OneFortyOne forest estate, and OneFortyOne will provide protection and management of its forestry estate.

The fire equipment required to manage the OneFortyOne estate will transfer to OneFortyOne, while ForestrySA will retain the necessary equipment and resources to maintain fire protection beyond the OneFortyOne estate in the South-East, along with the forests in the Mount Lofty Ranges and Mid North regions. Plant and equipment, IT systems and services required for the management of the non-OneFortyOne forest assets will be retained by ForestrySA.

The state government will continue to own the ForestrySA headquarters in Mount Gambier, and part of it will be leased to OneFortyOne. The government will also continue to retain ownership of the forest land, water and carbon rights. With this new agreement, the government has ensured that there will be no changes to the conditions relating to rotation length, domestic supply arrangements, annual reporting requirement or replanting obligations, which will continue to help ensure the long-term future of the industry.

In September last year, I released the Blueprint for the Future South Australian Forest and Wood Products Industry (2014-2040) and the Forest and Wood Products Industry Policy Statement. These involved significant consultation with industry and have identified a range of opportunities which could achieve significant economic, social and environmental outcomes for the sector. The government is continuing to work with industry to drive the activities identified in the blueprint,

including initiating discussions to establish a unified voice for the industry and realising the opportunities for innovation and collaborative research.

The recommendations from the VTT stage II report of the cellulosic fibre value chain study, which were identified in the blueprint, include exploring the use of new wood products and value-adding opportunities for underutilised wood fibre and residues. The VTT recommendations were also incorporated into the application criteria for the government's South East Forestry Partnerships Program.

This program reflects the government's continued commitment to ensure investment continues to support improvements in productivity through modernisation and innovation. The government established the South East Forestry Partnerships Program in November 2012. To date, grants totalling \$27 million have been approved for 15 significant projects which will generate total investments in the region's forestry industry exceeding \$79 million.

PIRSA also continues to work with other government agencies, such as the Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources, and industry across a range of issues impacting on forestry. PIRSA is also leading the government's Mid North Forests—Future Strategy during 2015 to set out a way forward for the industry, government and the community to determine the future direction the Mid North forests could take for the benefit of the region and the state.

PIRSA has a memorandum of administrative arrangement with ForestrySA to manage and fund non-commercial forestry activities of benefit to all South Australians. Annual programs and performance targets have been developed by ForestrySA in consultation with PIRSA. These programs recognise the importance of forestry and forest reserve uses to the people of South Australia. The ForestrySA budget is based on an ongoing transformation to be a more effective and efficient forest owner in the Mount Lofty Ranges, forest manager in the Green Triangle for OneFortyOne Plantations, and a renewed focus on implementing the community service obligations in the Mid North.

ForestrySA has achieved progress in the restructuring of its operations. In July 2014, the government approved a targeted voluntary separation package program which saw 66 staff accept voluntary separation packages. This investment of \$9.6 million should realise a saving of \$16 million over three years. A commercial system upgrade program has been delivered, providing considerable operational efficiencies. This allowed the restructure of the administration functions while providing a platform to improve the delivery of forest management services.

The Mount Lofty Ranges forests have been impacted by two significant fire events. The Sampson Flat fire in January 2015 saw approximately 176,000 cubic metres of standing pine plantation timber lost and some 2,500 hectares of native vegetation burnt. This will require the Port Adelaide export log business to continue to complete the fire salvage.

The second fire event was at the SA Pine Pty Ltd sawmill, which has further impacted log sales and the resultant cash flows. ForestrySA is still managing the impact of the Mid North's Bundaleer and Bangor fires in 2013 and 2014 respectively. ForestrySA has completed the fire salvage and has stopped the exporting of burnt timber. Its new focus is the Mid North community service obligations, in particular fire protection and the re-establishment of recreation and tourism in the forests. Since the first trial plantings in Bundaleer in 1876, the Mid North forests have become an important tourism and recreational asset for the local and wider community.

ForestrySA has also been negotiating new commercial arrangements for log supply in the Mid North and has been actively involved in the Mid North Forests—Future Strategy process. The market for softwood logs has stabilised over the past year, with strong domestic and solid export markets. This has resulted in a forecast improvement of \$500,000 during the 2014-15 budget estimate. The government acknowledges the important contribution forestry makes to the state of South Australia and more importantly to its regional economies.

**Mr BELL:** My questions relate to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 32 and concern compliance with ForestrySA's forward sale and contractual requirements. It is obviously not a big section, as there are only two pages, but it might reflect some of the forests goings-on. Did OneFortyOne indicate that they were not intending to renew the management contract in 2017? Is that what has led to this change in agreement?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** In discussions with OneFortyOne over the period of time that I have been the Minister for Forests, I think it has not looked like it was more than a 50 per cent chance, and we had to prepare ourselves for that eventuation if that is what actually happened. We had to look at all possibilities, and the thing I wanted to have as the main priority was job security for the 74 ForestrySA workers, particularly those 60 workers who were involved in the management of the OneFortyOne plantations, which is one of those roles you have as minister: you have to look at what the potential is and if there is something that might not go as we would have liked.

In an ideal world, we would like to have had a five-year term, where ForestrySA and its staff managed those forests on behalf of OneFortyOne, followed by a further five-year contract. I know that there were some frustrations, not with the workers—the workers are considered some of the best workers anywhere in the country when it comes to the management of forests—but for people who had to deal with two organisations instead of one organisation. I am sure as the local member you will have heard similar sorts of things as I have heard from industry, where sometimes they did not know whether they had to go to OneFortyOne or to ForestrySA to get the answers they required.

OneFortyOne did come to us with a suggestion. We had a good look through it. As I said at the outset, the welfare of those 74 workers and their families was uppermost in our mind. If anything was to happen, if we were to reach agreement, there had to be a very good deal for those workers. I went down yesterday and broke the news to those workers in person because it is big news for them and it is going to require some adjustment.

If you have 74 people, you have 74 individual reactions. Some people will say, 'This is fine; I am happy to transfer over. My rights and all my entitlements will transfer over with me. If I'm on an enterprise bargaining agreement, the only thing that will change in there is that instead of it being with ForestrySA it will be with OneFortyOne plantations.' The other change, I guess, is the fact that those entitlements will reach out to June 2018 now, instead of October 2017.

We think that we have come up with the best deal possible for the workers, but it will be up to all those individuals. No-one is going to be forced to move from ForestrySA over to OneFortyOne, and that is the important thing that people need to remember. We want to give them every assistance we can. We have an open-door policy in terms of, if they want to speak to anyone within OneFortyOne or ForestrySA; those doors are open for questions, and people will be given considered answers about what the future may hold for them.

The other really important thing was fire security, to make sure that there would be no deterioration in the level of fire coverage we have in the South-East. I am pleased to say that that was signed off on by OneFortyOne and the government. I guess the two really important things for us were the welfare and job security of the staff and for the firefighting capacity and capability to be maintained. They have been put out there as two non-negotiables as far as we were concerned and they are two things that have been signed off in this agreement.

**Mr BELL:** In terms of intellectual property, can you explain to the committee what is going to occur with that if you sit back and look at it and say, 'Right, ForestrySA no longer has the management contracts.' If that was a private organisation, they would shut down the systems that they have in place. There would be no transfer over of intellectual property, modelling, data, software or a whole range of IP that gives credit. In that explanation, would it be true to say that the government may have underplayed its hand if it transfers that IP across at no cost?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We retain the IP. We will give them a licence to use that IP. The whole IP factor was considered in the deal that was done. We are not giving anything away.

**Mr BELL:** Will that have a return to the state taxpayer in terms of a licensing fee, or is it just a licence for a period of time?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a perpetual licence.

**Mr BELL:** But there is no cost associated with it?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No cost to us. The consideration has been taken up-front in the overall consideration of the deal.

**Mr BELL:** In terms of staff, I really want to focus on that, where I genuinely believe your concern is as well. You are assuming 60 staff will transfer across to OneFortyOne. Let's play devil's advocate and say that no staff transfer across, so you have OneFortyOne looking for 60 staff and you have ForestrySA with 74 staff sitting on its books. What are your mechanisms in terms of dealing with that type of scenario?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We have three weeks to work out who is going to move over to OneFortyOne and who will not move over to OneFortyOne. I guess we will deal with the reality once we know what the reality is.

**Mr BELL:** Am I correct in my assumption that you are asking public servants, who are permanent, to at best take up a three-year contract with a private provider?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That offer is there, but they do not have to accept that offer.

**Mr BELL:** But that is the case: if they go over to OneFortyOne, they will have a three-year contract, because at best it ends in 2018?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, that is right. At the moment, the deal with OneFortyOne goes through until October 2017.

**Mr BELL:** Yes, with the right of renewal that could have been in there. What is the total cost to the South Australian taxpayer in breaking the previous agreement? I will give some clarity around that. I imagine that there are long service leave and sick leave entitlements that quite rightly will transfer across for any staff who take those positions up, but that is actually a liability that would be sitting on someone's books somewhere. What is the total cost if all 60 go across? How much extra money is the state government going to be putting in to cover those existing workplace arrangements?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Without breaking down line by line what this deal is worth, I think the safe thing to say is that this deal is not going to cost the government anything. In fact, over the next seven years the government will be more than \$30 million better off.

**Mr BELL:** So OneFortyOne will pick up the tab for existing sick leave and long service leave that has accrued over a period of time?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That has been part of the negotiations. As I said, it is commercial in confidence, but the taxpayers of South Australia are not going to be out of pocket on this deal.

**Mr BELL:** Again, more to do with the compliance issues, have there been any compliance issues raised by ForestrySA, OneFortyOne or timber processors to do with the current contract conditions that are in place? Have there been any concerns raised in the last 12 months on the forward sale conditions?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thanks again for the question, member for Mount Gambier. I might ask Stuart West, the Executive Director of Forestry, to answer that question.

**Mr WEST:** OneFortyOne is required to submit an annual compliance report to the government and they have done that as per the requirements. Many of the details of the compliance reporting are confidential as per the original negotiations, but OneFortyOne have submitted their compliance reports and have complied since their involvement in the business.

**Mr BELL:** So there have been no complaints about OneFortyOne's dealings up to this date?

**Mr WEST:** No, there have not.

**Mr BELL:** Who specifically monitors the compliance of OneFortyOne's requirements tied up with the forward sale?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** PIRSA does that monitoring.

**Mr BELL:** Is there a certain person within PIRSA or is it a team of people? Who specifically monitors the conditions of the forward sale and the compliance of those?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The forest policy unit, led by Mr Stuart West.

**Mr BELL:** Are you able to detail for the committee their qualifications? That can be taken on notice, but can we have a detailed breakdown?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I will ask Mr West to answer that one.

**Mr WEST:** I lead that group. I have a Bachelor of Science in forestry. My staff have either forestry degrees or up to 25 years of forestry-related experience. Most of my staff have worked for ForestrySA or its previous structure, the woods and forests department, at some point in their career. We have appropriately qualified people to look at the required elements, but it is led by me.

**Mr BELL:** Minister, just to clarify: how many people are in that team? Stuart obviously heads it up, but how many people are in that team?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Six people.

**Mr BELL:** Can you inform the committee when the report is published, the bits that can be published?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is tabled annually.

**Mr BELL:** A date—1 July, December?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I think it is May, from memory.

**Mr BELL:** One thing that has puzzled me is the mechanics of Carter Holt Harvey. Can the minister explain the mechanics of the supply agreement with Carter Holt Harvey, considering they have not novated their contract from ForestrySA over to OneFortyOne? What I am trying to get at is: does ForestrySA purchase the wood from OneFortyOne to then sell it to Carter Holt Harvey? The agreement is between Carter Holt Harvey and ForestrySA, not Carter Holt Harvey and OneFortyOne. I just want to understand those mechanics.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I will ask Mr Jerome Coleman to provide some in-depth information about that.

**Mr COLEMAN:** There is a back-to-back arrangement in place between ourselves and OneFortyOne. It is a fairly common occurrence, when you have a major business sale, that you novate your agreements, but a novation requires the agreement of all parties. In this particular case, Carter Holt Harvey did not agree to the transaction, so there is an agreement between OneFortyOne and ForestrySA to effect the same agreement as if a novation was in place. In short, there is a contractual relationship that exists, but for all intents and purposes, it is as if it is novated.

**Mr BELL:** Does the state government, through ForestrySA, take any percentage or any difference in what they purchase and what they sell back to Carter Holt Harvey, which they commonly call 'clip the ticket' on the way through? Is there any of that or is it just a straight transfer?

**Mr COLEMAN:** No.

**Mr GEE:** I refer the committee to Program 2: Forestry Policy, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 38 and 39. Will the minister advise how the \$7.12 million available in the third phase of the South East Forestry Partnerships Program will be used to maintain jobs and allow the forestry industry to grow?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** On 16 June this year, I announced funding for \$7.12 million from the South East Forestry Partnership Program phase 3, which will contribute to six projects with a combined total of almost \$25 million. The projects represent a significant investment in this key industry for the state and in particular for the Limestone Coast. The successful applicants were South East Pine Sales Proprietary Limited, with \$1.873 million to implement a new softwoods sawmill process. This will involve scanning and sawing, optimisation capability as well as the installation of a light organic solvent preservative timber treatment process. This investment will secure 30 current jobs as well as create an initial four to five full-time equivalents and one part-time role.

Another one was Roundwood Solutions Proprietary Limited, with \$1.58 million for a new combined gasifier and biochar plant. The plant will utilise wood residues from current operations, such as sawdust, shavings and woodchips, to produce biochar and hot air. Hot air will be used to generate steam to dry posts—we could do with one of those in here maybe. Biochar will be sold as

a fertiliser extender in local forests and agricultural markets, and this investment will provide work for up to five engineering trades workers during construction and initial commissioning. Once operational, it will provide employment to an additional 2½ full-time equivalents. Biochar will be a new product and a new skill will be required to produce it.

H&L Scheidl Pty Ltd. receives \$1 million for a new kiln, drying facility and treatment plant. This will value add to existing products, expand Scheidl's market and increase utilisation of forest products. The kiln will be heated by both solar energy and a bioplant run on mill residues. The post peeling line will enable more posts to be produced. It is anticipated the project will create an additional five full-time equivalents. The new equipment will require the skill base of existing employees to expand.

3RT Holding Pty Ltd. receives \$993,668 for a new customised 3RT Strand technology production unit in Mount Gambier. Low-value wood, which is the first thinnings and the damaged logs and mill offcuts, will be transformed into high-value timber products, being compressed wood, with similar properties to mature hardwood. The production unit will initially require five skilled workers, leading to 20 new employees when in full capacity mode. Development and expansion of the production unit will require uniquely skilled operators and technicians.

Timberlink Australia receives \$1.115 million for a new high-speed board sorter, scanner, stacker and cleat grading system to enable processing of more small log. The investment will allow the current Tarpeena greenmill assets to run at maximum capacity. This investment will continue to support the current employment level at the Tarpeena site and will require an additional four employees. A substantial specialty contract labour resource will also be required.

The Association of Green Triangle Growers Incorporated receive \$550,000 for a feasibility study into opportunities to increase processing capacity in the Green Triangle region. The development of a state-of-the-art processing facility will provide a significant opportunity for highly skilled employment during the construction phase of the project, should the outcomes of the proposed full feasibility studies support such an investment. These projects will help transform the industry in the South-East so it is globally competitive.

The South East Forestry Partnership Program is a \$27 million merit-based grant program. Its aim is to assist the forestry industry and forest products industry recovery by encouraging further investment in new and existing businesses. It supports the development of innovative products and technologies to increase sales volume and log throughput, making the entire forestry supply chain in the South-East more sustainable. Phase 3 builds on the investment in 2013 in phase 1, which resulted in the government funding \$15.38 million for five projects. The projects are expected to contribute approximately \$34 million of joint investment in the forest processing sector in the South-East.

On 13 January 2015, I announced \$4½ million of funding from the South East Forestry Partnership Program. Phase 2 for four projects are expected to contribute a combined total of almost \$22.2 million to the local economy. The total value of the SEFPP projects and government funding is estimated at more than \$79 million and includes applicant contributions of around \$52 million. It is envisaged that further leverage from applicants will occur once all the projects are underway.

**Mr BELL:** Minister, could you explain why Roundwood Solutions cannot get a log supply agreement with OneFortyOne, even though they are recipients of one of those grants that you just mentioned?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That is probably a question you should direct to OneFortyOne, and if you do not get an appropriate answer, come back and I will talk to you about it and see what we can find out.

**Mr BELL:** I am just interested in the assets such as the Fire Kings, which will cause some concern down in my area. Are they to be sold or transferred at commercial rates to OneFortyOne, or are they just going to be given away?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** They definitely will not be given away. They got transferred to OneFortyOne at their commercial value.

**Mr BELL:** The only other question I have, minister, concerns the South East Forestry Partnership Program. If there are any unspent funds from the South East Forestry Partnership Program (i.e., a project has received funding but does not progress for whatever reason) will that money come back into the fund, or will it go to general revenue?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The fund is currently fully acquitted, so I guess it is a hypothetical question, but my personal view is that the money should stay in the South-East. It was promised to the people of the South-East. It is an important industry, of course, as you well know. We have discussed this many times. I think we are both very passionate about supporting the timber industry in the South-East. Any way that we can help out that timber industry, we will do that. While it is a hypothetical question, it would be my intention to make sure that money goes where we said it would go.

**Mr BELL:** I appreciate that. Thank you, minister.

**The CHAIR:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments adjourned and referred to committee B.

*Sitting suspended from 12:46 to 13:45.*

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION, \$69,007,000**

**MINISTER FOR TOURISM, \$4,796,000**

**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE,  
\$1,592,537,000**

**Membership:**

Mr Pisoni substituted for Mr Bell.

Mr Knoll substituted for Mr Pederick.

**Minister:**

Hon. L.W.K. Bignell, Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr R. Harrex, Chief Executive, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Ms S. Rozokos, Chief Financial Officer, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr M. Warren, Director, Motor Sport Group, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr N. Jones, General Manager, Destination Development and International Marketing, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Ms H. Rasheed, General Manager, Events SA, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Ms E. Nicholls, Director, Marketing and Communications, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr A. Gilbert, Chief Executive Officer, Adelaide Convention Centre.

Mr A. Kirchner, Chief Executive Officer, Adelaide Entertainment Centre.

Mr L. Harrington, Director of Finance, Adelaide Convention Centre.

**The CHAIR:** I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements at Volume 4. I call on the minister to make an opening statement if he has one and to introduce his advisers.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** What a great week it has been for tourism in South Australia. It was fantastic to welcome the Liverpool Football Club to Adelaide this week, along with 10,000 visitors from interstate and overseas who came to watch the friendly against Adelaide United. Major events are a significant economic driver for the state, with this game in particular pumping an estimated \$10 million into the local economy. It was fantastic to see Adelaide Oval filled with 53,000 spectators for Liverpool's inaugural match in South Australia, taking the total number of people to visit the redeveloped stadium to 107,000 in just two days with the inclusion of the record-breaking Showdown 39 on Sunday afternoon.

The state government has identified 10 economic priority areas which will ensure South Australia continues to unlock its full potential. Tourism and the visitor economy is an economic priority for the state, and the 2015-16 South Australian budget reinforces the government's confidence in the value of the tourism industry to our economy. The state budget included a major funding package of almost \$50 million over two years to drive the economy and create jobs in two growth industries: tourism and international education.

During the past year, more than five million overnight visitors spent more than \$5.2 billion in South Australia across 18,000 tourism businesses, directly employing 32,000 South Australians. Although only about 23 per cent of South Australians live in the state's regions, these areas account for 43 per cent of tourism expenditure, underlining the importance of tourism to our regional economies and regional jobs.

The additional funds will support the government's efforts in achieving the full potential of an \$8 billion tourism industry by 2020. This would generate a further 10,000 jobs in South Australia. This is an ambitious target with strong market gains required. It is the perfect time to invest in the growing tourism industry. The additional funds will be invested in promoting Adelaide and South Australia to Australia and to the world and to raise awareness for our competitive strengths in food and wine, festivals and events, accessible nature and wildlife and a vibrant city.

At the heart of the funding package in the state budget for tourism is \$35 million over two years to promote South Australia to domestic and key international markets to secure new major events and conferences and to create thousands of tourism-related jobs. The South Australian Tourism Commission has been tasked with allocating these funds to deliver maximum impact for the state and for the tourism industry.

Also, \$14 million will be spent on increasing tourism marketing in our key international markets. The additional funds will help to achieve our target of increasing expenditure from international visitors from \$735 million to \$1.24 billion and maintaining and growing air capacity, taking international weekly seats into Adelaide from 12,200 to 14,500.

The investment will allow us to undertake additional marketing in China, India, Malaysia and Singapore, as well as the UK, USA, Germany and New Zealand. This will create further visitor expenditure, protect and increase direct air access and grow trade and business investment opportunities. China is a key market and will be allocated a further \$3 million to promote South Australia through partnerships with key airlines, digital social media campaigns, hosting influential media in South Australia, collaborating with the education sector and leveraging the Hong Kong Ocean Park opportunity.

Malaysia and Singapore will have funding of \$1 million for a digital online campaign in Malaysia, as well as a campaign with Singapore's largest media corporation, MediaCorp, to leverage broadcast, radio, magazine and newspaper promotions. In addition, \$1 million will be spent in India to drive and grow visitors by maintaining and increasing momentum from the ICC Cricket World Cup match through a public relations strategy and activities in India.

The US, the UK and New Zealand will be allocated an additional \$2 million which will focus on a dedicated marketing campaign aimed at building awareness and leveraging direct flights into bookings. The domestic market is also very important for the state, and we have allocated \$6 million to marketing campaigns to promote Adelaide and regional tourism experiences to the rest of

Australia. The aim is to increase expenditure from interstate visitors from \$1.37 billion to \$2.13 billion, as well as increase intrastate expenditure from \$1.19 billion to \$1.61 billion.

The funds will be used to boost activities which increase awareness, consideration, visitation and expenditure from our interstate markets. There will also be a focus on the state's regions, as we aim to increase expenditure in regional South Australia from \$2.24 billion a year to \$3.55 billion. Regions are a key element of the state's story and will feature strongly as part of our national marketing strategy. There will be targeted promotion of the state's five touring routes. This will focus on the self-drive holiday market by partnering with the state's motoring industry, and this market share is estimated to be worth \$326 million—or 24 per cent—of South Australia's total overnight expenditure.

Major events and conferences are integral to the tourism strategy for South Australia. They drive visitation expenditure and hotel occupancy while also helping to create vibrancy and a sense of pride in our state. We have recently integrated the South Australian Motor Sport Board with the South Australian Tourism Commission, the Clipsal 500 and the Bridgestone World Solar Challenge to complement our other iconic South Australian events managed and supported by Events South Australia, such as the Credit Union Christmas Pageant, the Santos Tour Down Under and Tasting Australia.

