

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Wednesday, 25 November 2020
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chair:

Mr P.A. Treloar

Members:

Hon. P. Malinauskas

Dr S.E. Close

Dr R.M. Harvey

Ms P. Luethen

Mr A.S. Pederick

Mr C.J. Picton

The committee met at 11:30

Estimates Vote

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION, \$69,285,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$266,003,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET,
\$9,289,000
PREMIER, OTHER ITEMS, \$5,426,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

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

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

Ms H. Rasheed, Executive Director, Events South Australia, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr A. Kirchner, Chief Executive, Adelaide Venue Management.

Ms M. Hannaford, Chief Financial Officer, Adelaide Venue Management.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Good morning, all. Estimates Committee A has reconvened by order of the house to further re-examine the remaining proposed payments in the Appropriation Bill 2020.

The committee will now resume examination of the following proposed payments that were postponed on 18 November. I refer members, the Premier and advisers to my opening statement on 18 November. I remind members that all questions should be directed through the Chair and must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers.

I will now proceed to open the following lines for examination. The portfolios open this morning will be the South Australian Tourism Commission, Adelaide Venue Management and the Adelaide Convention Bureau. The minister appearing is the Premier. I declare the proposed payments open for examination. I call on the Premier to make an opening statement if he wishes and please introduce his advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Can I begin by thanking the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition for allowing us to postpone the estimates committee, which was originally scheduled for my examination last week, due to the Parafield cluster. I am very grateful for that offer and we are very grateful that, when we did provide what we needed to do, the opposition was extraordinarily accommodating.

Today, I have sitting next to me Rodney Harrex, the Chief Executive of the South Australian Tourism Commission. Directly behind him is Hitaf Rasheed, the general manager of Events South Australia. Opposite Hitaf is Stephanie Rozokos, who is the chief financial officer. Later, if we are required to, we have Anthony Kirchner, the Chief Executive of Adelaide Venue Management, and Marie Hannaford, the CFO of AVM.

By way of an opening statement, can I just say this has been an extraordinary year and I am very grateful to all the people who work within the SATC—the chief executive, the executive team and all the employees, as well as the chairman and the board—for being very nimble and working to optimise a situation which is, I think by any determination, quite extraordinary, starting the year with bushfires and then moving directly into COVID.

Can I also thank Anthony Kirchner and his team at Adelaide Venue Management. Again, it is a similar scenario. These are extraordinary situations, and the fact that they have been able to pivot and optimise the situation for the taxpayers of South Australia is nothing short of outstanding, and I thank them all for their contribution this year.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to make an opening statement?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Only to thank the executives the Premier has introduced for your attendance today and also to put on the record my thanks and parliamentary Labor Party's thanks for all the hard work that has been undertaken in a pretty unique set of circumstances.

The CHAIR: Excellent, thank you. Questions, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 115, program 2. When was the decision made to axe the Adelaide 500 event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the exact date, but it was around the time that we made the announcement. We received a unanimous recommendation from the SATC board. I know this was an issue they had been grappling with for some time. As the leader would appreciate, we were coming towards the end of the contract that existed with Supercars. We had next year's race to go, but beyond that there was no contract in place.

There was a lot of work which was, in the first instance, put into delaying the race from early next year to later next year, but when we thought that was impractical we made a decision not to proceed with a street circuit for 2021. At the same time, we made a decision that we would not be renegotiating that contract thereafter.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In terms of the time line around that decision, when the government provided notice to the media of its decision to cancel the Adelaide 500, when were Supercars advised of the decision to cancel?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were advised immediately before we made the announcement. I think it was the night before the official announcement was made. We wanted to inform the people of South Australia as soon as possible, so we thought it was appropriate to make that announcement as soon as Supercars had been made aware of our intention not to hold a race in 2021 and not to renegotiate an agreement for the street circuit beyond 2021.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the Tourism Commission investigate cancelling or moving the Adelaide 500 from the street circuit early last year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, could you just ask that question—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the Tourism Commission investigate cancelling or moving the Adelaide 500 event from its street circuit early last year? Did it investigate that proposition early last year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that we have known that this current contract comes to an end. I was involved in discussions with people from Supercars at the events I have been at since I became the Premier of South Australia. We knew that this deadline was coming up. We are very keen to keep Supercars in South Australia. In fact, this year, incredibly—2020, a very difficult year—we have actually had three Supercars events in South Australia: one with our street circuit earlier in the year and two at The Bend later in the year.