These events are great examples of events which not only showcase our state as a unique destination but also attract visitors, spectators and event participants as well as create jobs, increase spend and lengthen the time visitors stay. Securing major events is very competitive, and it is absolutely vital that the state government is equipped to compete on the world stage. With this in mind, \$15 million has been allocated to the state government's Event Bid Fund. This includes \$5 million to secure conventions, meetings and exhibitions. This will ensure that the potential of the newly-redeveloped Adelaide Convention Centre and the Riverbank is fully utilised. This will deliver greater economic and employment impact through the direct spending of delegates.

Business travellers are high yielding, spending more than \$600 per day, which has economic impact for accommodation, retailers, bars and restaurants. The existing \$2 million bid fund has ensured that the state has been able to vigorously pursue major convention opportunities in competition with other states. As of 15 May 2015, the Adelaide Convention Centre Fund has helped secure 12 major conventions due to be held between 2015 and 2020. These conventions combined will bring more than 14,000 delegates to Adelaide and generate \$55.3 million in economic benefit for South Australia.

Ten million dollars of the events bid fund has been allocated to securing new events. It will build on the 10 events already secured through the fund, which are forecast to have an economic benefit of more than \$50 million. The expanded fund will allow the state to secure and develop even more major conventions, sporting, music and arts events, such as the Liverpool match at the Adelaide Oval. Attracting these events will generate significant benefits for our visitor economy and local businesses, as well as create and support hundreds of jobs. Consideration and priority will be given to events held in the quieter off-peak periods, events which utilise the state government's investment in infrastructure, events which provide business and diplomatic opportunities and regional events.

In addition to the \$35 million, \$6 million over four years has been allocated to further promote and grow the Santos Tour Down Under. The Tour Down Under injects almost \$50 million into the state's economy and creates about 450 jobs. This year's event attracted more than 37,000 visitors from interstate and overseas, who travelled especially to South Australia to see the biggest UCI world tour event staged outside of Europe and experience our premium food and wine, stunning regions and vibrant city. The new funds will allow the Tour Down Under to introduce new elements as well, such as continuing to grow and integrate women's cycling and women's content into the event, grow and improve the broadcast content and reach and a focus on international marketing and media activations.

The Adelaide Fashion Festival will also receive \$2 million over four years to establish the event in the CBD with a renewed focus on Asian markets. The South Australian Tourism Commission took ownership of the event with the aim of promoting South Australia to a target audience, which

includes a China focus, and driving further growth in South Australia's local fashion and creative industries, from retail to design and associated industries.

Fashion events are rapidly growing in popularity in countries such as China, a key market in which we want to promote South Australia. The funding will allow future events to sell a broader South Australian story through traditional and non-traditional media channels, including bloggers, to leverage trade and tourism opportunities and to open China as a market for production and distribution for fashion. Establishing the festival in the CBD supports our vibrant city economic priority and builds on developments already occurring in the CBD, including South Australia's first Tiffany's store and a new global headquarters for local company Australian Fashion Labels on North Terrace.

The 2015-16 state budget recognises the need to work collaboratively with allied sectors such as international education. Therefore, the state budget also includes \$5.7 million over four years for a Destination Adelaide campaign to further market South Australia to international students and their families. The benefits of international students extend far beyond the institutions where they study. About half of the students bring a partner or child and about a quarter of the students are visited by a parent during their stay. This funding injection will help market Adelaide as the pre-eminent destination for education and create ongoing tourism and trade opportunities. More than 30,000 international students are enrolled across South Australia and the sector is worth an estimated \$972 million to the state each year.

South Australia has the iconic products and experiences international and domestic travellers are seeking, such as the accessibility of our nature and wildlife experiences and our premium food and wine. The South Australian Tourism Commission has the expertise to showcase this to the world. The South Australian Tourism Commission is committed to delivering real economic benefits, promoting confidence and pride amongst South Australians, helping to deliver on the principle of a vibrant city and establishing our state as the destination choice for international and domestic travellers. The team has exhibited strong leadership and strategic thinking which has set the stage for this renewed focus and investment in the tourism industry.

The South Australian Tourism Commission has an incredibly important role to play as we transition from the old economy to the new economy. The investment in tourism underpins the expectations that tourism will deliver significant economic benefits and create jobs for our state. Tourism is a tough and competitive business which demands investment, strategic thinking and innovative approaches, all of which build and showcase South Australia's strength.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the commitment of the South Australian Tourism Commission and the industry for continuing to work towards growing this important economic driver for South Australia.

**Mr PISONI:** I would like to take the minister to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 140, Program 2: Tourism Events. The purpose of this program is to attract new events and grow existing events. Last year, the minister with an adviser visited Scotland to attend the Commonwealth Games to promote Adelaide's bid to host the games in 2026 and 2030.

This morning when I asked why only one hotel room was paid for at the Radisson Blu Hotel when the minister and his staff member visited Edinburgh, the minister stated, 'There were two rooms booked, there were two rooms used.' The opposition has checked the minister's receipt for that accommodation and it shows that a total of £412 was paid for two nights of bed-and-breakfast accommodation in one room. The Radisson Blu's website shows that their cheapest bed-and-breakfast package is £186 per night.

The opposition is concerned that the published total cost of the minister's trip may be inaccurate and that additional expenditure for a second room may not have been revealed, as required. Will the minister please clarify whether an additional payment was made for accommodation at Radisson Blu Hotel that has not been disclosed?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for his question. I did receive that question this morning and we investigated afterwards. Every month, under the disclosure rules, we put up all the costs of travel and other things that have happened in our office. Under the total cost, all those figures were there, but you are relying on something that you put in a freedom of information application on and, for one reason or another, you received in that freedom of information application

the receipt for my room, but there was also another receipt that you did not receive and I think that was also for £412. There were actually two rooms paid for, but it did not come to you in the FOI application, for some reason.

**Mr PISONI:** In the public disclosure that is required on the purchase card summary of expenditure that is available online, there is no second room. As a matter of fact, your credit card is not there for the month of August. Have you failed to publicly disclose that second invoice?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I do not know. It is definitely here and it has been sent through to me from my office, so I have a copy of that and I am quite prepared to give you a copy of that receipt. It looks like it must have been some sort of administration error or something like that.

**Mr PISONI:** On whose credit card was that paid?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I am not sure, but we can get all that information and get that back to you. The thing is that there were two rooms and there were two bills and they have both been paid for.

**The CHAIR:** Are there any questions on my right?

**Mr GEE:** Can the minister advise what the Adelaide Convention Centre bid fund achieved in 2014—

**The CHAIR:** What budget line are you on?

**Mr GEE:** Actually, we will come back to my questions, Madam Chair.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** Back to me? Thank you very much. Minister, are you confident in saying that this is the only error in your accounting processes for the total cost? It has been reported that \$170,000 was spent on overseas travel last year, and there is certainly no publicly disclosed amount available for the Radisson Blu Hotel for a second room. Nor is it available through the FOI process with the request for ministerial expenses and ministerial staff expenses and credit cards. How confident can we be in the public disclosure of the figures your office publishes concerning ministerial expenses and ministerial office expenses as directed by the Premier?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I would be more confident in the work that our office does than some of the things you put up in this place as fact. I think what happens when bills are paid for is they do not necessarily get paid for by the person who has had the room with their credit card because quite often they are paid for in advance by the ministerial office.

**Mr GEE:** Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 151. Can the minister advise what the Adelaide Convention Centre bid fund achieved in 2014-15, and what is planned for the 2015-16 financial year?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for his question. The state government allocated \$2 million over two years (2014-15 and 2015-16) towards an Adelaide Convention Centre bid fund. The funding was announced by the state government in November 2013. This fund is administered jointly by the SATC, the Adelaide Convention Centre and the Adelaide Convention Bureau.

The additional funding has ensured South Australia has been able to vigorously pursue major convention opportunities in competition with other states. This has been done with great success to date at a return on investment of 76:1, which is an incredible figure. For every dollar that we spend, \$76 gets spent in our state. The fund is used only to attract events to the Adelaide Convention Centre; however, the economic and job benefits are spread across many sectors such as accommodation, retailers, bars and restaurants.

As of 16 June 2015, the convention bid fund has helped secure 13 major conventions due to be held between 2015 and 2020. These conventions combined will bring more than 15,000 delegates to Adelaide and generate \$61.2 million in economic benefit for the state. The above result represents a 76:1 return on investment for the fund. In May 2015, there were an additional 14 active and proposed bids for events with a total of 16,900 delegates and an estimated economic value of more than \$89 million. Some of the wins as a result of the fund are:

- Australian Wine Industry Technical Conference in 2016 and 2019, with 3,000 delegates (1,500 per event), 15,058 bed nights (7,500 per event) and a total estimated economic benefit of \$12.4 million to the state (\$6.2 million per event);
- SimTecT and SimHealth Conference 2015, with 800 delegates and an estimated economic benefit of \$2.5 million to the state;
- Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association Conference and Exhibition 2018, with 2,500 delegates, 5,915 bed nights and a \$9.4 million estimated economic benefit to the state;
- International Council on Systems Engineering International Symposium 2017, with 750 delegates, 4,330 bed nights and a \$4.7 million estimated economic benefit to the state;
- Australian Society of Exploration Geophysicists 2016, with 800 delegates, 2,294 bed nights and \$1.9 million estimated economic benefit to the state;
- Royal Australasian College of Surgeons ASC 2017, with 2,000 delegates, 12,516 bed nights and \$9.8 million estimated economic benefit to the state;
- World Federation of Rose Societies Conference 2016, with 600 delegates, 6,279 bed nights and \$4.3 million estimated economic benefit to the state; and
- AusBiotech 2017 with 1,000 delegates, 4,249 bed nights and \$4.4 million estimated economic benefit to the state.

The South Australian Tourism Commission has received an additional appropriation of \$5 million over two years to secure more national and international business conventions to Adelaide. This is in addition to the \$2 million over 2014-15 and 2015-16. The additional funding will capitalise on the significant government investment in the redeveloped and expanded Adelaide Convention Centre and Riverbank by further boosting the Adelaide Convention Centre's ability to secure major national and international conferences. These conventions bring a significant number of delegates to Adelaide, delivering a significant economic return to the state and creating job opportunities.

Business travellers are high yielding by nature, spending more than \$600 per day. For this reason, the global convention industry is now highly competitive, with destinations 'buying' events due to the economic value of conventions to their destination city. It is generally expected that for every dollar invested by a bid fund in a major international event the return to the local economy can be as much as \$100, depending on the size and complexity of the event, the length of the convention and pre and post touring of delegates.

Beyond tourism and economic benefits, conventions deliver knowledge transformation for local industry with visiting delegates and global industry leaders; fostering of innovation and creativity, thereby boosting productivity; international profile and awareness for South Australia's industries and achievements; business to business opportunities resulting in export dollars; and research and investment attraction.

Importantly, business events also support the government's move to an advanced manufacturing economy, being closely aligned to the key medical research themes of SAHMRI and the universities, along with high-tech events which will assist the development of defence, bioscience, agribusiness and ICT.

**Mr GEE:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 140 to 142. Can the minister please provide an update on the latest developments for the 2015 Adelaide Fashion Festival?

**The CHAIR:** I know he will be mentioning the national calisthenics championship at some point, just from leafing through these papers, won't you?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Again, I thank the member for his question. The Adelaide Fashion Festival was established in 2008 by the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council. Its focus was to profile developing South Australian designers and to promote the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters district and drive a retail

spike in this area. Since its inception, the council has grown the event from a local community event to one which takes in the CBD and metropolitan Adelaide.

In January 2015, the state government entered into discussions with the council on the future management and funding of the festival. In February 2015, it was agreed the South Australian Tourism Commission would take ownership of the event. Events South Australia is currently reviewing past events and meeting with current and potential event stakeholders for feedback and ideas. The initial feedback is to make the Adelaide Fashion Festival shorter, with a higher impact and international level of quality. A program is being created based on that feedback.

Key goals for the event include promoting South Australia to a target audience, which includes Asia—initially China and specifically Shandong—driving further growth in South Australia's local fashion and creative industries from retail to design and associated industries and adding another significant event to South Australia's events calendar which contributes to the state brand and is consistent with the vibrant city agenda.

The 2015 event and future events will look to leverage the sister city relationship with Qingdao in the Shandong region; use the Adelaide Fashion Festival as a vehicle to sell the broader South Australian story through traditional and non-traditional media channels, including bloggers; leverage trade and tourism opportunities; open up China as a market for production and distribution and for fashion designs for South Australian businesses; and support those already in the market, including Australian Fashion Labels, which has just opened two offices in China. The festival will also work with Education Adelaide, TAFE and Flinders University to attract students.

**Mr GEE:** I have one more question, and the reference is Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 144 to 145. Can the minister tell us what domestic marketing initiatives have been undertaken by the state government in 2014-15 and what activities are planned for 2015-16?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I once again thank the member for the question. This will be of interest to the member for Schubert, who I know is a keen fan of the Barossa. Be Consumed ad, which in 2014-15 was the main focus of the state government's domestic marketing activities. The Barossa campaign included TV, cinema, an activation in Sydney and online activity. In addition, activity for the Adelaide Breathe campaign included cinema, online and press. For these campaigns, the state government partnered with a retail travel agent or airline to be able to offer a retail package or contact number and website for consumers to get more information.

Activity in the intrastate Best Backyard campaign also continued in 2014-15, showcasing the unique products and experiences of the state's individual regions, to give South Australians compelling reasons to visit the regions. Region-specific TV commercials aired on TV, supported by outdoor and online activity. A radio campaign promoted regional events and seasonal experiences from each of the regions, including prerecorded and live reads, competitions, online and social media. We also partnered with Stayz for the Best Backyard campaign to point consumers to [stayz.com.au](http://stayz.com.au) for great accommodation deals around the state.

In addition to the marketing activity, we trained, presented and familiarised 1,114 individual travel consultants and other key trade personnel. We entered into a sponsorship agreement with Virgin Australia to promote four of South Australia's premier events, namely, the Santos Tour Down Under, Adelaide Fringe, Clipsal 500 and WOMADelaide. They also involved Virgin Australia holidays packaging and selling holiday packages to these events. We implemented 22 marketing campaigns, with 15 partners promoting South Australia as a holiday destination. As an example, the following provides information on the three largest co-operative campaigns undertaken:

- campaign activity in partnership with Flight Centre, involving nationwide retail in-store South Australia window displays, national newspaper advertising, emails to Flight Centre's database, and inclusion in Flight Centre's national monthly magazine, Flight Centre website promotion and radio commercials;
- campaign activity with Virgin Australia, involving national newspaper advertising, emails to Virgin Australia's database, inclusion in Virgin Australia's national monthly in-flight magazine, and inclusion in Virgin Australia's in-flight entertainment system in the way of

South Australian videos and Virgin Australia website promotion throughout December 2014; and

- activity with wotif.com across its website, along with social media support of the campaign, email to the wotif.com database, advertising across other websites such as news.com.au, and press advertising, which took place in February 2015.

In the digital space, the South Australian Tourism Commission continued to develop and implement content and social media strategies for the Credit Union Christmas Pageant, the Santos Tour Down Under and southaustralia.com websites, as well as supporting domestic and intrastate consumer marketing campaign activities. These activities resulted in continuous social media engagement, website visits, online bookings, sales referrals to tourism operators, increased brand awareness and visitation to South Australia.

Campaign websites were developed for multiple international marketing campaigns, providing points of engagement for consumers. New mobile responsive websites were developed for the Credit Union Christmas Pageant, Santos Tour Down Under and Tasting Australia events. Microsites for the Cricket World Cup and road trips were developed to help visitors plan and experience their time in South Australia.

A new southaustralia.com website and a new day trip planning website, A Day in SA, which will help visitors build their own itineraries or follow recommended plans curated by the South Australian Tourism Commission, were developed and will be ready to use by consumers in the next few months. A tablet magazine app, Visit South Australia, was also developed, which will allow consumers to view and enjoy various digital magazine editions, with multimedia, stories and articles edited around a theme or topic, such as a region or season. This app will also be ready to be used by consumers in the next few months.

Six new Through Local Eyes films were produced. These films see the South Australian Tourism Commission work with South Australian filmmakers to create short films which promote the best of South Australia through online channels such as YouTube and social media. The new films were: *Pleasure in Pain*, *Dirty Apron*, *Kangaroo Island Hyperlapse*, *About Food*, *Chasing a Feeling* and *You Gotta Try Fleurieu*. These six new films have achieved 508,000 views in 2014-15, with a total of 1.75 million views across the full suite of 32 films produced since they were launched in 2013. The state government also supported the following three television programs:

- *SA Life* for 27 episodes, which includes a dedicated tourism segment promoting accommodation, attractions, tours and new establishments, including restaurants and bars around Adelaide and South Australia. That had a regular appearance on the Channel 7 network.
- *South Aussie with Cosi* for 12 television episodes, covering various regions of South Australia and additional online social media activity through Cosi's Facebook page, promoting regional experiences and attractions. That is on the 9 network. Cosi does a tremendous job with his *South Aussie with Cosi* program, and he is a tremendous ambassador for South Australia.
- *PLONK* is satirical comedy based around a fictional wine show that features real wineries, winemakers, restaurants and events throughout the episodes. Six episodes were produced, highlighting six of our wine regions. *PLONK* was created by the team behind the ABC's *The Chasers War on Everything*, and it aired on STAN on 17 June and Channel 9 aired it Adelaide on 7 July. I think it is on every Tuesday night for six weeks. I think we must be up to about episode 3 tonight. It is very good viewing, particularly the McLaren Vale episode with Lez Shiell putting everyone in the little steam tent; it gets a bit crazy.

Going forward, domestic campaigns will be supported and complemented by the new Network SA project using the additional 2015-16 budget funds allocated for domestic marketing. This project will see the creation and distribution of new content. Excitingly, this activity will be much more targeted through undertaking of consumer tracking and data capture, allowing the South Australian Tourism Commission to distribute the type of content based on consumer behaviour and targeting.

More than 200 new pieces of content will be created and distributed across the Fairfax Digital network, social media and on southaustralia.com. In terms of domestic activities, Adelaide. Breathe. will be the main focus and it will include TV, cinema, print, outdoor and online. *Barossa. Be Consumed.* will air in cinemas, including the outdoor Moonlight Cinema, and both campaigns will be in markets across Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. These two domestic campaigns will be supported by the Network SA project. Once again, all advertising activity will offer a retail package or contact details of a trade partner or airline for consumers to get more information.

The Best Backyard campaign will continue to promote regional South Australia to South Australians, as we again partner with Stayz to point consumers to stayz.com.au for great accommodation deals around the state. Our strategic partnerships with leading distribution partners have been successful in the past, and so we will continue with that activity. We will again partner with Virgin Australia and Virgin Australia Holidays, Flight Centre Group, Qantas Airways and Expedia to increase awareness of and visitation to South Australia.

The additional domestic marketing funds allocated in the 2015-16 budget will allow us to bolster our cooperative campaigns, in particular with Virgin Australia, allowing the most prevalent domestic partnership South Australia has ever had with an interstate airline. As part of these partnerships, the South Australian Tourism Commission will host a TravelManagers national conference in South Australia, bringing more than 250 interstate top-selling agents to experience a South Australian product during their conference. In the digital space, the South Australian Tourism Commission will continually create and publish content for southaustralia.com.au, the new A Day In South Australia day trip planning app, and the *Visit South Australia* tablet magazine; maintain and enhance South Australian Tourism Commission websites; and create online bookings and sale referrals for tourism operators.

*PLONK* will be publicly released on YouTube in September, and to maximise the benefit of this, a communications plan will be implemented to support driving more views to the YouTube *PLONK* channel, exposing the South Australian series to a wider domestic and international audience. Content from the show will be provided to South Australian celebrities who feature in *PLONK*, allowing them to distribute through their own social channels.

In terms of the successful Through Local Eyes campaign, we will continue to share and distribute the existing 32 short films whilst looking at creating articles produced by third parties on www.southaustralia.com and other online channels. At least three new video stories will be produced to complement the existing suite of video content.

**The CHAIR:** Before I ask the member for Unley to continue, I just remind the people in the galleries behind me that their voices and noise carries right down to the floor and it does make it difficult to hear the answers to the questions. Member for Schubert.

**Mr KNOLL:** The Barossa episode I think aired on Tuesday night, and played a bit unfairly on our Germanic heritage, I think, but it was all in good humour.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I think the Barossa gets another run as well. There is the Clare to Barossa bit.

**Mr KNOLL:** Yes, I think we have got two runs. I would like to get quite specific, if I can. You stated earlier in estimates today that—

**The CHAIR:** What line are we on?

**Mr KNOLL:** We are still on Tourism Events, page 140, within Budget Paper 4, Volume 4. The minister said earlier today that all ministerial travel exists within—

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** What line?

**The CHAIR:** The member for Wright has just asked you what line.

**Mr KNOLL:** We are talking about the program summary table where money is expended, which is what we are talking about. Earlier today, the minister outlined that all of his travel is undertaken out of his ministerial office. He has just suggested earlier—

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Point of order.

**The CHAIR:** The member for Wright has a point of order.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The program summary table is not about ministerial budgets.

**Mr KNOLL:** I am getting to that point in a second. It can also be about what is not in there as opposed to what is in there. Either way, if I continue on with the question, you said all of your travel came out of the ministerial office. The answer you just gave suggested that through proactive disclosure on your departmental website is where the information is that you just provided in terms of there being a second hotel room at the Radisson.

Looking at the proactive disclosure for the months of July and August, you do not have a credit card statement on the proactive disclosure, so if you have just suggested before that that exists publicly, it does not. But, looking at what is proactively disclosed there in terms of your ministerial adviser's credit card, that does not provide the information that you suggest exists. I would like to give you the opportunity, minister, to correct whether all your travel does come out of your ministerial office and, secondly, give you the opportunity to, if that information which you suggest is publicly available, tell us where it is and, if not, commit to providing that information publicly.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for his question. I am not sure it relates to anything that we have got here in our budget estimates, but I will answer it nonetheless. I should give a tip to the member for Schubert, one that the member for Waite learnt, which is do not rely on anything that the member for Unley gives you.

**Mr KNOLL:** I have my computer right here, minister.

**The CHAIR:** Order, member for Schubert. If you have the answer in front of you, I do not know why you are asking the question.

**Mr KNOLL:** The point is I do not have the answer in front of me.

**The CHAIR:** Then just wait and listen.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** If it is already on the website, you are the person—

**The CHAIR:** Order!

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** I think there is a lot of improper motive going on.

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! I want to hear the minister's answer. Both sides are reminded of 142. Both of you: stop.

**Mr PISONI:** Madam Chair, point of order. I ask that that be withdrawn.

**The CHAIR:** What withdrawn?

**Mr PISONI:** The minister's comments about the member for Unley be withdrawn.

**The CHAIR:** About not trusting—

**Mr PISONI:** Improper motives. It is clearly in breach of standing orders.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Just a minute.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It was more about your competence.

**The CHAIR:** Order! The member for Unley has taken offence. We ask you to apologise for the offence that may have been caused to him.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I apologise, just so we can move on, Madam Chair. I have had it confirmed from my office since the initial question that both the room charges were included in the total trip costs that were disclosed, as is required, so the member for Unley was wrong on that count. The reason that the member for Unley only has the receipt of my bill is because he only FOI'd me for that particular travel and not any ministerial advisers. The reason there is nothing for August 2014 in my disclosure about my credit card is because it was not used in August last year.

**Mr KNOLL:** To follow up from that, minister—basically, you are saying that it was not in the documents we FOI'd. That is fine, except you have contradicted yourself, because we have suggested it is not there and you have suggested that it not there because that is not what we FOI'd. You have suggested, then, that it is proactively disclosed on the website, and it is not. Will you commit to publicly providing this information? By any source that we have tried to use to understand it, it is not available.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Well, you didn't try and get the information; you did not ask for it, so don't try and blame someone else for it not being available.

**Mr KNOLL:** In your earlier answer you suggested—

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr KNOLL:** —that it was proactively disclosed.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Member for Schubert, it is not your turn to speak.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It was proactively disclosed. I think—

**Mr KNOLL:** If the minister could tell me where, that would be wonderful.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I think we have given all the information that we have been asked to provide through FOI. If you want this extra material, I am happy for you to have it. We have absolutely nothing to hide. I think you are trying to build some sort of conspiracy theory into something that it is simply not there.

**The CHAIR:** Members on my right, do you have any questions?

**Ms WORTLEY:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 144 to 145, entitled Domestic Marketing. Minister, can you outline how the state government is assisting in promoting South Australian regions? I know you touched on it briefly in the opening statement, but if you could provide more detail, that would be appreciated.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank the member for her question. The South Australian government acknowledges the important contributions regions make to the South Australian tourism industry. Working closely with the regions, the state government, through the South Australian Tourism Commission, developed in partnership with the regions destination action plans.

These commit the SATC, across all its units, to agreed areas of engagement with each region. These plans align with the six pillars of the South Australian Tourism Plan 2020, and take account of the regional tourism organisations' own plans and priorities. Each plan identifies achievable priorities which will deliver tourism growth in each region. The first round of these plans covered the period 2012-15, and planned implementation was reviewed with the regions throughout this time.

In 2014-15, the state government provided funding of \$30,000 to each of the regional tourism organisations. This contributed to the employment of a local contact person responsible for providing a range of services. These included visitor guide content and PR familiarisation support, communicating to industry, providing advice to regional operators and to the South Australian Tourism Commission, and identifying and implementing projects of agreed strategic significance. The partnership is driven by regular meetings between the South Australian Tourism Commission and the regional chairs and regional tourism managers.

The South Australian Tourism Commission launched five touring routes in September 2014, and developed a mobile responsive website promoting the touring routes. The routes are: Epicurean Way, Explorers Way, Southern Ocean Drive, Mighty Murray Way, and the Seafood Frontier, which I know is very important to the member for Flinders and his constituents, who enjoy some of the most scenic landscapes anywhere in the world and, of course, the best and safest seafood anywhere in the world.

**Mr TRELOAR:** In the world!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** In the world, absolutely; don't sell yourself short, member for Flinders. It is a ripper place, and you are very lucky to live there and represent the good people of Eyre Peninsula.

These five touring routes cover all regions of South Australia and offer differing experiences from each other. The SATC also advertised the routes in *The Wanderer* magazine, targeted at the drive market, and produced marketing collateral, including maps for each touring route to be distributed via South Australia's visitor information centre network. Since launching the touring routes website in September 2014, the Road Trips website has received 34,000 hits to 30 June 2015.

The South Australian tourism consumer website also features new pages dedicated to the touring routes, which have received more than 53,000 hits between September 2014 and 30 June 2015. The state government, through the South Australian Tourism Commission, also produced 13 regional visitor guides, including the Adelaide guide and the *South Australian Food and Wine Guide*, as well as supporting the production of the 10<sup>th</sup> edition of the Nullarbor guide. Each guide has printed and online versions.

The *South Australian Food and Wine Guide* specifically highlights South Australia's 18 wine regions and tourism regions, including Adelaide. The guide also promotes the fresh and unique produce and food experiences available in those regions. The touring routes will continue to be promoted. This includes *South Aussie With Cosi* and *SA Life* episodes dedicated to these routes, promotion at key consumer events, working with trade partners to sell packages along the touring routes and the development of new film content and print collateral.

In 2015-16, the state government will offer funding to the 11 regional tourism bodies for marketing activity. The Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund provides regions a maximum of \$20,000 for 2015-16 which can be applied for all at once or in smaller amounts, with a minimum of \$5,000 at a time. This fund is for marketing activities targeting consumers directly and is to be matched by the region, essentially doubling the marketing spend. This fund encourages a collaborative approach within the regions whereby the regional body can develop its plans for the funding cooperatively with operators and other stakeholders in their region. This helps to build regional engagement and buy into regional marketing activities.

The South Australian Tourism Commission will also continue to focus on key consumer events as a means to distribute visitor information directly to consumers. Regions are invited to attend these events as part of the South Australian stand that the SATC coordinates. The state government will continue to produce regional visitor guides on behalf of the regions during 2015-16, including the storage and distribution of the guides.

**Ms WORTLEY:** My next question refers to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 140 to 142 and, again, you touched on this in your opening statement. It is regarding the Liverpool football match at Adelaide Oval. What I want to know is the benefits of this week's football match between Liverpool and Adelaide United at Adelaide Oval. In saying that, I certainly saw some of the benefits on the evening. It was a fantastic evening. It was a cold July day and we had 53,000-plus people at the oval. What are the additional benefits to our state?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I again thank the member for her question and acknowledge her passion for the world game. She has been a big football supporter for many years. The Liverpool visit to South Australia provided much more than just a great contest of a football match, which Liverpool won 2-0 over Adelaide United—who I thought did a tremendous job against the might of one of the great clubs in the world.

Liverpool is not just a great club on the pitch: they are a tremendous club off the pitch. We saw their professionalism in the dealings that we had with them over the past 12 months in the lead-up to this game. While we are here, I would like to thank Rodney Harrex, Hitaf Rasheed and all the team in Events SA who worked so well with the Liverpool off-field team. When they arrived in town on the weekend, they were professional on and off the pitch in a way that I have never seen from another sporting club.

They brought with them ambassadors, former Liverpool legends of the game. They were professional in the way they conducted themselves and were all dressed in the team uniform. When the players changed from suits to tracksuits the ambassadors did the same thing. It was a great

pleasure to host them in a box at the Adelaide Oval for the showdown between the Crows and Port Adelaide. Of course, for the record, the Crows won Showdown 39 by three points. It was the biggest crowd ever, even surpassing the Rolling Stones crowd, with 54,500 people there. It was a tremendous day.

They walked into that box with no knowledge of Australian football. They had seen a little bit of it on the TV. They were amazed to see that there were 18 on each team. The boundary umpires provided the biggest laugh when they threw in the ball. From the very moment they arrived, they started tweeting and putting on the Liverpool website these wonderful images and experiences. Craig Johnston, who is a tremendous ambassador for world football as well as Liverpool, of course, and a great Australian player who won FA cups with Liverpool, was down at Glenelg fishing off the jetty.

All of these tremendous images showing off our state went right around the world so there is an economic benefit which will be delayed benefit—from people who had not heard too much about Adelaide and now they have heard from the legends, their heroes, what a wonderful place Adelaide is and they will come here.

But there was a direct benefit, and we know that 10,000 visitors came from around Australia and from around the world. Talking to Craig on Monday night at the game, he said that as one of his roles as an ambassador he had to go around to different pubs in town. He said that at one pub there was the Brisbane Liverpool fan club, at another pub there was a Sydney one and at another pub there was the Melbourne one, and so you had all these groups of people at different pubs.

Most pubs around Adelaide are not doing a roaring trade on any Monday, and it was tremendous to see the city come to life in the way it did with a combined total of 107,000 people at Adelaide Oval over those two days. We know that the economic impact just from the visitation, from people from interstate and overseas, is around \$10 million. It will take a little while until we get all the figures on exactly how much the direct economic benefit will be, but we do know that we have \$10 million in our pocket that we did not have before, which is a tremendous return on what was a very wise investment.

**Mr KNOLL:** I have one final question, and I refer to page 140, Volume 4, Budget Paper 4. I am just giving the minister the opportunity to clarify and put this issue beyond doubt. Given that the minister had on his phone the receipt of the invoice that he was referring to about the second room, would he like to update the committee about the total cost of those rooms over two nights?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I already did that before, Madam Chair. I must say that we are now 56 minutes into this estimates questioning—

**Mr KNOLL:** Of which 45 minutes have been on government questions.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The visitor economy is worth \$52 billion to the South Australian economy. It is incredibly important that we build on that, that we get more visitors coming here from interstate, that we get more visitors coming here from overseas. I know that—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, Madam Chair. This is going nowhere near addressing the substance of the question.

**The CHAIR:** The minister can continue. We will listen to his answer.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I am sorry, I must correct something. I just said \$52 billion; it is \$5.2 billion, of course, with respect to the economic benefit that tourism brings to the state. We have people here from the South Australian Tourism Commission, we have the head of the Entertainment Centre, the head of the Convention Centre and we have the man who has run motor sport in this state for several years. All these people have come here today, and I would have thought that the Liberal Party in South Australia would have had some questions about this vital industry.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, Madam Chair. There was no reference to the Liberal Party in the state budget papers, and the minister—

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** —has spent 45 minutes on Dorothy Dixers—

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** —blocking questions about the tourism portfolio.

**The CHAIR:** Order! We only have two minutes left. If you want to make your point of order in the last two minutes, it is up to you. He is not going to talk about the Liberal Party, are you minister? Have you finished, minister?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I am quite happy to explain to the tourism industry that, in the seven questions that were asked, there was not a single question from the opposition about tourism and its importance to this state. Not one single question was asked by the opposition, the alternative government in this state, about tourism, and that just goes to show what I have seen in the 2½ years I have been in this role. They have no plan for tourism, they have no idea about tourism—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order.

**The CHAIR:** Is there another question on my left? Is there another question?

**Mr PISONI:** You invited the opposition to ask a question and the minister took the floor.

**The CHAIR:** Is there another question on my left?

**Mr PISONI:** On the same point raised by the member for Schubert, are all reimbursements of cash expenditure or private credit cards also recorded on the purchase card summary of expenditure that is available publicly?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Look, that makes it eight from eight questions. And, yes, money that is reimbursed is publicly disclosed. As I have said before, you did not FOI the relevant piece of information you thought was not there, so you ran around and tried to speculate that there was something missing and that there was something wrong. You did not FOI it. That money was actually there in the disclosure report that we put online, as we do every month. I really hope that we see a better standard in the next section of estimates after having the opposition come here and ask eight out of eight questions with nothing to do with this vital—

**Mr PISONI:** Perhaps you could give the opposition some time to ask questions—

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** —instead of filling it up with Dorothy Dixers.

**The CHAIR:** That's enough. Order, member for Unley! There being no further questions on this part of the budget, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the South Australian Tourism Commission closed. The Minister for Tourism's section is completed. I thank his advisers for coming in.

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE, \$560,412,000**  
**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE, \$7,928,000**

**Membership:**

Mr Whetstone substituted for Mr Pisoni.

Mr Bell substituted for Mr Knoll.

**Minister:**

Hon. L.W.K. Bignell, Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr P. Anderson, Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Ms K. Taylor, Director, Sport and Recreation Development, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr T. Nicholas, Manager, Finance, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr B. Cagialis, Chief Finance Officer, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Ms S. Hameister, Racing Industry Support, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr W. Battams, Director, South Australian Sports Institute, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr I. Houridis, Director, Facility Development and Infrastructure, Office for Recreation and Sport.

**The CHAIR:** I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements in Volume 3. I will ask the minister if he would like to make an opening statement on this line as his advisers change over. This would be a perfect point to let everybody know that the National Calisthenic Championships will be held in Adelaide in 2016. We laugh but I can tell you that the same number of bed nights will be taken up by the calisthenics people of Australia as with any other convention. I have just come back from Queensland and there were over 800 people supporting their teams there, so we would be mad not to pay attention to it. The competition will be in the Festival Theatre and I expect to see a lot of you there. Thank you, minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** First, I would like to introduce the wonderful team who surround me. To my immediate left is Paul Anderson, Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport. Then, on his left is Tim Nicholas, Manager, Finance, Office for Recreation and Sport. On my right is Kylie Taylor, Director, Sport and Recreation Development. Behind me we have Sue Hameister, Racing Industry Support, and Bill Cagialis, Chief Finance Officer, DPTI.

The Office for Recreation and Sport is the lead agency for the state government's policy on sport and active recreation. The agency has three clear strategic priorities: build a capable and sustainable industry, deliver better places to participate and perform, achieve sporting excellence. The achievement of the strategic priorities would simply not be possible without a high level of community engagement. Within each of your electorates you would probably be aware of organisations which are seeking or have received funding or assistance from the Office for Recreation and Sport.

Just earlier this week, I was signing a whole heap of letters to 47 different members in this place with some money that is coming everyone's way, up to \$40,000. In fact, the member for Chaffey and I have fallen a little bit below the \$40,000, so what happens next time is that a little bit more activity goes into areas to make sure people are aware of it and stuff like that. Not everyone can get that funding but there is a pool of money there and it is pretty evenly distributed, so look forward to (as they say) the cheque in the mail.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, exactly. The Office for Recreation and Sport regularly engages with and assists the 67 state sport and recreation peak bodies and organisations, seven industry representative bodies, 68 local councils, the national committees, the 47 members of parliament and electorate officers.

I must say they do a tremendous job. I rarely get any complaints from electorate offices. In fact, I do not think I have had one about the sort of service that the Office for Recreation and Sport provides to electorate offices and to the sporting communities within our electorates. I think that is a tremendous tick of approval for the hard work that goes on there and that very personalised service they provide to the sporting and recreational organisations within our communities. They will always do as much as they possibly can to help people and assist them in filling in grant applications, etc.

The Office for Recreation and Sport also has to deal with state government departments and, at the same time, the Office for Recreation and Sport administers nine separate grant programs

ensuring that all processes are at best practice with good governance. In relation to grants alone, each year, on average, the Office for Recreation and Sport answers more than 4,500 telephone calls from community organisations, sends in excess of 6,000 emails and attends more than 100 individual meetings with clubs, associations, councils and MPs.

During the past 12 months, the office has assessed more than 1,720 grant applications requesting more than \$35 million in equipment, programs, facility planning and development, and organisational development. In the same period, 1,500 grant agreements were managed. During 2014-15, across a range of grants programs, \$16.38 million has been approved to 801 grantees. A breakdown of this allocation is:

- Active Club Program—473 successful applicants, sharing in \$2.35 million;
- Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program—74 eligible organisations, sharing in almost \$3 million;
- Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program—113 successful projects and 77 individual scholarships, totalling \$3.19 million. Of these, 29 projects were identified to assist with the inclusion-based initiatives;
- Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program—46 successful projects, sharing in \$6.95 million;
- State Facility Fund—\$500,000 was shared between three projects; and
- VACSWIM Funding Program—13 organisations shared in \$400,368.

The VACSWIM program, which was conducted for the first time in 2014-15, was particularly successful. This new model for the delivery of the iconic VACSWIM program allowed for better connections at a community level and saw the program delivered across 126 locations statewide.

An exciting new initiative for the government in 2014-15 is the sports vouchers program. This program provides \$50 every year for every primary school student to reduce the cost of club fees and participation in sport. The budget available for the scheme is \$7.7 million for four years, with \$1.09 million in the first year rising to \$2.25 million in the fourth year. Providers have been able to redeem vouchers for joining or for membership fees from 4 March 2015, and to date 21,454 vouchers have been redeemed for a total of \$1.06 million.

Excitingly, the online portal for the sports vouchers, [www.sportsvouchers.sa.gov.au](http://www.sportsvouchers.sa.gov.au), has won the South Australian award for the government services category in the 2015 iAwards which recognise the achievements and innovations made in ICT across all areas of the economy. The portal enables clubs to register and claim submissions, as well as helping the public search for participating clubs, and now moves forward to the national judging phase of the iAwards.

To support the implementation of a performance-based investment strategy, the Office for Recreation and Sport places a strong focus on customer and industry relationships to drive and support agreed outcomes. Each funded state sport, recreation or industry body is assigned a designated industry adviser to support the relationship between the government, the organisation and their affiliates. The industry adviser works with the paid staff, boards and volunteers of sport and recreational organisations to support business improvement initiatives and ensures that government understanding of sport and recreation is complete, up-to-date and minimises duplication.

In the past 12 months, the Office for Recreation and Sport provided 101 training and development opportunities to support the industry in the following areas:

- coaching, volunteering and officiating;
- child safe environments;
- governance and board-related functions;
- integrity;
- inclusion; and

- leadership.

A range of partnerships have been developed to deliver 104 participation programs for people traditionally underrepresented in sport and active recreation participation. This includes the following groups:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders;
- women and girls;
- people with disabilities; and
- people from a cultural and linguistically diverse background.

In May 2015, more than 220 participants attended the Office for Recreation and Sport's conference 'From Diversity Comes Innovation and Growth' held at the Adelaide Convention Centre. A dynamic and diverse group of speakers challenged the sport and active recreation industry to think differently through the conference themes of:

- a progressive sport and recreation sector is strong, vibrant and diverse;
- diversity of people and product is good for business;
- enabling change in sport and recreation;
- commercialisation; and
- innovate or suffocate.

In a concerted effort to fully understand the impact of rising utility costs on community sport and active recreation, the government, through the Office for Recreation and Sport, engaged KPMG to review the impact of rising utility costs. In response to KPMG's review, the Office for Recreation and Sport is working on strategies to help clubs and associations manage their utility use more efficiently. These include:

- the establishment of an Office for Recreation and Sport-led utilities working group, established to work on a collaborative cross-government strategic approach. The group comprises representatives from the Office for Recreation and Sport; SA Water, Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources; Department of Education and Child Development; SA Health; and the Local Government Association;
- investment in the STARCLUB Club Development Program to develop sustainable clubs which directs users to helpful resources, templates, websites and tips to help clubs and associations reduce their utility usage;
- development of the resource Greening Your Club which provides information on environmental issues clubs and associations within South Australia now face and equips them with the tools and skills necessary to reduce their environmental impact and utility usage;
- development of a series of case studies to educate clubs and associations to manage their utilities more efficiently;
- development of a Recreation Grounds Rates and Taxes Exemption Act 1981 Fact Sheet identifying exemptions eligible organisations may be eligible for under the act. I think I wrote to everyone explaining this material was available, but if anyone needs it, we are happy to provide it because it is a good resource. What we see in sporting clubs is that new people come through in their volunteer capacities in roles of president, secretary or treasurer and that sometimes not all of these things are known to them, so it is a handy fact sheet when it could be of some assistance to the clubs.
- the Office for Recreation and Sport is also playing a significant role in SA Water's current Irrigated Public Open Space—Code of Practice review as a member of the review steering committee.

Deliver Better Places to Participate and Perform: In the period 2014-15, the government, through the Office for Recreation and Sport, has continued its program to plan for and deliver recreation and sport infrastructure. The development of the \$4 million State Diamond Sports Centre at Adelaide Shores, West Beach, has been progressed. This facility will support the sports of softball and baseball and provide a multi-diamond precinct with associated indoor training and administrative facilities.

The Parks Community Centre has been completed, delivering indoor pools, a gym, refurbished indoor courts and football pitches, and associated facilities for the local community. Facility developments totalling around \$1 million have been undertaken at the State Netball Centre and the State Athletics Centre.

To maximise the community's access to a range of government-related infrastructure, work commenced on an initiative which examines Schools as Community Hubs. This work focuses on utilising school facilities, including ovals and indoor and outdoor courts. It aims to connect community groups to these facilities when they are available outside of programmed use by the school.

The Office for Recreation and Sport also facilitated the establishment of an industry-led Recreational Trails Advisory Group, bringing together key stakeholders from around the recreation community to inform and drive the sustainability of the State Trail Network.

Through this period, the Office for Recreation and Sport has assessed or assisted with more than 650 proposals and inquiries across the state relating to facility planning and development, development plan approvals, sport and recreation master plans, and partnerships between federal, state and local governments and state sport and recreation organisations for the provision of facilities across metropolitan and regional South Australia.

In the area of elite high-performance sport, the South Australian Sports Institute has excelled in the major sporting events of 2014-15. The performances of our athletes showcased the success of our pathways programs, talent identification programs, and coaching and athlete development. In 2014, 26 SASI athletes brought home a total of 35 medals in 24 world championship events. The tally included 12 gold, 14 silver and nine bronze—a tremendous effort by those athletes. Nine remarkable South Australian athletes, all cyclists, were crowned world champions in 2014: five senior world championships and four junior.

At the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, SASI made an outstanding contribution to the Australian team and medals tally. South Australia and SASI were represented by 41 team members, or 10 per cent of the 417-strong Australian team. South Australian athletes contributed 20 per cent of Australia's gold medals and 19 per cent of Australia's total medal tally of 137. We had 22 Commonwealth Games medal winning athletes across seven sports, including athletics, hockey, lawn bowls, netball, shooting, swimming and cycling. Collectively, these athletes brought home 54 Commonwealth Games medals. This tally included 16 gold, 13 silver, and five bronze from 26 Commonwealth Games events. South Australian cyclists collectively won an impressive 17 medals.

The Office for Recreation and Sport provides the resources to engage with the racing industry and to be the first point of contact between the government and industry. Since corporatisation of the racing industry in 2000, the government has not sought to interfere in the day-to-day management of the racing industry. Government dealings with the racing industry since then have revolved around major policy issues of local and national significance. The government will continue to develop positive and constructive relationships with the state's peak racing industry bodies, as well as represent the interests of South Australia's racing industry at Australasian racing ministers conferences. The government will continue to recognise and promote the importance of the development of collaborative partnerships with other states and territories on significant issues which affect racing nationally.

Consultation and involvement of the Office for Recreation and Sport with industry in 2014-15 has included: support of racecourse developments; animal welfare issues; integrity of the racing industry; funding requests; promoting resources available within the Office for Recreation and Sport in matters such as governance and diversity; liaising with other government agencies which have interactions with the racing industry; advice to government on matters pertaining to the racing

industry; monitoring developments in other jurisdictions which could have ramifications at a local level. The government has continued to acknowledge the importance of the South Australian racing industry and its economic and social contributions to South Australia.

**The CHAIR:** The member for Chaffey.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Finished? Twenty minutes!

**The CHAIR:** Keep moving; that's another 10 seconds of our life.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I refer to the community rec and sports facilities program in Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 76, under Financial Commentary. I note the \$3 million reduction in the sport and recreation facilities development improvements program in 2015-16. What is the specific program that the budget is referring to, as there is no program for this official title within rec and sport? Is this the community recreation and sports facilities program?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The identification of the fund is in all of our publications as a specific funding program, and applications can be accepted for the planning or building of facilities. Apart from the planning phase, matching funding is required for the rest of those funds.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** What is the current annual funding available in 2015-16 through the community recreation and sports facilities program? Did you take on board advice from your office of rec and sport which previously advised against the reduction in funding of the CRSF program?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That figure is \$2.5 million for those state-scale facilities which we can still go for in the general budget. That decision was taken before I took over this role as Minister for Recreation and Sport, so I was not part of the process of what advice was given at that time. With the remaining \$1 million, we are seeing that that is being replaced with the dividend we are getting back from the money we receive from Adelaide Oval—so, not entirely that \$4 million in the first year. It started as \$200,000 in the first year, rising by \$200,000 a year in the years after that to a maximum of \$1 million. I point out that that \$3.5 million reduction I am talking about still leaves \$4.1 million remaining in the fund.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Is it correct that the \$1 million of reduction in spending on the Community Recreation and Sports Facilities Program is being redirected into the \$50 voucher program?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No, the \$50 voucher is a new program with new money that came in after the election last year. We went to the election promising the \$50 sports voucher scheme and it was very popular with people. After the election we committed money to that, so it is new money.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Where are the rest of the savings from the reduction in the sports facilities program being distributed?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** When you say 'savings', there is still the money there available in the general budget whenever we need to go for something the size of the diamond pitch development down at West Beach, or the year before that we put in the extra hockey pitch out at the Pines. For any of those big scale developments, the money is still available in the general budget, but what Treasury was keen on at the time—and, as I said, it was before my time—was not to have that money sitting out there in a defined scheme but to make sure there was a submission that came to all of government to ensure that that was money well spent. I can assure you that if we have a good project to fund I will be in there fighting tooth and nail to get that money.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** What is the current status of the community sports hub report and is there any further action required on it?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** There is no further action required in terms of the development of the plan. It has been brought together and worked on by not only government but also local government, and it is really important to have them, and Sport SA is also represented. Everyone has got together and worked out what it should look like and then we will see what eventuates with the scheme in the future.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** When is the Deloitte Access Economics report on the economic and social value of sport in South Australia going to be released and what did it cost?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The report cost \$65,000. A lot of discussion and feedback was sought from government departments, local councils, etc. The first draft of the report has been prepared and we expect to have the final report later this year.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Given that the last Office for Rec and Sport grants review was done in December 2011, will there be another review soon? When are we due to have another report?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** An internal review is done every year by the Office for Recreation and Sport. They are looking at implementing a review every three years, not a year-long review or anything like that, but a review that does take into consideration the views of people in the sporting and recreation community.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** If one is done every three years, there must be one due sometime soon?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a new initiative, to bring this in. There has not been one done since 2011, but this is a new initiative. Rather than do a whole year-long thing like the one done in 2011, it will be done every three years from, I presume, sometime soon. I am informed that the Office for Recreation and Sport has just gone out to the sector with a 360° review of the department to ask for feedback from people, and grants are included in that review.

We are always listening to any sort of advice and feedback that we can get from everyone in the sector about how things can be done in a better way, and that includes MPs as well. If people think there is some way of maybe doing it better, please drop us a line and let us know.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I certainly will. Minister, can you provide a bit more information regarding the one-off increase of \$4 million to fund the sport and rec facilities development and improvement fund in 2014, and why was it only a one-off?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That was a really good program and it delivered a lot of upgrades right around the state. It was \$4 million set aside out of the budget so that we could fund a range of projects that had missed out. In terms of calls for expressions of interest and asking people to put in their grant applications, we can never fund all the proposals that were put up. This was an attempt to put some money aside for the sport and recreation sector to try to clear the decks to a certain degree.

I travel around to many places, for example, Bordertown and up through the Mid North, Snowtown, Crystal Brook, and places like that. I caught up with some people in Ceduna, and their netball courts had been resurfaced. A lot of projects missed out maybe once or twice before, sometimes maybe three times in rare examples, but they could get the funding that time around.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** That is a top-up fund, if you like. Do you foresee the creation of a top-up fund anytime soon?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I would love to, but things are tight across the general budget. I think there was some money there that was available and we were lucky enough to get it for the rec and sport sector. I am always in there asking for more money for this very important portfolio area. We would take more money any day of the week. It is, of course, tight economic times, and we do not have as much money as we would like to have, and I think that is probably the case for most states and territories as well.

We have to do what we can with the resources that we have, but if there is ever a bit of money floating around, we will always try to get our hands on it, because we know the benefit that it brings to not just the people participating in the sport but to the communities, particularly in country areas. I do not have to tell the three of you anything; you all represent great country regions. Football, netball, tennis, cricket and all those other sports that are played in your area bring together so many different parts of the community where everyone can get together. It is a really important part of the week, the month and I guess the season of so many people.

**Mr GEE:** I refer to Program 3: Recreation, Sport and Racing, Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, pages 76 to 78. In March 2014, the Premier announced an election commitment for a sport voucher program. Could the minister update us on the progress of this initiative?

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**Mr GEE:** I was interested in the—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**Mr GEE:** I would like to hear a bit more about it.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Thank you very much.

**Mr GEE:** A lot of members in my electorate are benefiting from that program.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a terrific scheme, and I thank the member for his question. The program provides a voucher of \$50 every year for every primary school-aged student to reduce the cost of club fees and participation in sport. The initiative aims to address cost as a barrier to participation and ensures young people have access to community sport. The budget available for the scheme is \$7.7 million for four years, with \$1.09 million in the first year, rising to \$2.25 million in the fourth year.

On 30 November 2014, our provider preregistration website was launched, and in early December 2014 I wrote to state sporting organisations, clubs and providers to encourage them to register online through the sports vouchers website. I advise that 2,185 registrations of interest have been made, with 1,389 eligible providers emailed and provided with a username and password, and 1,095 clubs are now accepting vouchers at 1,342 venues—in excess of 50 sports.

There are no surprises regarding which sports have been most popular with children. To date, the greatest number of sports vouchers take-up has been with children playing Aussie rules football (9,530), netball (5,412), soccer (2,374), gymnastics (1,464), followed by basketball and hockey. We will see a seasonal differential in the way the applications come in, because obviously you have different seasons. When they were first launched, the cricket and tennis season was practically over, so we will probably see an influx of applications later in the year.

Of course, each child's sports voucher is valid for a one-off use until 31 December. The Office for Recreation and Sport is committed to working with all sports to ensure the number of children redeeming vouchers for sports reach anticipated targets. Later this year, we can look forward to an increase in voucher numbers redeemed against summer sports, such as cricket, little athletics and surf life saving. Vouchers have been redeemed for sports as diverse as judo, lacrosse, BMX, table tennis, Taekwondo and archery. It is great to see so many forms of competitive sport being played by the children of this state.

Sport and recreation agencies in Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory already administer a sports voucher program where a unique voucher is provided to every eligible child and comes at a considerable cost. By having a different model for delivery of the program, this saves South Australia an estimated \$228,000 per year, and it is terrific to have that money going into the sport rather than into the red tape. The online portal for sports vouchers has, as I mentioned in the opening statement, won the South Australian award for the government services category in the 2015 iAwards. We hope it goes even further and takes out the national title.

Providers have been able to redeem vouchers for joining or membership fees from 4 March this year, and 21,454 vouchers have now been redeemed for a total of \$1.061 million. South Australia's model provides the most cost-efficient and streamlined process in Australia, and outperforms all the other states in terms of cost and volume processed. The projection for the 2015 calendar year is approximately \$2 million based on the estimated demand.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Minister, back to grants. The number of managed grant agreements has reduced from 1,702 in 2013-14 to a projected target of 1,300 in 2015-16. Why is that the case?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is largely to do with the special purpose grants—that \$4 million that we had in place which we were talking about before. There were so many projects there that were being undertaken around the state. Also, some of the other reduction is related to that \$1 million reduction that was brought into place before I took over the role.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The \$200,000—I guess that is the sinking fund for community sport from the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. Has that been included in the current budget?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It has not gone in yet; it is paid in arrears. This is the first financial year of the scheme, and the first \$200,000 instalment will be provided in July 2016. A year after that, it will be \$400,000 and then \$600,000 after that, up to \$1 million indexed.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** So no money will actually be able to be used this year, it will be next year?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, that is correct.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** While we are on Adelaide Oval, can you give us an update of the full redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval? I believe that there is still some money remaining to be spent there on weatherproofing of stands and the like.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We do not have anything to do with that. That is all under the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's portfolio area. Basically, they build it and we fill it, so all those questions need to be directed to minister Mullighan in his capacity as infrastructure minister. I think it has been a terrific project, and one that has been with the infrastructure minister since Pat Conlon's days, and rightly so. I am not sure, down the track once everything is completed, whether it will move over to the Minister for Sport's portfolio areas.

Certainly, I have a lot to do with John Olsen, John Bannon, Andrew Daniels and the rest of the team down at Adelaide Oval, but we talk more about what sort of events are coming up and things like that. We do not get into discussions about who owes what for what part of the development. But it is an exciting development, and those Liverpool guys, who have been to a lot of grounds around the world, loved it. I cannot help you more with an answer on that.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** That is okay. Liverpool still did not manage to pip AFL, though.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No, exactly, but they loved it.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I just want to touch on scholarships—Budget Paper 4, Volume 3. The number of athletic scholarships and services provided has dropped from 300 in 2013-14 to 224 in 2014-15, and is only targeted at 230 in 2015-16. Why is the state government handing out fewer scholarships at a time when we are looking for athletes to excel at high-level games such as the Commonwealth Games, Olympic Games and world champs?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The short answer is that we have targeted our scholarships to athletes who are true medal prospects, so I guess it is going after the very best and ensuring that they have some added resources to help them on their road to the world championships, Commonwealth Games or Olympic Games.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Never enough money for high-performance athletes.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a balancing act, too, because you want to look after the grassroots. It does not matter what portfolio you have or what part of it, we could always do with more money. It is something that all states and territories grapple with. We would all like to have more money in our budgets.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Has the budget for providing athletic scholarships been reduced, or was there money saved through providing fewer scholarships than targeted?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** There was a reduction but there is still money there for talent identification, which is really important. There are plenty of potential gold medallists out there who do not know they have the attributes required and, if they combine that with a lot of hard work, they can go all the way to the world stage in, I guess, the sporting pursuit chosen for them by those who go out and do the identification.

We also have money for people in regional South Australia, because we obviously know that distance can be a big factor and something that makes it a bit more difficult for people in our regions. We have a million square kilometres and we try to look after anyone who has to drive three hours or five hours to get to events, or things like that, as well.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The sports training programs: can you explain why the number of training and development services provided to the active recreation and sports industry has decreased and

is projected to decrease even further in the 2015-16-year? Have any of those programs been looking for discontinuation?

**Ms TAYLOR:** I am going to answer this question. It is a combination of factors. Probably the primary one is the rising technology, that people can now access courses online that are delivered anywhere throughout the world. In the past, we needed to deliver face-to-face. Now people are accessing their courses that are delivered interstate or even overseas. That has resulted in us needing to deliver less face-to-face. There are also third-party providers out there who are potentially picking up courses that we used to offer. There is no point duplicating something if it is available in the community so we try to focus on the courses that are not available elsewhere.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** So, these courses are now predominantly online?

**Ms TAYLOR:** No, we offer a combination of online and face-to-face. Traditionally, our suite of courses relates to accreditation of coaches and officials and also the update of coaching accreditation and courses, but some of that can be delivered online.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** What about the cut of funding to the Recreation and Sport Youth Traineeship Incentive Program? I might just add that they have cut all the funding to that program.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The Recreation and Sport Youth Traineeship Incentive Program was discontinued by the Office for Recreation and Sport in 2014-15. This was due to a pattern of decreasing applicants for the incentive allocations and because a large number of the organisations funded by the program had capacity to fund the positions themselves.

Between 2011 and 2014, 72.7 per cent of total incentives allocated were to organisations which have a turnover in excess of \$1 million, and one-third of these with more than \$5 million of turnover or they were commercial enterprises. Sport SA received approximately \$60,000 annually from the commonwealth government for the delivery of training to these trainees and the Office for Recreation and Sport has only ever provided financial support to the employers of the trainees.

The Office for Recreation and Sport does not directly subsidise the training offered by Sport SA as a registered training organisation or any of the other state sport or recreation bodies who are registered training organisations in South Australia. It is not the Office for Recreation and Sport's role to give any one organisation operating a commercial business arm an advantage over its competitors. The government is aware Sport SA delivers a range of qualifications in the areas of sport and recreation. They undertake this as a commercial enterprise, not as part of their function of providing advocacy and services to their members.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, minister. This will interest Mr Battams, I am sure. With respect to the SASI athletes and high-performance programs a target for the SASI athletes is to win medals at international benchmark events in four sports. How much funding is provided directly to the SASI program and can you, minister, provide a breakdown of that funding allocated to coaches, athletes and administration?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Member for Chaffey, did you want the breakdown of what each coach is paid, because we just have a general overview, which is that \$4 million of the budget goes to SASI. Do you need more information than that?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I was curious as to what part of that \$4 million is allocated to coaches, to athletes and to administration.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** A general answer is that SASI has an incredibly small admin sector, so all that sort of back office stuff and admin is largely provided by the Office for Recreation and Sport. All the money that gets spent on people goes into coaches, sport scientists and specialists, because it is their role to get the athletes up and ready and performing. We could come back to you with some breakdowns on it if you wanted, but rest assured that the money is being spent largely for the direct benefit of the athletes through good coaches and the like.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** To cut to the chase I was looking at what money hits the ground and what money is stuck in offices?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I think having everyone collocated in the one place is terrific, too, because we do have people down there who can answer the phones and things like that in the Office for Recreation and Sport and handle things for SASI at the same time.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Are there operating costs for facilities that come out of that SASI funding?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Can you repeat that question, the last one; and I might ask Wes Battams to step into the hot seat.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Are there operating costs for the facilities that come out of that SASI funding?

**Mr BATTAMS:** No. The net appropriation that is identified specifically for SASI operations is about \$3.5 million, supplemented by about \$600,000 of revenue that comes in from partner national sporting organisations. All of the operational costs, facility-related costs, are absorbed through the Office for Recreation and Sport, and so our budget is a direct operational budget, and approximately \$1.3 million is allocated on sports science and performance-related support.

The balance of the funds are allocated for direct program-related expenses for the nine sports programs and the individual scholarships. The only administrative infrastructure, you might say, would be in essence me and some secretariat support there. The other is all directly related to implementing programs; so, coaches and support staff.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Are there cases where the Office for Recreation and Sport hires a facility and then charges SASI to use it?

**Mr BATTAMS:** No. We have internal arrangements through the Aquatic and Leisure Centre as part of the agreement there. Access to training facilities for water polo, diving and swimming is built within the arrangements the government has with the Aquatic Centre and other facilities. I mean, the only leasing we would pay would be we have a lease for the Boat Shed, for example, at West Lakes, but they do not charge us to use the water.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Fair call. How much of the funding goes directly into the nine high performance sports programs, and what do the individual sports receive of that funding?

**Mr BATTAMS:** I can provide the breakdown. It is approximately \$2 million for the specific sports programs. The investment level for the different sports programs varies and is made up of a combination of state government or SASI funding plus joint investment from the national sporting organisations.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** How has the minister allocated priority to the four sports for targeting medals, particularly when we have nine high performance programs?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** SASI works with the national sporting organisations to work out what the priorities are going to be and what sports will be looked after by SASI. Sometimes it gets down to an individual athlete will come along in a particular sport and things will be tailored around them wherever possible.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** As an example, there is a South Australian Olympic trampolinist who has a real chance at a medal at the 2016 Olympics. He is being forced to pay his own way. He is having to fund himself almost entirely. He is getting support from SASI but this program is no longer funded through the high performance program.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I might ask Wes to answer that one.

**Mr BATTAMS:** Since 2012, there has been a national high performance strategy put in place by the federal government and endorsed by the state governments and that is called Australia's Winning Edge. The focus of that strategy is for Australia to place in the top 5 at the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games and to be the top Commonwealth Games nation. It is an unashamedly focused strategy with targeted investment, using a business model, with the sports that can contribute the most to the medal tally at the Olympic, Paralympic and Commonwealth Games being invested in.

As part of that strategy sports themselves have changed their investment portfolio. For example, Gymnastics Australia previously jointly invested with SASI to run a national high

performance program in trampoline in South Australia. As part of the AWE strategy, Gymnastics Australia assessed that that program was no longer a medal prospect and hence was not a priority for their investment and withdrew their joint funding and that program was concluded as a Centre of Excellence program.

Individual South Australian athletes, such as the one you are talking about, were retained on scholarship by SASI to contribute towards their training and development but the level of funding that they received previously, as a national Centre of Excellence program, from Gymnastics Australia that would allow them coaching and international travel was reduced by the national body.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thanks, Wes. While I have you there, through the minister, how much funding was spent to maintain the SASI facilities at Kidman Park in 2014-15, and was any money spent on upgrading those obviously ageing facilities?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** There were upgrades undertaken at Kidman Park at SASI in the 12 months but we will have to take that on notice and get back to you with those details.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Also, what funding was spent on upgrades at the SA Athletics Stadium in the 2014-15 year?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I will just get that figure for you. I will give you what we have on hand here. We have a special purpose grant of \$400,000; that is part of that \$4 million that was spent around the state. That was to provide for 196 new seats under cover adjacent to the main grandstand, a 90-metre section upgrade of the eastern tiers to six tiers enhancing spectator access, an upgrade to the marshalling area adjacent to the 200 metres start, shaded areas for spectators, turf regeneration—because it was pretty arid and unappealing out on that part of the track—and a detailed design for the full set of spectator tier upgrade works. That was 400. Then there was \$30,000 for irrigation infrastructure, which enabled the javelin and discus areas to be available for event programming. Through the 2014-15 State Facility Fund, Athletics SA received a further \$355,000 to deliver further upgrades to the spectator part of the stadium.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Minister, I take you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 78. In regard to racing, under activity indicators, I note that the number of consultations with the racing industry was targeted to be 26 in 2014-15 and it ultimately finished at 57 consultations. Does this show that the streamlined consultation process the government was utilising was not really effective?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I am advised that there were some extraordinary circumstances which led to increased consultation around live baiting and other issues like that.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Just on that theme, how does the government propose to meet a target that is once again reduced in 2015-16?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is going to vary year to year, depending on the number of issues. Since it was corporatised back in 2000, the government has a very different role than it had once upon a time.

**Mr TRELOAR:** What has been the feedback from the industry about the government's approach with regard to consultation now and the way you are managing that?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I have not had any complaints about it. My door is always open and they have my mobile number. I meet with people right across all the different racing sectors. We had a good meeting a couple of months ago down at Morphettville with the provincial clubs and the country clubs, which was terrific. I want to do that as often as I can as well—when I say 'often', I mean once or twice a year—because it is a good place to get feedback. We know that many of us get out to the track. I have been to the Mount Gambier races and the Port Lincoln races already this year—

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Been to Mindarie?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No. How is your track going up there?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Good. Just waiting for the minister to come.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is a great place to be, but sometimes everyone is a bit busy. You have a race meeting to run and everything else, so it is a little bit hard to talk to the people who are actually running the event. I found it really interesting to go down and spend some time talking to the provincial clubs and the country clubs during their regular meeting at Morphettville and, as I said to them, I am happy to talk through ideas.

In fact, one of the ideas I heard in the discussions with them—and we do not know whether or not it will come off—was to do with the fact that because of OH&S they need to have running rails and they need to be good running rails, but at tracks like Penong, Roxby Downs, Quorn and several places around the state they only run one race meeting a year. To put in running rails for one race a year is pretty cost prohibitive, but at the same time those race meetings mean so much to those communities. Streaky Bay is another one. It is apparently the most fun of any race meeting anywhere in the state. I do not know whether you have any tales that you can regale us with, member for Flinders.

What I suggested was that maybe we could look at a set of mobile guard rails that we could have in a container or a couple of containers. We could have the foundations in the ground at these racecourses and then just transport these running rails around as needed. There is going to be a lot less heat stress and other climatic stress on them because they would be packed away for the majority of the time, but it would tick the OH&S box, and I think it would ensure that we can keep those very important country race meetings going in those smaller communities where they mean so much to them.

Getting back to the point about consultation, I will continue to be out and about as much as I can talking to people across all three codes. I know that the staff we have in the Office for Recreation and Sport also always have the phone ready to answer and a door open to listen to what people want, and they also get out to the track as much as they possibly can to see firsthand what is going on.

**Mr BELL:** Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 78, activity indicators. Of the \$33.2 million for the recreation, sport and racing budget, is there any funding allocated for the Mount Gambier track which has been a debacle for 10 years due to a botched redevelopment some 10 or 11 years ago?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The short answer is no. There is no money in there because, as we have said before and I explained to you in a briefing a few weeks ago that we organised with Thoroughbred Racing SA, the sport was corporatised in 2000 and what happens now is that money goes to the three codes and that is money forgone by the South Australian government. It is the turnover tax on TAB betting across the three codes. It is done on a pro rata basis, so if harness racing gets a certain percentage of the turnover then they get that percentage of the pot, if you like, another percentage goes to greyhound, and then another percentage goes to Thoroughbred Racing SA, which is up to them to spread between the metropolitan club with the SAJC and the country and provincial clubs.

We must remember that when this track upgrade was done 10 years ago it was done by Thoroughbred Racing SA, and for whatever reason the job just was not done properly. The wrong sort of base was put down, so there is a real problem with drainage. I was actually at the Mount Gambier Cup when it was washed out after race 3, the steeple, and I know that there were a lot of disappointed people. It was the first time in the 140-year history of the event that the Gold Cup had not been held, so it was very disappointing, although I am happy to say that when it was re-run a few weeks later at Penola everyone was let in free of charge and they got a good crowd there. It is good that in the record books in years to come 2015 will not be a dash because the cup was not held.

The problem is that the base was not done properly 10 years ago and drainage is insufficient, so water pools there. It really restricts the number of race meetings that the Mount Gambier club can hold.

I know Thoroughbred Racing SA has competing interests around the state with other race clubs. I guess there is also a bit of a list of priorities and people they have looked after in the past, so if it is not really Mount Gambier's turn—this is something that came out of the meeting—and there are two or three other racetracks somewhere in the state that are in front of Mount Gambier in the queue, then that has to come into it. There is no money allocated at this stage, but as I said at our

last meeting, we are happy to keep being involved and seeing what we can do. Maybe it does not come out of office of rec and sport; maybe there could be something there in the regional grants or something like that.

You have my mobile number. We are always happy to take your calls and work with you in the community down in the Mount. I grew up on those racecourses down there, getting my great-aunt to put bets on when I was five or six years old. She looked after me and did not take a slice of the dividends when she gave back the winnings, which was good. I have a real soft spot for the Mount and for racing in general in the South-East, so any way we can help we will.

It really is a difficult situation in terms of the \$7 million or \$8 million a year that goes to the three codes, which was \$7 million or \$8 million that used to come into the coffers for the South Australian government. We are missing out on that money. We entrust it to the three codes to use it as they see fit. If you get stuck, come and see us and we will see what we can do.

**Mr BELL:** As the minister knows, just following on from that, what is genuinely happening down there is that the club is losing two to three races a year, which is basically putting their finances in about \$100,000 a year deficit. This is probably just a word of caution that it is on a slow decline and it will not be too many more years before racing in the South-East ceases to exist at the Mount Gambier track due to this continual slide. We are in this slow death role, so any support that can be garnered is greatly appreciated.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We also understand the importance of the location, because you have trainers and owners on both sides of the border, so it is really important that we have a successful and well-run racing club in Mount Gambier. It also supports a lot of people who earn their keep out of the racing industry down there. It is definitely on the radar, as you know. We are very keen to help in any way we can. We do have a list of priorities and we do have a large amount of money going to racing. It varies each year depending on how many people are on the punt, but it is usually around \$7 million to \$8 million a year.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Are you able to provide an updated status on the proposed national racing integrity advisory group that was announced as a target back in 2012-13?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It has not really gone far at all, but not for lack of desire on our behalf. We would love to be part of it. We have been keen to back it right from the start, but when you try to get all the states and territories involved, particularly New South Wales does not like the proposal. It has not actually gone anywhere yet, because we need to get all the states and territories to get behind it and back it. We cannot have half of us going one way and the other half going the other way. I guess it is a work in progress and let's hope it does not take as long as the national rail network to get everyone lined up and on the same gauge.

**Mr TRELOAR:** So it is something you are still pursuing, though, minister?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, it is raised at national meetings and stuff like that between the jurisdictions.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The Commonwealth Games is obviously a topic building. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 77 under highlights. There is mention of the Commonwealth Games. Why has the state government not allocated any funding to the Commonwealth Games bid, particularly given there was a \$700,000 grant for an Olympic appeals committee in the 2013-14 budget?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The money you referred to was for a four-year Olympic cycle and it is to support the athletes, to get them to the Olympics, rather than for us to go for the Olympics and try to bid for the Olympics. In regard to the Commonwealth Games, we have a bit of time on our hands there. The Commonwealth Games we are likely to go for is in 2026 or 2030, and 2030 is probably the first one we can go for. If it is 2030, they are not going to decide who gets that until 2023.

The thing that worries me is the sort of expense that you have to go to for some of these international organisations now, including the Commonwealth Games. The body of work that you would have to do to put your case forward is about \$5 million to say, "We have got this and we have got that." You might think that is \$5 million we could put into grassroots sport or some other recreation and sport facility somewhere. It is a tremendous amount of money. While there is no rush to actually

put forward a bid to host the Commonwealth Games, we should take a little bit of time to work out whether that is a necessary expense.

We know what we have in terms of existing sporting infrastructure and we know what we have in terms of existing transport infrastructure. We would have to look at a couple more facilities. We would have to look at a Commonwealth Games village for the athletes. I wonder whether a \$5 million outlay just to basically throw your hat in the ring is a good use of taxpayers' money when we have so much need out there, I guess across all portfolios, but if we just leave it to sport and recreation, that \$5 million could go a long way. I am sure Wes could do a lot with \$5 million down at SASI, for example. It is something we will keep looking at, but it probably does not have the urgency that a lot of other things do.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I am disappointed to hear that. I think that is a bit of a glass half empty approach. When I look at all the other countries around the world that have hosted Commonwealth Games, it is not about the \$5 million and it is not about what you achieve at the Commonwealth Games, but it is about the upgrading of facilities for sport in general and it is about bringing our sporting facilities up to speed at a wide level. I visit, as you do, many sports facilities that are in dire need of funding and in dire need of a focal point and I think that the Commonwealth Games bid is something that would be crucial to bringing the state to a good level with sport.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You are preaching to the converted there and I think that would be great. I do not think everything is in dire condition here. We have just spent a lot of money on an upgrade of the velodrome, which is one of the best in the world. We have the best aquatic centre in the country down at Marion. We obviously have Adelaide Oval, the best stadium in Australia at the moment. We have some fantastic facilities, so the skeleton is there. Yes, some things need a little bit of an upgrade and they will need more of an upgrade by the time 2030 rolls around.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Come on, 2026.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I listen to Robert Gerard and he thinks someone else has 2026; I think it might be Halifax or something. He seems to have the inside word on what is going on. Whether it is 2026 or 2030, they are not going to announce the winning bid for 2026 until 2019. I would love to see it, but I think we are going to need a huge commitment from the federal government on it as well. The federal government has put a few hundred million dollars into the Gold Coast hosting the next Commonwealth Games, which will be held on the Gold Coast in 2018.

I am not saying no to the Commonwealth Games and I like the Commonwealth Games. I saw firsthand what it did to Glasgow and we are nowhere near in the sort of condition that Glasgow was in pre games. Glasgow had a reputation of being an old city and an industrial city with buildings caked in black soot or whatever the build-up was on them. They used it to provide not just a great sporting event for a fortnight but a great sense of pride in the Glaswegian population, and also a legacy.

They went after the legacy, and that is the thing we will have to get right if we do go for it. We would want to make sure in the five years leading up to the Commonwealth Games, if we were to get them, that we had many test events here and really used the facilities we have to put Adelaide and South Australia on the map throughout the commonwealth and also that we upgraded things like disability access and so on. Those things are game changers. I think we are as one on the positives. It is just how you commit to that \$5 million.

Of course, getting back to that is the legacy as well, that seven years after the Commonwealth Games and that afterglow when people want to compete on the track or in the pool that was used in the Commonwealth Games. I think we are as one in our vision in that we can see it as a real winner. It is just that in tough economic times, a long way out from when they are going to make the decision, would we pay \$5 million and then perhaps have to get that work redone between now and 2023, if it is 2030 that we are going after? I am happy to keep having the conversation, but I just do not think we have the money for the sort of facility and asset-scoping that is required.

I do not know whether it is the right thing to do. Has world sport built up this industry around it to keep consultants and all these other groups in money? How do you justify \$5 million? I am not asking you the question; I am asking a rhetorical question: how do you justify \$5 million going around saying, 'We've got an aquatic centre at Marion. Oh, gee, I didn't realise we had that. We've got an

Adelaide Oval.' It is actually not that hard to work out what it is that you have. And then we talk with our transport department: how are the linkages? Do we need another tramline somewhere? Have we got the right public transport infrastructure?

As I said, the biggest thing we would have to look at would be the village and where we would locate it. How you would build it, and what sort of funding model would you use? Would you have one where an operator comes in to build it so that it is fit for purpose for the village and then converts it into apartments and keeps all the profits? That would probably be the best thing, if you could keep it off the government's balance sheet. There are all these questions to go through. The big hurdle I see is that \$5 million one.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I am sure there was more than \$5 million spent on consultants during the pre-consulting stage for the Adelaide Oval, but we digress.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** At least we knew we were going to get that. That is the thing: when you know you are on a sure thing, you will put in the \$5 million because you want the work to be done well, but if you are going to put in \$5 million to see if you are going to get in the queue to get through the door, there are a lot of things that can go wrong between handing over the \$5 million and getting what you want at the end of the process.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Well, we spent \$2 million on Lance Armstrong.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We did not spend \$2 million on Lance Armstrong.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Alright, I will move on. A desktop facilities audit has been completed by the department. Has a full economic impact statement been associated with those costs and compiled in preparation potentially for the future of our sporting facilities?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We did do that desktop study to look at all the facilities, and it showed us that we were in pretty good order in terms of our facilities. It pointed out things that we pretty well already knew. We would love to have some more indoor facilities for sports like volleyball and the like. The economic statement is the one that would cost the \$5 million, and that is the one that we have to work out in term of what else does not get funded to come up with the \$5 million to go into a game of chance. I would like a bit more security around it.

We are still in discussions with the Commonwealth Games Association of Australia and we will continue those negotiations and discussions. We want to make sure that we do not get caught in some bidding war with Perth, Melbourne, Sydney, or another state. I do not think Australia can afford to waste money on consultants because a sporting organisation pits two states against each other or two states decide to go up against each other. I think it is a waste of money. I would rather see it spent on footy boots, bicycles, basketballs and things like that that actually deliver to grassroots sport, or into facilities that are going to help our elite athletes who are going to try to get to the Commonwealth Games. I actually think there is something wrong with the system at an international level that requires all this work to be done at such an early stage.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Yes, I think it is planning in general with anything that is a major investment. Minister, of the overall sport and rec budget (\$33.2 million), how much is specifically targeted for assistance in women's sport?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Again, I thank the member for Chaffey for the question. It is actually impossible to pull it all apart and give a 50:50 answer or a 51:49 answer because we support facilities right across the sporting spectrum. What I can say is that I have been delighted with the work the Office for Recreation and Sport has done in women's sport in the time that I have been involved. I have been to a conference where they spoke about getting more women in leadership roles as well, not just on the sporting field but around the clubs, and I think that is really important. It has obviously been a focus of our government since 2002, when we came out with an objective to get at least 50 per cent membership of women on boards and a commensurate number of women as chairs of boards. So, there is all that work being done.

The Premier has appointed Katrine Hildyard as his parliamentary secretary, and one of her specific roles involves women in sport. I come from a strong background as a journalist who always pushed women's sport. I think the people at the ABC nearly had a heart attack when I told them we

were not going to be running Sheffield Shield packages every night. This is back in 1996 when no-one was actually going to the cricket to watch Sheffield Shield. We did stories on women rowers, netballers, basketballers and hockey players because they were the people all of Australia tuned in to watch every four years but were so largely ignored by the media in the four years in between. So, I have a strong background in supporting women's sport.

The Office for Recreation and Sport is the state government's lead agency for the implementation of policy on recreation and sport and it is committed to raising the profile of and acknowledging the important role women play in all aspects and at all levels of sport in South Australia. The Office for Recreation and Sport has implemented the following initiatives to improve the representation of women in governance and leadership roles.

In 2012, when the Australian Sports Commission released its high performance strategy, Australia's Winning Edge, it noted there was a compelling case for change in Australian sport. The key area of focus was a commitment to a number of mandatory sports governance principles for the most highly funded organisations, and the Office for Recreation and Sport has since promoted these principles in South Australia. Principle 2.6 of the Mandatory Sports Governance Principles states:

There is good evidence that diversity on Boards leads to better corporate performance. The Commonwealth Government has set a target of a minimum of 40 per cent of Commonwealth Boards being female by 2015. Similarly, the [Australian Sports Commission's] position is that each [national sports organisation] should seek to achieve a target of 40 per cent...over a similar timeframe.

The Office for Recreation and Sport has now adapted the Australian Sports Commission's Mandatory Sports Governance Principles to suit state associations, with the aim that they will become aspirational key principles for all state associations. Included in the Office for Recreation and Sport's key principles is a requirement for a minimum of 40 per cent component of either gender on boards. The Office for Recreation and Sport is strong in its belief that a board consisting entirely of one gender, including solely of women, is considered not to represent good governance.

In 2014, the Office for Recreation and Sport hosted the conference 'Governance, diversity and opportunity: are you on board?', which had a primary focus on promoting the need for gender diversity within the world of sport, and especially within sporting governance, including board and executive positions. I was pleased to be at that conference here in the city. It was terrific to see the sort of support and the great line-up of speakers that had been arranged.

A focus now for the Office for Recreation and Sport is to increase the number of skilled and experienced women on sport and active recreation boards and committees as a step towards further diversity. Like the Australian Sports Commission, the Office for Recreation and Sport has undertaken governance reviews with five strategic important organisations: Swimming SA, Yachting SA, Basketball SA, Hockey SA and Rowing SA.

The Office for Recreation and Sport continues to support all five organisations to implement the findings of the reviews but believes some organisations would benefit from assistance in understanding unconscious bias and its limiting impact. That is why the Office for Recreation and Sport has offered Yachting South Australia and Swimming South Australia the opportunity to work with an external expert to address this—an offer which each organisation has accepted.

The Australian Institute of Company Directors' 'Foundations of directorship training' was recently made available to 25 women in the sport and active recreation sector to increase their skills and confidence to seek board positions within state sport and recreation organisations. In April this year, the Office for Recreation and Sport hosted an initiative, Business Meets Sport, to provide professional women with an opportunity to network with the chief executive officers and board representatives of state sport and active recreation organisations.

The Office for Recreation and Sport recognises more still needs to be done to address issues regarding gender diversity on sport and active recreation boards. It is also very important to highlight the many and diverse roles women play in sport and recreation while also being participants and fans. The Office for Recreation and Sport is committed to remaining active in this area and to ensure a vibrant and sustainable industry that contributes to the economic wellbeing of South Australia.

I guess that is a good wrap-up of what is happening off the field and in the sporting arena, but we are also making sure that all the sports, no matter what the gender, get the same sort of attention that they deserve without any bias to one gender or another.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** There is obviously bias. I think for too long we have heard all those lovely words that you have just said about gender balance, but women's sport is underrepresented, underfunded, and is given far less attention than the cross-section of sport in general. The reason I ask this question is that last year there were targets in the 2013-14 budget for women in sport—emerging leaders, as you have previously said. I would like to think that the Premier will put action into the budget bottom line and give better representation to women in sport.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I do not think the government can take all the responsibility for a lack of recognition for women in sport. I think the media have got a lot to answer for, and I think private enterprise has got a lot to answer for when it comes to getting behind women's sport and supporting it. I think the government is probably doing as good a job as anyone in making sure that the gap between men's and women's sport is as narrow as possible. I think the real problem lies elsewhere. I think we saw that with Adelaide Lightning. When they went looking for a private sponsor, there were not too many people putting their hand up.

I think that people in business should look at the people that they have in their own organisation. They should look at their customers and work out that 50 per cent of them are women and there is a lot to be gained by getting in and sponsoring and backing women's sport. I think Priceline should be congratulated for their outstanding contribution to the Adelaide Thunderbirds. They obviously see it as a really important marketing position, as the people they are marketing to are largely women. Why would you not get on the shirts and the television banners of one of the most successful women's sports teams in Australia, the Adelaide Thunderbirds?

To all those companies who are out there supporting women's sport, good on you: I hope you continue that, and thank you for backing these really terrific teams. Whether they be at the grassroots level or at the elite level, I think support of the private sector and the media is important, and the media have a lot to answer for.

I remember having a conversation with a mate of mine who is a sports journalist at one of the commercial stations and I said, 'Why do you run a story about someone missing a night's training in January or December because they might have hurt their little pinkie but you don't run a story on some outstanding achievement by a female athlete somewhere?' He said, 'The audience gets what it deserves.' I thought, 'The audience gets what you serve up to it.' I think some of the commercial TV stations think that people do not want to watch women's sport, and that could not be further from the truth.

If we look at the success of the Matildas campaign in the soccer Women's World Cup recently, people do have a thirst to see women participating in sport, and I would love to see the media change their focus a little bit. I do not think we need to have the navel gazing at the AFL that happens so much. I am sure many within the AFL would be happy to have a little bit of a reprieve as well. I know they have their sponsors to look after but sometimes some of the stories are bordering on the ridiculous and hardly newsworthy.

**The CHAIR:** We need to remind everyone the time has passed.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** May I have one last question?

**The CHAIR:** You would be pushing it. Hurry up.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** It is an old chestnut, minister. What I would like you to explain is the difference between the recreation and sport fund and the Sport and Recreation Fund?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is an old chestnut. I can hear Iain Evans in the background somewhere, almost. I think we have had this one every year when Iain was in the role. I am going to hand this over to Paul Anderson.

**Mr ANDERSON:** The recreation and sport fund came out of the old soccer pools act and, since then, it has been the lotteries act and it is about \$220,000 a year that comes into that. It was most recently used to help pay off the Netball SA debt on the netball stadium. The other fund came

from the Gaming Machines Act, so they are actually two different things. The Sport and Recreation Fund feeds straight into what we are doing with the Active Club Program, part of our targeted funding, the state facilities fund and so forth. They come from two different origins and they are used for two different purposes.

**The CHAIR:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments of the Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance adjourned until Monday 27 July and thank all members and advisers who have attended.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thank you for your wonderful work today as Chair of this committee. I also thank the government and opposition members who attended and all the staff who have been so diligent in putting together so much information across all the different portfolio areas that we have examined today. I also extend a massive thankyou to my own staff who do a tremendous job all year round, and they deserve to be acknowledged for their outstanding contribution.

**The CHAIR:** Well done. In accordance with the agreed timetable, I advise that the committee stands suspended until 4.30.

*Sitting suspended from 16:18 to 16:30.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE, \$560,412,000**  
**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE, \$7,928,000**

**Membership:**

Ms Chapman substituted for Mr Whetstone.

Mr Wingard substituted for Mr Bell.

Mr Pederick substituted for Mr Treloar.

**Minister:**

Hon. S.C. Mullighan, Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr M. Deegan, Chief Executive, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr P. Gelston, Chief Operations Officer, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Ms J. Tepohe, Chief Corporate Officer, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr B. Cagialis, Chief Finance Officer, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr S. Rodrigues, Acting General Manager, Customer Experience, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

**The CHAIR:** I welcome you to the estimates committee. Estimates committees are relatively informal procedures and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions, although I do remind members that normal standing orders for conduct in the chamber remain in place. I understand that the minister and lead speaker for the opposition have agreed an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments which will facilitate a change of departmental advisers.

Can the minister and lead speaker for the opposition confirm that the timetable for today's proceedings, previously distributed, is accurate.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes, the portfolio programs have been identified in the time frame.

**The CHAIR:** Just a simple yes is fine. That is good. Have you seen that?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have. I am just indicating the portfolios that have been identified are there; it does not mean that it is the whole of the budget for which the minister is responsible in this area, but I just make that point.

**The CHAIR:** Changes of the committee membership will be notified as they occur. Members should ensure that the Chair is provided with a complete request to be discharged form. If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than Friday, 30 October 2015. This year estimate committee responses will be published during 17 November sitting week and corrected daily *Hansard* over a three-day period.

I propose to allow both the minister and lead speaker for the opposition to make opening statements of about 10 minutes each, if they should wish. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on about three questions per member, alternating each side. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule.

A member who is not part of the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identified or referenced at the beginning of each question. Members unable to complete their questions during the proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*.

There is no formal facility for tabling of documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution to the committee. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the house; that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length. All questions are to be directed to the minister, not the minister's advisers. The minister, however, may refer questions to advisers for a response. During the committee's examination, television cameras will be permitted to film from either the northern or southern galleries.

I will now proceed to open the following lines for examination. We are looking at the proposed payments for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. The minister appearing is the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to Agency Statements, Volume 3. I call on the minister to make a statement if he wishes and, if he does not, he can proceed to immediately introduce his advisers.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not propose to make an opening statement and we do not intend on taking government questions. If I could introduce who I have next to me: Michael Deegan to my right, Paul Gelston to my left as well as Julienne Tepohe.

**The CHAIR:** Deputy leader, are you making a statement or are you going straight to questions?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Straight to questions. I am referring to Agency Statements, Volume 3, Budget Paper 4, and I will start with the Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct Plaza and Integration that is identified on page 67. I indicate that yesterday the Attorney-General answered a number of questions in respect of this project but confirmed that it was a project that was under your department's management and, therefore, I have a couple of questions in relation to it. It is also referred to at page 71 in relation to your portfolio statement.

Curiously, he was not able to answer this question and suggested that I ask the Treasurer, given that these documents are published by his department, but it is also referred to as an Across Government initiative in the Budget Measures Statement. That is something new in the 14 years I have been here, but he was not able to answer it. I would inquire first as to why that has a special provision for it as Across Government rather than as a budget measure under your department?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am sorry, deputy leader, which specifically were you mentioning? Was there an item on page 71 to which your question is relevant?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** No, that is where it is mentioned in your portfolio, but separately in the budget measures document, which is a budget paper—and I think it has been shown next to you—it is referred to under Across Government, which is a new division in the budget papers. You have a special section in the budget measures document for your department, each of the departments do, but at the beginning of that document it refers to Across Government measures and one of them is this project and the second is the Sampson Flat bushfire provision. My inquiry to you, as to the Attorney-General yesterday, is as to whether you have any knowledge as to why that is not in your portfolio list of budget measures but in fact has a special provision as Across Government?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Perhaps two points to make. Firstly, the reference on page 71 comes under Program 1: Land Use Planning, which is a part of the budget papers that refers to the Minister for Planning's ministerial responsibilities. Secondly, as to the existence of Across Government initiatives, like the Minister for Planning I would suggest that you or someone else interrogate the Treasurer as to why that has been placed in the budget. I suspect it is because it reflects that more than one agency, for example, will be responsible for delivering a initiative.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** That is fine. I indicated yesterday that I would be asking the Treasurer but I thought I would give you the opportunity. I also mention that this is a project which is identified in your portfolio at page 67 as a project under the administration of your department not his.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Our department, yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Sorry; yes, in fairness, he is in that as well, but he is suggesting that it is actually in the Department of Transport, that it was a provision under Mr Hook rather than Mr Hanlon, as it was, and now Mr Deegan, hence I raise a couple of matters with you; that is, firstly, whether you can provide an indication as to when that project is to come before the Public Works Committee, given that the first stage of that project is to be completed prior to the next election?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Just to reiterate the point I was making earlier, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is the department which has responsibility for carrying out functions for which several ministers have ministerial responsibility, one of whom is the Minister for Planning. As I mentioned earlier, page 71, Program 1: Land Use Planning, refers to his ministerial responsibilities. In broad terms, my understanding is that there is a governance arrangement of which my department is involved as well as Renewal SA. As to when the Public Works Committee submission will be made to parliament, I cannot give a date at this point in time. If I can provide any further particulars about that I will bring that back before indeed (perhaps) that project is submitted to the parliament's committee.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** To be clear on this, we did raise this yesterday with minister Rau and his indication was that whilst, I think he described it as—I have his evidence to the committee here—that notwithstanding that it was a project which has involved Renewal SA and indeed the Riverbank Authority, his evidence to that committee was that the actual project management of this was by your department, your part of the department, if I can put it that way; that is, that some were in some major projects or some division of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and roles in that regard were in your domain, hence why I am asking you now as to the progress of that project. I appreciate that you will indicate as to whether there is any further information you can bring to the committee for public works.

My next question in relation to that is: when will the car park and public realm proposal be presented to the Public Works Committee to consider? You have just indicated that you will make some inquiries about that. Will the agreement lapse in the event that the project does not commence within 12 months by the Walker Corporation?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The agreement between whom?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The agreement between the government and the Walker Corporation.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have not been privy to the particular details to which you refer, so I would have to make some inquiries about that. Either the Minister for Planning or I will try to furnish the house with an appropriate response.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When will the Festival Centre upgrade commence?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That information will be contained in a submission for the Public Works Committee, so I guess in addition to seeking out a time frame for that report I will come back with the particulars of that matter as well.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Will the Riverbank Festival Plaza development agreement lapse again—and I am referring to the same document, or part thereof—in the event that both the office and retail components are not commenced within five years?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I indicated earlier to your similar question, either the Minister for Planning or I will seek to bring back a response to the parliament.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** What is the effect on the development agreement in the event that the Walker Corporation fails to use its best endeavours to secure occupation of 10,000 square metres by interstate tenants?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will have to take that matter on notice and either I or the Minister for Planning will bring back a response to the house.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Similarly, in respect of the Attorney-General's contribution as Attorney-General in estimates yesterday, he answered a number of questions on the now abandoned courts precinct project—and perhaps I will find the page reference for you as we go. The courts precinct proposal was announced by the Attorney-General as having been aborted as at 13 March 2015. As you might recall, he had announced that the proposal that had been developed and presented was 'not value for money'. My understanding is that your department is responsible for the management of that project, in particular the work around obtaining the expression of interest and obviously going through the tender process last year, leading up to today.

I asked the Attorney to at least provide information to the committee as to what his department—or in particular the Courts Administration Authority and/or the Attorney-General's Department—expenses would have been to date. Obviously, as he indicated, this is a project under your department in the sense, again, of it being a major project that your people are managing. Could you also provide the committee with a total of the cost since the project was developed, since the original funding was provided for the scoping study, what expenses your department has incurred to date in respect of that project?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If you could furnish the committee with an appropriate page reference before we finish proceedings at 6.30 this evening then I will endeavour to take that matter on notice.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The project reference in respect of the courts precinct is in yesterday's evidence, commencing at page 2, and you will see that there are a couple of pages that refer to that project. I thank you for taking that on notice.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Page 2 of the Agency Statements, Volume 3 is blank.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** No, I am talking about page 2 of yesterday's transcript of evidence.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Unless, of course, you are colouring it in for us.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am talking about yesterday's evidence.

**The CHAIR:** Are you looking at *Hansard*, deputy leader?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Indeed.

**The CHAIR:** If we could just make that clear.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, without a page reference—I know you have been doing this for 14 years, but you do not seem to have a page reference relevant to the budget papers.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have. I have given you page 67 of the budget papers. What I am referring to—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Could you draw my attention to which line on page 67 refers to that project?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Well, I started with the Adelaide Festival Centre precinct and then I went on to—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, and now you are talking about a project which you yourself have described as both abandoned and aborted, and you do not have a budget page reference. Can you furnish the committee with that or should we move on to something that is relevant to the budget?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If you could take the time at some stage before we conclude to view the matters that have been raised in relation to the courts precinct project, the evidence—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No. I have been called before this committee by the parliament to answer questions about my budget lines within this volume of the Portfolio Statements. You have failed to give us a page reference about this question. If you cannot give us a page reference then perhaps we might move on to a matter which is within the budget papers and of relevance to today's proceedings.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am just indicating to you, in fairness, that the Attorney-General yesterday—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not interested in what the Attorney-General does. I am interested in my portfolio of responsibilities—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** You may not be but he is the Deputy Premier.

**The CHAIR:** If I could just ask for a moment of order. I think the minister is correct in saying that the courts precinct stuff is not in this paper, so perhaps we could give the matter some extra thought between the next two questions. You only have another 15 minutes left on this line and I do not want to miss out on all the questions that are coming through. Perhaps rethink that strategy and we will move on to another question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am happy to do that. I will give the minister the opportunity to follow that through.

**The CHAIR:** No; he has already indicated to you that he is here to answer questions.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Can I clarify this then, minister: was your department responsible for the development and management of the courts precinct project up until the announcement in March this year that it is not to be proceeded with?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Certainly my department was involved with that, as was the Attorney-General's Department.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** In respect of that—because I assume things have ceased since then, since the Attorney's announcement—can you provide to the committee the cost to your department of the development and management, including the scoping study, of that project up until March?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes. You have repeated the question you asked me earlier and I will repeat the answer that I gave earlier. If you can furnish the committee with an appropriate budget paper reference that is relevant to today's proceedings, I will take that question on notice.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Are you saying that although that is a project under your responsibility and a project that has concluded and which has not been identified as a project that is ongoing, you are not therefore going to provide that information?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, that is not what I said.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Having had that expense—it is somewhere here in your budget as to what you have done up until 30 June 2015—all I am asking is that the cost be identified.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If you feel confident in your assertion that it is somewhere within the budget and pointing to the budget paper that we are meant to be interrogating, then surely you can furnish me with the appropriate budget line so that I can answer the question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Just because the Treasurer has not—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, just because you have not met your responsibility in naming the budget line so that you can ask the question, it does not mean that I need to do your work for you.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Very well. I am happy to ask you a question in relation to that in normal question time.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That would be more appropriate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** But the Attorney-General has been happy to indicate that he will get it from his department.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, there you go; you do not need to ask it of me now.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** From his department, but he cannot identify what cost your department has incurred, hence that is why I am asking you today. If you do not want to give that information, that's fine, but I just make the point that the Attorney-General has been happy to identify from both the Courts Administration Authority and the Attorney-General's Department that he will provide that to the committee. Obviously, he is not in a position to provide it from your department, so I will leave it with you. Next, in relation to the improving critical road infrastructure at page 67, firstly, can you provide detail as to what projects that is going to cover?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, this is an additional allocation of road funding to provide more of the road maintenance and asset maintenance works which we do each year across our road network. It goes a long way to filling the ongoing budget gap, in excess of \$9 million a year, that the state has been left with following the reduction in last year's federal budget of road funding to South Australia.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Does it include there, or in any other of the annual programs that are on page 69, provision for any planning or upgrade or maintenance of the Strzelecki Track?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised, no, it does not.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Is there any provision in your budget for the 15-16 year for any planning upgrade or maintenance of the Strzelecki Track?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If I can just pause on my previous answer, I should point out that out of our annual road maintenance budget to which the \$70 million over four years will be contributing, there is of course an allocation to our outback roads, the most prominent of which is the Strzelecki Track, being not only the outback but unsealed and a very long piece of road. If I can remember from the top of my head a previous piece of information that had been provided to me, I think we expend something in the order of 20 or 25 per cent of our outback road budget trying to maintain this, so I suspect—as you see on that line the \$10 million—whether any of that specific \$10 million will be going towards the Strzelecki Track or, if indeed the allocation to the ongoing maintenance and improvement of different parts of the Strzelecki Track that we would carry out on an ongoing basis is part of the rest of the pool of funds in the road maintenance budget, I could not specifically say.

However, I think you can rest assured that there are perhaps two considerations of funding for the Strzelecki Track. There is the ongoing maintenance to which I have just been referring and then there is the Strzelecki Track sealing proposal which has quite some focus in recent months from parties around South Australia. Of course, we have been advocating for the sealing of the Strzelecki Track for quite some time for several reasons. One is to make sure that those people who use that track on a regular basis get a much improved service from that road but also because it would unlock a new freight corridor, a more reliable freight corridor, between Queensland and South Australia, and also very significantly reduce the transport costs, particularly that operators in the Cooper Basin are having to experience given the sort of time delays and damage and also the necessity to use heavy or heavier trucks and having to navigate such an unwieldy road, for want of a better term.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I will come back to Strzelecki in a moment, but in respect of the improving critical road infrastructure allocation, \$10 million in this financial year, can you provide to the committee the breakdown of the balance of those moneys in the forward estimate years?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not sure that we can and for a number of reasons. While we have a pretty good handle on priority projects which need to be attended to across our road network, that assessment is fluid and so some projects may come into consideration and indeed funding which might not currently be conceived based on future assessments of road condition.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I appreciate that the nature of what projects will be provided for out of that funding, but at present the \$70 million that is there for the total project allocation I am assuming has been allocated over the forward estimates for an amount per year.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If you are talking about what the dollar amount per year is rather than the actual projects—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The dollar amount is as specified on page 46 of the Budget Measures Statement: it is 10 in 2015-16, 10 in 2016-17, 20 in 2017-18 and 30 in 2018-19 and, of course, I am referring to millions of dollars.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Back to Strzelecki, that project, as we know, is currently the basis of a submission to the federal agencies. In that, has there been any proposal for a road network charging contribution to be made?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think the project has been submitted to Infrastructure Australia and it is also the subject of discussions with the commonwealth. Certainly, the opportunity for non-government entities to make a contribution to the road has been flagged, and I think there is particular interest in, and discussion around, those Cooper Basin operators. Whether that looks like a network charge or whether it looks like a more direct contribution, either in retrospect for recompensing the cost of the infrastructure or by some other means, certainly has not been settled at this stage.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The Premier's statement in respect of transport, on 9 July this year, that money could be raised for road infrastructure by charging the freight companies based on the mass, distance and locations travelled by trucks, is a matter that I am sure you are aware of. Do you, as the Minister for Infrastructure, have any preferred funding proposal as to how that should operate?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Is this in reference to a particular income line in Program 7?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** No, it is in relation to the Strzelecki Track.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not want to trawl through the same ground that we have been through merely a matter of minutes ago but, of course, given your extensive experience in conducting inquiries in this forum, you would be aware that you need to give a budget paper reference when asking questions.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have, and we have been dealing with it under 'Improving critical road infrastructure'. You have indicated that there would be an amount there for the Strzelecki Track and I am now asking about—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I indicated about the road maintenance spending, which may or may not be funded from that, and then you segued onto talking about the Strzelecki project, which is not funded and, hence, does not have a budget line in this current year's budget. Now you are seguing onto another matter which is also not in the budget papers, unless of course you can correct me and point me to a line that I have currently overlooked.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Perhaps I misunderstood the statements you have made to date, that there could be money in this portion for the provision for Strzelecki, not as a capital funded amount. As you have pointed out, you have put in an application to Infrastructure Australia to support that and you have indicated to the committee that various options of funding arrangements are under consideration and that there is no issue with that. I am simply asking the question as to whether, in

the items that you have just referred to as options that are available or are under consideration, you as the minister have a preferred model?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** For funding road maintenance on the Strzelecki? For road maintenance projects, as—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** For a contribution.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** For road maintenance projects on the Strzelecki Track, as opposed to a project which would seal the Strzelecki Track, we make a budget allocation through our road maintenance budget. An assessment is made of what needs to be done and when. Sometimes that changes. For example, we had a project that we delivered with the commonwealth to replace some infrastructure on the Strzelecki Track—some floodways—but that is an entirely different matter to the prospect of a project to seal the Strzelecki Track. That was what I was referring to previously.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When you were giving information to the committee just a few minutes ago as to the options you say were under consideration for road funding contribution by freight vehicles, that was to do with maintenance, was it, and not to do with the project that is currently sitting in Infrastructure Australia?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not think I made reference to funding options by freight vehicles. I made specific reference to operators within the Cooper Basin.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Is there any provision for the Northern Connector in the budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I assume that you have looked through the budget papers—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have, yes.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —and might be able to identify a line.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I was disappointed to note that there was not anything in it that I could see, so I am asking you the simple question.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** So, I guess we can move on if you cannot identify the line then.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Is there any provision for it in your state budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If there were, there would no doubt be a line to which we could refer and engage in some question and answers.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Not necessarily. It could just be under any of these investment projects that are there, so that is why I am asking.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Not really, because there are quite a few investment projects which quite apparently would not be for that project.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have no doubt about that but, in relation to the projects, some are under annual programs. I do not know whether there is an arrangement there for planning.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** A project like the Northern Connector would not be able to be consumed within an annual program budget; it is a pretty substantial project. If you are insistent on talking about it, I notice that it is something which the state government, of course, when we commenced our funded South Road strategy project in 2013, publicly committed to with the federal government and publicly announced.

Then there was the ingenious policy which you yourself, deputy leader, took to the election, saying that we needed a north-south strategy to be developed and that you would commit a future Liberal government to doing that. Of course, you released a map which, at the north, stopped at Wingfield, so clearly this has not really been on your radar for quite some time, but I am glad that finally you have recognised the benefit of a project which this government, as well as the federal government, has shown a keen interest in.

In the same way, I guess, you also went to the election promising to cancel the Torrens to Torrens project—a project which has a very strong cost-benefit ratio. Now that it is funded, we will be supporting in the order of 480 jobs per year in construction and in other tasks. Of course, at this point in time, those sorts of projects are incredibly necessary. Is there any other detail you would like about it?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am pleased to hear, minister, that in all of that your government is still progressing the Northern Connector project, so were any moneys allocated for the progressing of that project in the budget up to 30 June 2015?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If you could perhaps attach progressing that initiative to moneys which have been expended by both state and commonwealth governments on the preparation of the 10-year plan, then that may be the case, but I would have to take that on notice.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If you can bring that back to the committee as to any moneys that have been expended to date. It may well be just in relation to the costings, cost-benefit analysis, preparation of documents, submissions and the like in that early planning stage; it may be other work that has been undertaken, but in any event we look forward to receiving that from your further inquiries. Can I move to the income position of your employees.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Personally or in total?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** In total. Page 65 has the workforce summary of your employees of the department. Has there been any provision of bonuses for staff separate to their salary and usual entitlements—that is, superannuation and the like—approved for the payment of your staff in the department?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Not that I am aware of, but I will have to take that on notice and check.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If that is going to be applicable in this current year for 2015-16, similarly if you could take that on notice and make that provision to the committee. Could I have an indication of that, minister?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Sorry, was that a question? I will see what information I can bring back.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you. In respect of roads and marine, I am going to refer to the ports now in respect of any provision. There has been some provision for the two new River Murray ferries, but I would be keen to identify whether there is any provision in the budget for the development of a deep sea port, both capital or planning.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In the middle of last year, both the Treasurer and I announced that the Resources Infrastructure Taskforce would be carrying out a body of work to examine preferred locations for a deep sea port, principally looking at the Eyre Peninsula although not exclusively. As to how that work has been funded for those employees from the department, I will come back with some finer detail on that.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Consistent with that announcement in mid last year, the taskforce was to provide a report by June this year. It is now July. Has it completed the report?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Certainly it has carried out an extensive amount of work, and the government is yet to formally consider the work that has been done.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I take it then that you have received the report and it is yet to have cabinet's consideration.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I would not possibly confirm what cabinet has or has not considered, deputy leader.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Let me just ask the first part of the question: have you received the report?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Some work has been done and I have been briefed on it so, when we have sufficient information, when the government has considered that report, we will be releasing that publicly.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I take it then that you have the report and you are looking at other aspects of it. Has it been provided to you as the minister or does it go to the Treasurer?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Both the Treasurer and I have been briefed on the work that has been undertaken by the Resources Infrastructure Taskforce.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Has there been a proposal presented from Flinders Ports to develop the Port Bonython option without requiring a government capital contribution?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have not seen that. Whether that is something that has been provided to the Coordinator-General in his role as someone who is in receipt of unsolicited bids and the like may be the case, but I have not seen such a proposal.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If it was presented under the unsolicited bid proposal, which is possible, in those circumstances are you usually provided with some information about that as the minister?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that the Coordinator-General functionally reports—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** To the Premier.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —to the Premier and through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** But anyway, to your knowledge, you are not aware of any proposal that has been presented to government for a development of Port Bonython?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, no-one has raised that with me, but if that has been presented to government, again I say that it may well have gone to the Coordinator-General, for example or, indeed, to another minister.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Are you aware of any other proposals for port development that have been submitted to your department?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not sure about—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am talking about deep sea ports.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I am not sure about the description of 'submitted to the department'. Of course, there are port proposals which are in existence and are publicly released. Iron Road, for example, has been pushing theirs and, of course, there are other proponents and, when I say proponents, I am principally, although not exclusively, referring to those people involved in the resources industry or minerals extraction. As you can imagine, there are a number of those, given the number of people who are out in the market seeking funding for their mineral developments and they tend to have a pretty broad range of port solutions which, as you would imagine, suit their purposes best, first and foremost and so I could not give you a list. I can certainly take the matter on notice and see what further information I can provide to the parliament about that, but I guess it is fair to say that there are a few proposals that are out there publicly at the moment.

Without meaning or sounding to denigrate them and how realistic they are—particularly given the recent downturn in commodity prices and the difficulties that that is placing on these proponents for these minerals projects in raising funding to develop their prospects, let alone invest in the sort of infrastructure such as ports, etc., that you are referring to—I am aware that there are several, or least more than one because, of course, there is more than one mineral prospect not just on Eyre Peninsula, but in the Braemar region and other regions of South Australia.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** To the best of your knowledge you are not aware of any projects that are under consideration by your department but, as I understand it, you will make that inquiry with your department and provide that information to the committee if it is able to be provided.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Perhaps if I can provide a little more information about the Resources Infrastructure Taskforce. The purpose of it, as the Treasurer and I have publicly announced, is that there would be a joint effort by staff of what is now called DSD—the minerals and energy people in the former department DMITRE—and staff in our department who would follow on from the Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plan and work to make an assessment of how 'likely'

some of these mining prospects are, taking into account a range of factors, none the least of which, obviously, are the prices for their commodities on the global market as well as the sorts of infrastructure requirements that they each have.

Out of necessity, staff from both departments have been talking to a range of mining companies as well as representative bodies and other groups about those prospects as well as their infrastructure requirements, which include port projects. I suspect that they have been festooned with proposals about ports as well as other infrastructure requirements, but of course there then has to be a judgement at some stage about how likely they are, and I do not just mean in terms of in total how likely they are, but how likely they are within a relatively short or medium term necessitating the sort of further consideration about how that infrastructure might be brought to bear.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When you make that inquiry, in the event that there is an application in your department which is under consideration and in the event that it includes the progressing of an assessment of an environmental impact statement on it, could you bring that information back to the committee in the sense of providing a response as to the progress of the approval of that environmental impact statement process?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that it would not only need a firm proposal but, at the very least, a development application to kick off those sorts of requirements of assessment. I am not sure that the project to which you refer—if, indeed, it is something that has been submitted—let alone any other, have reached that stage; even Iron Road's project which, of course, is held up by its proponents as being the 'obvious' and most likely to succeed, but I will make those inquiries.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When you have made those inquiries, in the event that one of these projects—in particular, the one I have referred to in respect of Port Bonython—is in your department and is progressing, albeit slowly as I understand it, with an environmental impact statement assessment, I would ask that you provide the committee with a report as to its progress.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In the event that it is a matter for me to contemplate a report on or, of course, if it is a matter which is best answered by the Minister for Planning as minister responsible for those agencies who would be making calls or issuing approvals or otherwise for these sorts of projects. But we are not quite at that stage yet, are we?

**Mr WINGARD:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 83, line 4, 'once-off transfer from MAC to the highways fund in 2014-15 for future investment in road safety improvements (\$852.9 million)'. Have these proceeds been allocated to projects in forward estimates?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is a good question. Of course, funds within the highway fund are hypothecated for—I will not get the exact wording right—road purposes and so in principle, yes. As for the exact projects, I would have to come back to the house.

**Mr WINGARD:** So you will come back with which projects. Thank you for that. How much of that fund is unallocated?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I would have to take that on notice. I do not think I have the balance of the highways fund going forward.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can I then ask you to get the balance of the highways fund? That would be greatly appreciated.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Sure. Now or in time?

**Mr WINGARD:** When you have an opportunity, thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, no, sorry. Do you mean the balance of the highways fund consistent with those projects going forward over the forward estimates or 30 June?

**Mr WINGARD:** Consistent with those projects going forward. Actually, if I can have 30 June and then we can table going forward, that would be great. How is the new roads and marine line created in the budget with the changeover from the last budget to this budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I stand to be corrected, but I think that is a transfer of funding from one part of the agency to the other due to the restructure. I am advised that there has been a

consolidation of sub-programs within the 2015-16 budget. That transfer which I think you are referring to is the dot point underneath the words 'partially offset by'. That, I am advised, reflects that consolidation of sub-programs into a program.

**Mr WINGARD:** Fantastic. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 83, line 9. There are actually two references here. You can go to the same budget paper, page 69, line 13. It talks about the fact that you opened the Southern Expressway to two-way traffic, and the other one talks about the Southern Expressway duplication. I am just wondering what extra works need to be completed on this project between now and the finish date, which is tabled there as June 2018?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will see if I need to bring back any further detail on this, but my understanding is that some ongoing vegetation and landscaping work needs to be done, and I think following the local member's representations, there are some additional noise mitigation works that are going to be undertaken. There might be some very minor ancillary works, but they are the two primary works that will be undertaken.

**Mr WINGARD:** Fantastic. So you can get back to me with the timeline for that?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If there is any further detail, yes, I will come back to you.

**Mr WINGARD:** Also, with regard to the noise mitigation you spoke about, a question aligned to that is: are you satisfied with the noise mitigation work that has been done there, or are there more works to be done, as you suggested?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As you might have been briefed on previously, we do a range of sound modelling and acoustic testing, and we also apply the appropriate standards when we are building these projects. I think what occurred was that that noise modelling and the infrastructure was constructed in order to meet the standards, and then of course representations were made by members of the community who lived immediately adjacent to the road corridor, feeling that they had been exposed to a greater level of noise than they should. Given that this is yet another project which has been recently delivered within budget and there were some funds available, then a judgement has been made that we could extend some additional noise mitigation works in line with the representations that have been made.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you for that. I will follow through with you and get the outline of those details as they come to hand. That would be great. Has the date of June 2018 been pushed back because of those extra works?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I think it more reflects that, once we have the road in a state where it is safe for motorists to use, then we will open the road as quickly as possible, but then continue on with works on an ongoing basis, particularly those which do not necessarily impede traffic. You will also see references in this current budget to the Northern Expressway project, and that is another example of how a road which was opened a number of years ago continues to require some minor works, and hence some budget allocation, well past when traffic first started using that particular road.

**Mr WINGARD:** Are any of these issues around road safety?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not believe so, but I will double-check with the department.

**Mr WINGARD:** I refer now to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 68, line 27, the O-Bahn extension into the city. Will this include any rebuild to the 30-year-old track as part of this project?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** While we undertake ongoing maintenance of the O-Bahn track, the department has advised me previously that the track is considered to be in reasonable condition, not requiring replacement or significant works, contrary to the assertions of the member for Adelaide. Like with every other development in Adelaide, whether it be the Adelaide Oval or the footbridge or other things which bring people into the city en masse to enjoy themselves, she opposes this project. She has said that the O-Bahn track is crumbling and in dire need of replacement. Well, that is not the advice that has been given to me by the department.

**Mr WINGARD:** The fact that the speed was dropped from 100 km/h back to 85 km/h in 2012, does that have anything to do with the state of the track and/or the vehicles on it?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that, whether it is specifically in relation to that point in time you refer to, there has been occasion where speeds have been limited, particularly when those sorts of maintenance works to which I referred earlier have been undertaken.

**Mr WINGARD:** But there is a blanket speed reduction on the track: the O-Bahn buses used to do 100 km/h and now they are set 85 km/h top speed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that speed reductions have not been implemented for the purposes of reflecting the condition of the track. I am advised that it is potentially because we are running such a high frequency of buses, particularly during the peak hour, that the speed limit has been reduced. You perhaps would have heard me say earlier than in the timetable changes that we have increased the frequency of buses, particularly in the morning peak, I think to some 150 bus services in the two-hour morning peak. So, that gives you an idea of how often these buses are using that corridor. I am advised that it is most likely due to the high frequency of buses being run.

**Mr WINGARD:** I appreciate that but, if there is a high frequency, would you not want to get them through the track quicker and get them out the other end; henceforth, dropping speeds would slow them up?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding of how authorities, both here in South Australia and other authorities, whether it is around Australia or internationally, approach road safety matters is through an issue of risk management and, where possible, risk mitigation. I think that there is a substantial amount of evidence that you can lower the risk of incidents occurring through lower speeds. When you have very, very high traffic volumes carrying a substantial number of people, you can understand why a modest reduction from one speed which is very high to a similarly very high speed is an appropriate risk mitigation strategy.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given that we are about saving time on the journey, how much time did that add to the journey, slowing the O-Bahn buses down?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have to admit, much to my pleasure, that I have stopped doing maths, let alone point-to-point calculations of travel times based on public transport vehicles leaving one area and arriving in another, but I will see what information I can provide you.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 83, the last line—'Commission two new River Murray ferries'. I know we have already done one ferry, but I do not know that it has been placed. Can you tell us where the one ferry and the two new ferries will be stationed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I said that there will be four new ferries in total, two of which I think were funded, from memory, in the 2013-14 state budget, and there are two that are being funded from the moneys we have available going forward in our roads budget. Those ferries, as they are commissioned and come into service, will be placed at areas of highest need.

As I have explained to the member for Chaffey, when there are seasonal demands for higher load limits, for example, then we will move a steel-hulled ferry, whether it is one of the eight we already have in service or whether it is one of the new ones we will be commissioning over the next three years. I cannot give a fixed location, but we try to make sure that the load-restricted wooden-hulled ferries, some of which are between 60 and 80 years old, are located at those areas of lowest demand, principally, from vehicle weight as well as volume of vehicles.

**Mr WINGARD:** So actually where they will go you cannot say as yet because you have not decided which venues will get what?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, we make a regular and live assessment about where the demand is likely to be, particularly for trucks. If there is harvest on, for example, or some other time of year when heavy vehicles will have a higher than regular demand at a particular crossing, we will move a steel-hulled ferry to that location. Once we deliver all four of these ferries that we are now funding, those sorts of activities will not be necessary, but until we have all of them in service—and we still have some wooden-hulled ferries in service, which of course are load restricted now—we will

cycle the steel-hulled ferries around in order to give the local communities best service out of those river crossings.

**Mr WINGARD:** To clarify, you will move the steel-hulled ferries around to different locations according to where the demand is?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think that is what happens at the moment—yes. We will continue the practice of moving these steel-hulled ferries.

**Mr WINGARD:** So a region could have a wooden-hulled ferry for a period, but a steel-hulled ferry might come in during harvest, then the steel one might go again and the wooden one come back?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Correct. That is a strategy which we will continue, but continue on a reduced basis over the next three years as these ferries come into service.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I refer to page 81. The reference in the commentary for explaining the change of variation between budget and estimated result includes, at the penultimate point in the explanatory commentary:

- the reclassification of expenditure from investing to operating for SA Water relocation work for the South Road Upgrade from Torrens Road to River Torrens project (\$10.0 million)

This is the relocation work that has gone from being a capital expense to an operating expense for SA Water. What is that for and why has that been changed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is a good question. We require SA Water to do some service relocations for the project. The reason it is reclassified from investing to operating I will take on notice. To be honest, accounting standards require us to do all manner of things like this, so I will endeavour to find the answer and come back to you with a response.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When you do make that inquiry, could you inquire as to not only why it has occurred but who has required that to occur—whether, in fact, that has been an initiative from Treasury or whether it is to remedy what should have been a correction as to its description previously?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, but I guess in context it may be because at one point in time it was envisaged that there would be a more direct role for the department or its contractor to be carrying out the works and, hence, initially considered to be investing funds. If it is subsequently considered to be a transfer of payments and then considered to be an operating item, I would imagine that is the sort of flavour of the reasoning. However, as I said, I will take that on notice.

**Mr WINGARD:** To move on to public transport, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 87, line 5: 'Commission twenty-second and final electric railcar and remove diesel services from the Seaford line'. Given that the 22<sup>nd</sup> electric railcar will be commissioned very soon, can you tell the house how many electric railcars are needed to service the southern lines?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is substantially less than the 22. It may not be possible to give you a fixed answer, because we would have a view about how to accommodate current patronage levels, and we would have a separate view about how many EMUs we would use to service a higher patronage level. Of course, one of the principal reasons for electrifying the Noarlunga line and extending it out to Seaford was to grow patronage. I will do my best to give you an estimate on that, but it may not be possible for that reason.

**Mr WINGARD:** So no figure has been calculated previously to say how many EMUs are required to service the southern lines?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** There could well be, for want of a better term, a minimum number to replace what was considered to be, at a point in time, a current level of patronage that was being accommodated in diesel railcar units. We would likely be regularly changing our mind, given the very positive growth we have had in patronage on the Seaford line. So, we would say that to service the growing patronage we would want to use more railcars.

**Mr WINGARD:** So, given the excess stock (and I am led to believe that it is five), which is about \$50 million (at \$10 million an EMU), what is the increased average maintenance cost per unit, given the oversupply of these electric trains?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** First, I am not sure I agree with your description of oversupply. The purpose of having a larger fleet than the one you might run on a typical day is for a couple of reasons: first, there will always be at least one railcar being serviced for routine maintenance, perhaps more than one. There may be, as there has been recently (although this of course will eventually come to an end), the need to extensively test and then commission railcars, but I come back to the point: having a greater number in terms of rail capacity than we had at a point in time for diesel services enables us to grow patronage into the future, so we would not agree with the characterisation of oversupply.

**Mr WINGARD:** Some might say that it is an excess to have an oversupply, but again I confirm the number of 17, which is 16 and a spare and which was the suggested number needed for that. The question I asked was: given that 22 will be in service, as is pointed out in the budget papers, and that the service contract for 10 years was set up around there being 22 in operation, is there an increased average maintenance cost per unit with the oversupply? So, 22 are getting fully serviced when they are not all in operation because the line only requires 16 and a spare. How much extra cost is there in the maintenance budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Again, the way you have framed your question is predicated on having an excess number of railcars, hence an excess amount of maintenance to be conducted on those railcars. As I have explained, as we continue to grow patronage on the Seaford line and put more railcars into service, that would belie your characterisation of them being excess.

I also point out that, depending on how the terms of the maintenance contract are set out (and I do not have those details with me), there may be some declining arrangement in terms of additional cars being serviced, or we might have a fixed price for servicing all of them, which would mean would we would not be able to give a unit price for it.

**Mr WINGARD:** So are you saying that there is a declining scale in the contract?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I am saying it is possible; I just do not have the details in front of me. I also said it is also possible that there is a fixed price for looking after the whole fleet. I just do not have that information in front of me.

**Mr WINGARD:** If there is a fixed price for looking after the whole fleet, and the whole fleet is not getting utilised to its full potential, then surely there is a cost differential here and a wastage in not getting that full capacity out of the fleet.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I see the point that you are getting at but in the environment where we are running electric services out to Seaford, we are seeing patronage grow year on year and, indeed, extraordinarily returning to the sorts of trend increases that we wanted to see from the electrification of the Seaford line, then of course calls are made on the rest of the fleet, and that is also true when we have times of particularly high demand outside of peak.

So for example, with Footy Express services, the department has been running effectively six-car sets, so two EMUs joined together which is something that we have not previously done, not necessarily just with EMUs of course, by definition, but also with the diesel railcars. So we are able to get these railcars into service on an increasing basis and that means that we can provide a greater level of service to those communities in the southern suburbs.

**Mr WINGARD:** You take us to a very good point—the running of the six-car sets. Of course, for those who do not know, the EMUs run as a three and a three, and you have to run them either as a six or a three, which I understand. How many stations on the southern lines are not long enough to accommodate six cars?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Several, I think, and so the strategy that we have used is trying to best inform people as they are boarding the six-car set that, in order to get off at a particular station, they need to be either in the front or the back of the configuration to make sure that they can get off. That is a system that has worked pretty well, although it has been drawn to my attention that there has been at least one occasion where somebody has been caught out.

**Mr WINGARD:** Stuck in the doors?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Somebody has been caught out, and we have made sure that we have continued to improve both the signage and the advice that we give to people, particularly people coming back into the railway station after Footy Express services, so that we are making sure that people are on the right carriage to get off.

**Mr WINGARD:** Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 86, the last line states, 'Completed station upgrades at Broadmeadows and Parafield stations.' Of course they are not on the lines. Do you have any other stations that you are going to be lengthening and upgrading as part of that project to alleviate this problem of people getting stuck in the doors, and trains being too long for the station?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I guess there are two elements to that one: 'Are we lengthening platforms for the purposes of running six-car rail sets?' or perhaps were you referring to, 'Are we continuing on with our regular station upgrade program across the network?'

**Mr WINGARD:** I was hoping the upgrade would be lengthening to accommodate the six-car rail sets.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** What we have seen with the introduction of electric train services on the Seaford line, particularly when we have introduced limited stop peak services, is that those services will only call at particular stations, so it would be a very expensive and unnecessary task to lengthen every platform of every train station along the Seaford line to accommodate a six-car set, because of course we know from our data that some stations are vastly more heavily patronised than others, so to spend great deals of money to lengthen a platform at a station which is not particularly heavily patronised might not be the best allocation of—of course what we have across all areas of government, and transport is no exception—defined resources.

**The CHAIR:** If I could just butt in here. I have recently come back from a study tour in England and the trains there do not always accommodate the platforms, which I noted particularly, and they seem to be able to manage with just some announcements.

**Mr WINGARD:** I appreciate your comments but the fact that someone got stuck in the doors the other day is a little bit alarming and they are a bit concerned about it, but thank you for your comment, Chair; I do appreciate that. Back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 87, line 5 about the commissioning of the 22<sup>nd</sup> railcar. The statement also says that diesel railcars will all be removed from the Seaford line and presumably moved to the Gawler/Outer Harbor and Belair line with a 35-year old 2000 series train scheduled to be taken out of service.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We are removing those from service as we speak and continuing over the coming months.

**Mr WINGARD:** When were they scheduled to be taken out of service?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think they were scheduled to be taken out of service once we had received all of the electric train sets and gone through the testing and commissioning process for those rail sets.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can you give us a date as to when they will be taken off the Gawler line?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Not right now, but I can certainly endeavour to come back to the committee with some further information.

**Mr WINGARD:** I refer to Budget Measures Statement, Budget Paper 5, page 48, Station security and amenity upgrades. It says that there is \$1 million per year for four years for CCTV lighting and amenities. Which stations are earmarked for these upgrades this financial year and how much will be spent on each one?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We will be making assessments of where this money is best spent. We have been rolling out improved security and safety arrangements across our train stations over the past six or seven years in particular, and we are left with, off the top of my head, a small handful of stations which do not have those sorts of amenities. We will also be looking at what other improvements beyond those CCTV and lighting upgrades we can provide to those stations. We

already spend an amount of money every year improving, upgrading and refurbishing train stations. This is additional money which will help us move through that task a little quicker.

**Mr WINGARD:** What percentage of CCTVs at stations have been transferred from analog to digital?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not have that detail in front of me.

**Mr WINGARD:** Does anyone alongside you have that information?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will this budgeted program transfer all current analogue systems to digital by its completion?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No; as I pointed out, this is in an effort to roll out CCTV and lighting improvements to a greater number of locations than what we currently have.

**Mr WINGARD:** How many stations on the Seaford line have been identified with poor lighting?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not have that in front of me if indeed any have.

**Mr WINGARD:** Does anyone alongside you have that information?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No.

**Mr WINGARD:** Has this poor lighting at stations caused problems for drivers, with inadequate vision on the cameras and the monitors in the cabins of the EMUs when passengers get on and off?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Your assertion within that question is that there is poor lighting at those stations, and that has not been advice to me. In the event that lighting is an issue at any of those stations, I would have to take that on notice.

**Mr WINGARD:** So it has not come to your attention that there is poor lighting at stations where the EMUs that have the cameras on the side cannot see people getting on and off?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I appreciate the assertion that you are desperately trying to make that there is poor lighting along stations on the Seaford line. I guess to remind you of the answer I have just given, that information has not been provided to me, but nonetheless I have undertaken to see if there is any further information I can provide to the committee.

**Mr WINGARD:** You will come back to us, thank you very much, I appreciate that. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 87, line 12, '% of train services arriving within 5 minutes and 59 seconds'. The 2014-15 the target was 95 per cent and the 2014-15 estimated result was 91.18 per cent. In 2016-17, the target is 94 per cent. I note there is a change in methodology measuring on time running. Why the change?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Perhaps if you can provide me with some more information about the change in the methodology of on time running.

**Mr WINGARD:** That is what I am asking you: the Budget Paper has a note that says there has been a change in the methodology.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will come back to you on that.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given that on time running for trains is measured at five minutes and 59 seconds, if they are inside five minutes and 59 seconds they are not deemed to be late, but if they tick over to six minutes they are deemed to be late. Can you confirm that on time running of trains coming into Adelaide station are clocked? Does the clock stop when they hit the platform and people can alight the train at the Adelaide station, or does it stop well before that?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I guess there are a few points that should be made about—

**Mr WINGARD:** Not really.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Sorry?

**Mr WINGARD:** I was just saying, whether they can get to that stop or not is the question that I am asking.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I appreciate the question. I am beginning to answer it. On-time running reflects, obviously, how well these vehicles are moving between train stations. Whether on-time running is assessed as a train reaching the Adelaide Railway Station in particular, let alone at a particular point in time within the Adelaide Railway Station, or if indeed it is a measure of a train and it is travelling between two other points in the system, I would need to clarify.

For example, by your measure, only trains coming from areas such as Grange, Outer Harbor, Belair or Seaford reaching into the Adelaide Railway Station would be assessed for on-time running rather than trains, for example, leaving the Adelaide Railway Station and heading out to places like Belair, Grange, Outer Harbor and Seaford, as well as Gawler.

Secondly, I guess the point I make is that, while it is unfortunate for the rest of the passengers on board, sometimes on-time running issues arise because there are a higher than anticipated number of boardings at a particular station, or indeed at a particular number of stations, which, in a concertina effect, cause trains to run beyond the five minutes and 59 seconds.

I guess the other point I should make as well is that sometimes train drivers need to step out of their cabin where they control the train from, walk down the side of a train, which can be an extensive walk, particularly if it is on a three-car diesel set or indeed an EMU, and assist disabled people or people with other mobility issues getting onto a train.

So, while 100 per cent would be fantastic, we have benchmarks reflecting that, from time to time, higher levels of patronage and/or people with mobility issues using public transport are impacting those figures. So, I am perhaps not quite as ruthless as you are in towelling up train drivers who are doing the right thing by people in our community, helping them use public transport on an increasing basis.

**Mr WINGARD:** That is absolutely nothing to do with what I said, and actually did not even address the question. If I can ask the question again—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I think I addressed it, particularly in the early part of my answer, pretty well.

**Mr WINGARD:** No, the question is: are trains deemed on-time running when they arrive at the station, or is it just when they get into the Adelaide rail yard? If they make it into the Adelaide rail yard inside that five minutes 59 seconds, does the clock stop then, and it does not matter how long it takes them to get to the station, or does the clock stop when they get to the station? It is a simple question.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The answer that I have provided you is that—

**Mr WINGARD:** Yes or no?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —there are likely to be several definitions for on-time running, depending on which direction the train is heading. So, by your definition, we would never be able to assess a train heading out to Belair, heading out to Grange, heading out to Gawler, or heading out to Outer Harbour, because your definition of on-time running is when a train is entering the Adelaide Railway Station.

**Mr WINGARD:** No, I am saying as a measure. Does the train have to get to the platform, or just inside the rail yard?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, and providing you that context in my answer I said that I would seek some information from the department about how it is measured.

**Mr WINGARD:** Sorry, I did not hear you say that bit first. I apologise, I did not hear that bit and I am sure the gentleman alongside you can probably answer that question straightaway, and if we can get an answer, that would be great, because it is quite a big measure. If people know that the train arrives at the station and it is on-time running or if it is just in the vicinity, like the rail yard, there is a big difference. So, would you like to—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Maybe it is to do with the car park tax—who knows?

**Mr WINGARD:** Would you like to ask—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Mitchell, in my opening remarks to you: all questions go to the minister and he directs from there.

**Mr WINGARD:** I am just wondering whether—

**The CHAIR:** No, your questions are to the minister.

**Mr WINGARD:** Fair enough, and he will decide if he asks?

**The CHAIR:** He will seek the answer if he needs to.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have indicated twice that I would take the question on notice and bring back further details to the house.

**Mr WINGARD:** I appreciate that; I just thought—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I can write it down for you—

**Mr WINGARD:** I just thought we could do it really quickly, because he is sitting right next to you, but if you do not want to do that, that is fine. Budget Measures Statement, page 47: 'Rail signals and communication cable upgrade'—\$6 million over the next two years, with a budgeted spend of \$6 million a year over the next two years. Will this fix all the issues with rail signals and communication cables on our metro rail network?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I guess the first point to make is this is additional money. It is not \$6 million but indeed \$12 million—

**Mr WINGARD:** Sorry, \$6 million over two years, that's \$12 million, yes. Apologies, I need to make that point.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —that we are providing in addition to the tens of millions of dollars that we spend on rail maintenance on an ongoing basis. While we have spent significant amounts of money in extending and electrifying the rail network (certainly on the Seaford line), and while we have spent a significant amount of money on resleepering the vast majority of the passenger rail network as well, that does not mean that every element of the rail system has been upgraded.

Given that we take the services we provide to South Australians on the public transport system seriously enough that we would contemplate a range of measures that could possibly improve the public transport experience for South Australians, and given that we promulgate those sorts of policies on an ongoing basis, whether it is through budgets or whether it is at elections, this is another of our efforts to improve the reliability of the system.

You asked me if I will guarantee that this will fix every problem in the system. Of course it will not. Problems will always emerge in the rail system, in the same way that problems will continue to emerge on the road system as well. The key is: are we doing more about it? Yes, we are, and we are dedicating our resources accordingly.

**Mr WINGARD:** What impact is the current signalling system having on the Seaford line express trains, given that it was pointed out by the head of the department that he was having trouble sleeping at night because of some of the signalling problems that were within that network?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that that comment was particularly in relation to level crossings. Given, as I have explained to this chamber on previous occasions, the fact that we have what is perhaps described as a comparatively open rail system compared to other passenger rail systems around the country (for example, Sydney, which has a far more closed system; indeed, I am advised that some parts of it are completely closed, particularly to crossings, whether it is road or pedestrian crossings), the opportunity for people to deliberately or inadvertently stray onto our rail network and put themselves, drivers and other passengers on public transport vehicles like trains at risk is something which indeed causes all people who are involved with this area a great deal of stress.

I am sure if you spoke with emergency services workers, the prospect of having to attend a scene where somebody has been hit or killed in an accident on our rail lines would cause them an amount of concern and stress as well.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given that we are attempting to fix these rail signals and communication cables with this upgrade, how many different signalling systems will there be on the metro rail network after this upgrade?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that we are replacing components of the existing system. I am advised that this work is aimed towards upgrading the existing components within the signalling system rather than installing a new signalling system.

**Mr WINGARD:** The question was: how many signalling systems do we have on our Adelaide metro rail network?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will come back to you on that.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will these new upgraded signalling systems work seamlessly with the automatic train protection system when it comes online?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I said, the \$12 million over two years is not a measure to introduce a new and separate signalling system. This is money which is dedicated towards replacing and improving elements of the existing system. My understanding of the automatic train protection program is that it is designed to operate in coordination with the existing signalling system.

**Mr WINGARD:** So when will the ATP system come online?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The ATP system is being rolled out over a period, including both the works necessary, I think, below rail and above rail. I am not sure that I have a date, but I will endeavour to come back and find one.

**Mr WINGARD:** It was, in last year's budget papers, saying that it was already completed.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am sorry, could you repeat that?

**Mr WINGARD:** It was in last year's budget papers saying that it was already completed, but it is not up and running yet. Is there a reason?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am just advised that it is in the testing and commissioning phase, some elements of it.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will the ATP system then run on the entire network, or only on certain lines?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that it is progressively being rolled out across the system. As to how much the current initiative and the current budget funds, I would have to take that on notice and come back.

**Mr WINGARD:** Just to clarify, we are not sure how many lines the ATP system is going to be running on?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not sure but I am pretty confident someone in the department would be.

**Mr WINGARD:** But we are not going to ask them. Will the upgrade of the signalling system and the SigView system be able to handle express trains automatically, or will there be ongoing issues with yellow cautions slowing them down?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will take some advice but I would have thought whether a train is configured as a single or multiple car set, whether it is stopping at each station or running between stations missing some stops would not necessarily have an impact on how effective the signalling system and the automatic train protection system is, but I will come back if there is any further detail to add to that answer.

**Mr WINGARD:** More specifically, will the new upgrade of the signalling system work in with the SigView system and prevent the ongoing caution problems that are causing problems and delays with the trains as it stands?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I guess, either for the third or fourth time, I reiterate that the \$12 million that we have over two years is to replace components in the existing system rather than—

**Mr WINGARD:** And will it make it work, is what I am saying.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Mitchell.

**Mr WINGARD:** I am just trying to clarify because he is saying—

**The CHAIR:** Let us hear the answers and then you can jump in again. I need to hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You have already questioned me about this during question time and, as I said to you at the time, this is about improving the reliability of the system and making sure that we have fewer service interruptions due to signalling issues. It is a priority for this government because, of course, unlike your side of politics, we are always looking for ways to improve the public transport system and get more people onto public transport.

If you wanted some evidence to support my claim, not only have you personally failed to come up with one idea to improve public transport but, certainly, your party has failed to take a policy to the last three elections about public transport and, indeed, your federal party has made it very clear to jurisdictions, including South Australia, that they will not fund public transport improvements. I think that is a pretty clear demonstration of the Liberal Party of Australia's plans on this issue.

**Mr WINGARD:** I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 69, line 26: Public Transport Infrastructure Renewal. What projects will be done under this budget line in 2015-16, \$13.8 million?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You will see in the preceding two columns, for example, Estimated Completion, and not applicable is given to each quarter and to Total Project Cost not applicable is given. That is a treatment common throughout budget papers for programs which are on an ongoing basis, and that is the annual allocation for the 2015-16-year. Not only is it an increase of some \$4.2 million on the previous year but it also indicates that this is an ongoing effort with no end because, once again, we recognise that we need to continue investing in the public transport system, certainly in its improvement as well as its maintenance.

**Mr WINGARD:** I understand you have got a pool of money and you have got projects you want to do as ongoing works that need to be done. Has that pool of money been allocated to any projects?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I would imagine there is a standing number of matters that would need to be addressed on an ongoing or periodic basis within the maintenance budget. Whether all of it has been allocated or whether the additional money that we are putting in to improving our public transport infrastructure has been allocated, I will take that matter on notice.

**Mr WINGARD:** Is Laing O'Rourke's maintenance contract paid out of this capital works budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that this question, which you asked me in question time a number of weeks ago, is about the maintenance of parts of the rail network for which Laing O'Rourke has a contract, and is that paid for out of a project budget for the Seaford rail line? I think my answer stands that no, it is not.

**Mr WINGARD:** So it is not paid out of this budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think you said—

**Mr WINGARD:** The question is then: is Laing O'Rourke's maintenance contract paid out of this capital works budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Out of its capital works budget?

**Mr WINGARD:** Out of this capital works budget.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that it is unlikely because the payments made to Laing O'Rourke are likely to be considered operating expenditure.

**Mr WINGARD:** So it is considered operating expenditure and it is not being paid out of this budget line. Is that confirmed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is what I am advised. I am advised that the maintenance contract is most likely to be operating expenditure but I will double-check that and, if I have it wrong, I will bring it back to the house as a correction.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you. Can you confirm that Laing O'Rourke was paid \$250,000 a month for its maintenance budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I cannot confirm that.

**The CHAIR:** We just do not understand the word you are using; what is the question?

**Mr WINGARD:** I just asked: can the minister confirm that Laing O'Rourke—

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, what is the next bit: Laing and?

**Mr WINGARD:** Laing O'Rourke.

**The CHAIR:** Is that the name of a company?

**Mr WINGARD:** Yes, the name of a company—are they being paid \$250,000 a month for their maintenance budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I cannot confirm that; I do not have that figure with me.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can you check it and get back to the house?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I can check it.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you. I move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 86, line 1, which states:

- additional income for services provided for special events through the implementation of the special events levy (\$2.2 million).

What was the total budget for the special events levy for 2014-15?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You mean the anticipated receipts? It is not mentioned here but what is mentioned here is the fact that there is an increase in income of some \$2.2 million from the application of that special events levy. I think that would have been outlined in the previous year's budget papers.

**Mr WINGARD:** The budgeted was but I am looking for what the actual was for 2014-15 for the special events levy, the actual figure.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Unless I am mistaken I think it is \$2.2 million. I am told it is \$2.5 million.

**Mr WINGARD:** So the budget was for \$1.7 million but the special events levy brought in \$2.5 million?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am sorry. I am advised that the budgeted amount of revenue was \$2.5 million and it appears here the estimate is—

**Mr WINGARD:** For what it is worth, I think last year's budget papers indicated \$1.7 million, if that is of any help.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will clarify that. I do not have last year's budget revenue target in front of me so I will have to double-check that. I am also advised that we do not yet have a consolidated actual revenue figure for that financial year, so I will provide that.

**Mr WINGARD:** Is there an estimated figure?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This is an assumption and, of course, subject to correction, but if there is an increase in income, \$2.2 million of that being for the special events levy, it may well be the case that the amount is \$2.2 million but I would have to clarify that because, of course, that could also be just a \$2.2 million increase on what was already being collected. I am just not

100 per cent sure how these numbers are broken down so I will take that on notice and come back to you.

**Mr WINGARD:** I understand, thank you. What is the budget for the special events levy for 2015-16?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that it is \$4.75 million.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can you outline which events paid the levy in 2014-15?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not have that list but, of course, the bulk of it to date and on an ongoing basis will be payments for the Footy Express services which are currently made by both football clubs, the SMA and the SANFL in different proportions.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can you come back to the house with a list of all the events that do pay the special events levy?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think so; I think we should be able to provide that, yes.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you; that would be great. Moving on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 69, line 1, Rail Revitalisation—remaining network re-sleeping. Does this work include replacing the wooden sleepers with concrete sleepers on the Seaford line between Oaklands and Warradale?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not believe so, but if I am wrong about that then I will correct the record subsequently.

**Mr WINGARD:** Does this include replacing all remaining wooden sleepers in the Adelaide rail yard with concrete ones?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised we will have to take that on notice.

**Mr WINGARD:** Can I ask where these wooden sleepers will be replaced with concrete ones, if it is not those two locations?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You can and I will take it on notice and provide you with an answer.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will all projects be completed by December 2015, as outlined in the budget as the completion quarter?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Given we have \$43,000 left to spend, I would hope so, unless there is some mitigating issue which prevents us from doing that.

**Mr WINGARD:** Sorry, but you have just said that you will not be doing the Oaklands to Warradale stretch and you will not be doing the Adelaide rail yard.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, and then you asked me: will the line at the top of page 69 be complete by December 2015?

**Mr WINGARD:** And that is the re-sleeping of the entire network with concrete sleepers?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I specifically pointed out previously that that is not the re-sleeping of the entire network.

**Mr WINGARD:** So, the project will not be completed, is that what you are saying?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think you might be getting confused. The project is a project of re-sleeping an amount of the wooden sleepers. You asked me earlier would we be re-sleeping those wooden sleepers in the vicinity of the Oaklands crossing and I made it clear that we will not be. However, given that there is money available and, of course, works still to be done, then this element, this project, will be conducted, or it is estimated to be done by December 2015.

**Mr WINGARD:** So, to quote the Premier, the wooden toothpicks will be staying at Oaklands.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not think the Premier said that the wooden toothpicks will be staying at Oaklands. Could you provide me with the reference for that?

**Mr WINGARD:** No, he called the wooden sleepers the wooden toothpicks; that is alright.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In areas on the Outer Harbor line and the Gawler line that was certainly the case, many sleepers that were replaced were in an advanced state of deterioration, but your characterisation that that applies equally to every wooden sleeper across the network, I think, is a bit of a stretch.

**Mr WINGARD:** Again, just quoting the Premier. What impact will this project have on service delivery when the work is being carried out to replace these sleepers?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I would need to check where the sleepers are being replaced, but the rail commissioner has been endeavouring to conduct maintenance works and improvements to infrastructure in the period when trains are not running and I assume that is the case with these, but how that \$43,000 is to be spent within the next six months I would need to double-check.

**Mr WINGARD:** Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 69, line 26, Public Transport Infrastructure Renewal. Does this project include trailer bogie inspection timer replacement for 3000 series trains, compressor upgrades for 3000 class railcars, road rail excavator for concrete sleepers, Glengowrie depot overhead upgrade and a tamper machine?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I explained in a previous answer a little while ago, this is an ongoing program, it is not a specific project, so these moneys will be allocated across public transport assets not necessarily just within the rail system nor necessarily just within the tram network or even indeed amongst the bus network. It will apply across those different areas and, indeed, maybe in other areas which immediately have not come to mind. You asked earlier if I could provide a breakdown as to what this will fund and my answer stands that I will seek some further detail and return to the house.

**Mr WINGARD:** So, it may or it may not be some of those projects, is that what you are saying?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I said, it will go—

**Mr WINGARD:** It is unlikely.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I did not say whether it was likely or unlikely. I reconfirmed my previous answer to the committee that I will seek some detail and bring it back to the house.

**Mr WINGARD:** How much has been paid to Tracksure for tamping works as part of the rail revitalisation program?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I would have to take that on notice. Are you out of questions?

**Mr WINGARD:** No, not at all, just smiling—just smiling. Given how important it is to have properly tamped tracks to run electric trains properly and to prevent damage to these trains, the department believe that our 30 and 40 year old tamping machines cannot do the work required. Given that, as you point out, the majority of sleepers now on the rail line are concrete, is the intention to keep the Tracksure contract going or is the intention to purchase a new tamping machine?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that what we have done with some of the works on the Seaford line is that we have made use of specialist equipment when it has become available in between that equipment being used by other jurisdictions for other purposes. Whether that is the approach for this work, I will have to take that on notice and confirm it.

**Mr WINGARD:** Where are we getting the machines from?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I said, I would determine—

**Mr WINGARD:** What other jurisdictions are we getting them from?

**The CHAIR:** Member for Mitchell, can we just hear the answer?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will walk you through them: Perth has a rail system, Victoria has a rail system, New South Wales has a rail system, there may be contractors in Queensland that have these sorts of machinery, and there are also two states and territories which have commercial operations as well which might—

**Mr WINGARD:** Are we getting it from all those states?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You have asked which other states we might get it from, and I am outlining to you those others that comprise the federation.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given the need for these machines and us getting them from other states, are we looking at getting a wheel lathe for our rail network to profile the wheels in maintenance, to maintain the money we have spent on the rail revitalisation program?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that we have used a non-government wheel lathe; we have used a private wheel lathe in the past. Whether it is value for money for us to purchase one, I would have to make an assessment at the time as well as make an assessment of the availability of the wheel lathe. If it is just as easy or efficient or cost-effective to use someone else's wheel lathe and to procure those services on a regular, or even on an occasional basis, then we will make that judgement. It is about making sure that we are using our maintenance budget effectively.

**Mr WINGARD:** How much does it cost to send tram bogies to Melbourne to get the wheels lathed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not sure whether all tram bogies are sent to Melbourne to get them done—

**Mr WINGARD:** They are.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In the event that it does happen, I will take that on notice. I do not have that figure with me.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will you get back to the house with a figure?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If I can provide one.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given that an Evans & Peck report in 2012 suggested that the train wheel lathe that we have access to is diminishing and dying and unlikely to be replaced, have you done any scoping work and costing work on how much it would cost to ship our trains to Melbourne to get the wheels lathed as well?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I explained, we would make an assessment on whether it is more cost-effective to purchase a wheel lathe and continue to own and operate that piece of equipment, with all the budget implications that would entail, or whether it is more cost-effective to call these services in from the private sector, or indeed one of the other jurisdictions that comprise our federation. It is about making sure that we use our funds as efficiently as possible and also, of course, balancing the impact on the railcars that we are able to put into service.

**Mr WINGARD:** Could you inquire with the department as to any scoping work or costings that have been done and get back to the house as to how much it would cost if you were to go down that path of sending trains to Melbourne to have the wheels lathed?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not sure that the practice has occurred, but I will make an inquiry as to what the current arrangement is.

**Mr WINGARD:** My apologies; I am not saying that it has happened, I am asking if any scoping work has been done to get a price on what it would cost.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am not aware of that. I will see if I can find out any further detail for you.

**Mr WINGARD:** That would be greatly appreciated; thank you very much. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 87, line 9. The percentage of metropolitan weekday passenger vehicle travel on public transport was 6.5 per cent in 2013-14 and was maintained at 6.5 per cent in 2014-15, and it was 6.6 per cent in 2012-13. Given that this figure has gone down since 2012-13 and currently sits at 6.5 per cent, are you confident of meeting your target of 10 per cent by 2018?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We certainly aim to meet the target. It is a function of two things. One, of course, is the increasing levels of patronage on our public transport network. Of

course, patronage increased by 5.5 per cent in the last financial year compared to the year above, and we saw very significant increases, for example, on our train system; some 7 or 8 per cent on the Gawler and Outer Harbor lines and, albeit compared to a year where there was some service interruptions and restrictions for work, a 78 per cent increase on the Seaford line. So we are growing our patronage.

However, as I have also outlined in another initiative that we have announced in the last 24 hours, we are also seeing a significant increase in the number of road vehicles that have been registered here in South Australia. Presumably because the cost of cars is decreasing as they become more available to people and more people take up the opportunity of travelling on weekdays in private motor vehicles, it becomes a more difficult function to catch that target, despite having strong growth in our public transport patronage.

The answer is: we will continue to chase that target down and, in doing so, we will continue to invest in initiatives like improving the services that we currently provide, improving the network on which we provide them, through the sorts of initiatives like improving the signalling system and replacing elements of it and also increasing the number of services, as we continue to do on the train lines, let alone what we are doing on our tram and bus network. Of course, the bus network does, for want of a better term, the heavy lifting of public transport movements in our city.

**Mr WINGARD:** Given the media release today that said train patronage for 2014-15 was up to 13 million from 10.3 million last year and given the growth of the line, the addition of extra stations and the lengthening of the line—the release also points out that the Adelaide Metro annual patronage numbers have gone up too, and they do not include the Footy Express or free travel—do the train patronage numbers include the free travel as well, the 13 million?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No; I am advised that the nearly 67 million passenger figure that we released today in terms of total patronage across excludes the eight million free trips that we provide as well. Including those, you would be looking at something in the order of 75 million trips across both buses and trains, but also trams, and that reflects certainly the Footy Express services. We do not quite do eight million or anywhere near eight million of the Footy Express services; we have been averaging a little over 50 per cent of Adelaide Oval attendances. To give you an idea, that is perhaps in the 24,000 or 25,000 people a game average, although sometimes that is much higher and sometimes it is a bit lower. That also includes the free trips that we give to pensioners and those eligible concession card holders outside of peak times, as well as for other community events for which we do not cost recover through special events.

**Mr WINGARD:** I appreciate that. I just want to make my question abundantly clear. You said that the 66.7 million people that used Adelaide Metro in the annual patronage figures did not include the free trips for special events, etc. I am asking: did the figure portraying of 13.1 million patronage include special events and all the free trips and the like?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My advice is that the 67 comprises the 13 as well as the other amounts for tram and bus, and that the 67 doesn't include the eight.

**Mr WINGARD:** The 13 doesn't; is that what you are saying?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It does not, is my advice.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you, I appreciate that.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I will triple check that, but I am pretty sure that that is the case.

**Mr WINGARD:** Sorry, you will check that?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I said I will triple check that, but I am pretty sure that that is the case: it does not include those free trips.

**Mr WINGARD:** Fantastic. If you could get back to the house that would be wonderful. Budget Paper 4, Agency Statement Volume 3, page 68, line 34, 'Public Transport—Park'n'Ride Interchanges': of the \$8.9 million to be spent in 2015-16, how much will be spent on upgrading the car parking at the Paradise Interchange?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is an excellent question because we, of course, went to the election with a policy to benefit people who use public transport—being the only major party in South Australia that conducted such an exercise—and we said two things. We said that we would upgrade the Paradise park-and-ride as well as a series of other park-and-ride locations, and we also said that we would introduce a transport development levy, which would go into the sorts of initiatives that would reduce congestion in our city. Of course, public transport is a major contributor to reducing congestion in our city. So when people like the member for Hartley, who has been banging his chest about wanting to get on with improving park-and-ride capacity at the Paradise Interchange, then voted against the revenue stream, which would have specifically funded it, unsurprisingly we were unable to continue with that initiative.

So, it has been a regrettable task for me to inform as many of his constituents as possible that he is responsible for meaning that hundreds of people each day continue to have to park on Darley Road, sometimes many hundreds of metres away from where buses pick up and set down passengers.

**Mr WINGARD:** Will you be bringing back the car park tax?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, it is not in these budget papers and we have no plans to do so.

**Mr WINGARD:** How much is the estimated upgrade cost for the park-and-ride at Paradise Interchange?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** There had been a previous budget allocation but there were of course several options which were being considered, everything from trying to provide an improvement either at or adjacent to the car park of the Paradise Community Church (that is not what it is called now) or moving roughly westwards towards where the skate park is to perhaps try to find a solution on the unfortunately spaced constricted area actually at the interchange on the same side of Darley Road as the interchange.

The figure off the top of my head was something in excess of \$2 million, but unfortunately because your side of politics does not support public transport let alone those sorts of measures which encourage and enable people to take it, this revenue measure was voted down and we cannot deliver these sorts of important improvements which would benefit people in the north-eastern suburbs.

I am pleased to say, though, that despite the opposition of 'I do not support any improvements in the city of Adelaide, member for Adelaide,' we are getting on with the O-Bahn City Access Project which is a benefit to people in the north-eastern suburbs. Those two disparate positions of the two political parties which comprise the vast majority of members in this chamber—those who support the north-eastern suburbs and public transport and those who do not—that is a distinction and a delineation we look forward to promulgating throughout those suburbs, particularly in the lead-up to March 2018.

**Mr WINGARD:** When you did not mention the car park tax. Which measures are being undertaken to improve security such as—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, there is no car park tax. It is called the Transport Development Levy.

**Mr WINGARD:** —cameras at the car parks at the Paradise Interchange?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think I have used several hundred words to explain what we are or more—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** It is still not clear.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, perhaps you are still fossicking around for an appropriate budget reference. Perhaps that is why you were not able to concentrate on—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I've got it here for you in a minute.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You've finally got it, have you? It is a shame you didn't have it an hour and a half ago.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Mitchell, did you have a question?

**Mr WINGARD:** Yes, I did. Sorry, I did not realise you had finished. Apologies. I refer to Budget Paper 5, page 47, line 2: Operation Moving Traffic Adelaide. Given this initiative is looking to improve traffic flows around Adelaide, will any of these measures be designed to keep cars out of the city?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, I think your commentary has been that this is a waste of money and a distraction. Is that correct?

**Mr WINGARD:** No.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not want to distract you from the task at hand here.

**The CHAIR:** Order! The member for Mitchell is a big boy. He can look after himself.

**Mr WINGARD:** Are there measures to keep cars out of the city in this proposal?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If you had a look at the material which was provided publicly, you would realise that this measure is about making it easier for cars to move around our metropolitan area, including the city.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** So what is the answer?

**The CHAIR:** Order! It is getting late.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, if you listened, deputy leader, perhaps with some attention, you might be enlightened.

**Mr WINGARD:** The Premier has made mention that he does want to get cars out of the city, so I am asking on the back of this proposal to make transport easier and improve traffic flows, will any of that be to divert traffic out of the city?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No.

**Mr WINGARD:** So, that is all good. Fantastic. Thank you for that. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 83, line 23 on strengthening the national chain of responsibility laws. I note that given last year's papers referred to the commencement of the implementation of the heavy vehicle national law, is the government concerned by suggestions that the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator will not be able to implement its chain of responsibility legislation, roadworthiness reforms, national registration scheme and mass distance location charging, given financial constraints that they will not be able to deliver all four of those?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** To provide a bit of context, we have been working with industry stakeholders to come up with a package of reforms that will provide demonstrable benefits to road safety, particularly for the heavy vehicle industry. We have been doing that with the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association, and we have been doing it with the South Australian Road Transport Association, as well as other national organisations, such as the Australian Logistics Council.

In the same way that we have been working cooperatively and our efforts have been wholly supported by entities like the RAA, for example, which represents some 680,000 motorists and also the Bus Industry Confederation, which represents those bus operators, in the same way that they have supported wholeheartedly our efforts for Operation Moving Traffic, these other stakeholders, with regard to the heavy vehicle industry, have been supporting our efforts in this respect.

In the last meeting we had as national transport ministers, in May, I successfully moved that we accelerate efforts which were being conducted by the National Transport Commission, which is the policy-generating body for these matters. The Heavy Vehicle Regulator is, as its name suggests, the regulator: it is not an organisation that designs or sets policy or, indeed, is responsible for drafting legislation or negotiating with the states about how we roll that legislation out. When the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator makes comments that 'we cannot possibly afford to do all these policy functions', that is for good reason, because that is not what they are funded for.

It is South Australia's view and, I am aware, the view of some other people nationally, that, quite frankly, until we have the permitting systems and the other operations of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator functioning smoothly, they need to stick to their knitting and make sure that we can move trucks around our community as efficiently as possible.

That is making sure that they process permits, so that we do not have to go to the extent that we have previously done between now and February 2014 and second staff out of our organisation, paid for by South Australian taxpayers, to supplement the money and the efforts that the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator has gone to with the money that South Australian taxpayers have already contributed to those efforts. If they say they are not confident that they can bite off a whole bunch of tasks beyond their remit, then that is probably because they are not meant to and they are not funded to.

**Mr WINGARD:** When do you expect the mass distance location charging trials to get underway?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Which budget reference are you looking at?

**Mr WINGARD:** I was just referring to 'strengthening national chain of responsibility laws'.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is something different.

**Mr WINGARD:** Fair enough—we can skip that. I will read in the omnibus questions because we are running out of time. Thank you very much; I do appreciate this.

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 in 2014-15 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

2. For each department or agency reporting to the minister in 2014-15, please provide the number of public servants broken down into heads and FTEs that are (1) tenured and (2) on contract and, for each category, a breakdown of the number of (1) executives and (2) non-executives.

3. In financial year 2014-15, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2015-16?

4. Between 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more which (1) has been abolished and (2) which has been created?

5. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, please provide a breakdown of attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors in the years 2013-14 and 2014-15.

6. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budget of all grant programs administered by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister and, for 2014-15, provide a breakdown of expenditure on all grants administered by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister listing the name of the grant recipient, the amount of the grant, the purpose of the grant and whether the grant was subject to a grant agreement as required by Treasurer's Instruction 15.

7. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budget for each individual program administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

8. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the names and budget for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

9. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what is the total budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates by year and how are these packages to be funded?

10. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2015, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices and ministerial liaison officers?

**The CHAIR:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Madam Chair—

**The CHAIR:** We are out of time.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I just wish to thank the members of the department for being in attendance, and confirm, as I previously indicated, that, if the minister were to view page 5 of the *Hansard* yesterday of the Attorney-General, he would understand why he and Mr Deegan have been put in the deep end.

**The CHAIR:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of proposed payments adjourned and referred to committee B. I thank all members of the ministerial staff for their help today.

At 18:31 the committee adjourned to Friday 24 July 2015 at 10:30.