We would like to continue to have Supercars come to South Australia. This is something that I have recently spoken to Shane Howard about. We would like to see Supercars coming back to The Bend, and I think that there have been useful discussions around that option.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the Tourism Commission seek legal advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office early last year regarding moving or cancelling the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the Crown Solicitor's Office advise the Tourism Commission that, if the Adelaide 500 was cancelled or moved, there would be a high risk of legal action and substantial damages?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of that, but again I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier confirm that the sanction fee (i.e. the payment to Supercars for the 2021 race) was \$2.75 million?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information and I do not know whether we make that amount known but, if we do, then I am happy to take that question on notice and come back to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Chief Executive of the SATC able to confirm that the sanction fee was \$2.75 million for the 2021 race?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure whether we make that generally known publicly. I am advised that that is not publicly disclosed. It has not been the practice of the SATC in the past.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will the Premier or the chief executive now confirm what the cost of running the Adelaide 500 is all-up to the taxpayers of South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Of course, that varies, depending on the situation. There is a cost to actually put on the event and that obviously varies. The total costs associated with putting on that event have been escalating over recent years, but that is not the net cost to the taxpayers because coming in is revenue against that total cost: general admission ticket sales, corporate ticket sales and sponsorship. As the leader would be aware, that has been reducing while total costs have been increasing in recent years.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What was that net cost for the race in 2019?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure that we have published that in that detail. I am not sure that is something we provide generally to the public, but I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if it is a cost to the South Australian taxpayer, there is a net cost to the South Australian taxpayer. We are not talking about the amounts being paid to the Supercars per se. I am not asking for that detail acknowledging your earlier answer, but presumably how much it costs to run the race. Let me put the question another way. Does the SATC know how much it costs to run the race?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, but for the same reasons that the previous government—a government that you were a cabinet minister in did not publish what the total costs were to have various concerts or events in South Australia—did not publish what the TDU was costing. We keep those matters confidential, because by putting that information out I think that it diminishes our ability to negotiate going forward. That has been the practice of the government under both major parties.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, I am not asking about the cost of a particular concert. I am not asking about the cost to Supercars here: I am asking about the net cost of hosting an event factoring in all of the variables that you mentioned earlier, like revenue and so forth.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have given my answer. I can elaborate further by saying that net cost to the taxpayers continued to very significantly increase in recent years and, further to that, the compounding factor with regard to where we were going forward was that we thought that the costs associated with running events next year would significantly increase again, and any independent analysis of what would happen with revenue would demonstrate that that would significantly diminish, because we know that we cannot hold events with 200,000 people.

Sir, as you would be more than aware, if you are going to have increasing costs, if you are going to have significantly diminishing revenue, the net cost to the taxpayers is going to significantly increase. The SATC executive and board considered this information. Let me tell you, it was an agonised decision.

We have had great support for the Supercars street event in South Australia over an extended period of time. This has been a great event for South Australia, but the SATC board formed a unanimous view that this did not offer the right return for the taxpayers going forward during this period of very increased uncertainty, and so made that recommendation to the government, which we accepted with regret.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might return to that particular response in just a moment, but what is the expected cost of cancelling the Supercars event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, and I think that it would be subject to a negotiation with Supercars as to what happens in South Australia going forward.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You have made a decision to cancel the event because of supposed rising costs, but you will not disclose what those costs are. You made a decision to cancel the event because of rising costs without knowing what the cost is of cancelling the event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We knew what the cost of going ahead with the event was going to be, and it did not offer a return to the taxpayers that anybody on the SATC board thought was appropriate.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So how does paying a cost to cancel the event—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, I was just finishing my answer. What we know is that there is a negotiation underway at the moment with Supercars, but I do not have anything to report on that. Certainly, that negotiation is ongoing and has not been finalised.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just to be clear, then, you made a decision to cancel an event because of cost without knowing what the cost is of cancelling the event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we knew was that the cost to the taxpayers going forward was going to significantly increase. It was going to be significantly larger in future years, and the SATC board felt that, despite the fact that there may be some costs with exiting the contract, it was much better to do that and to apply that money to maximise the number of people employed in South Australia.

What they did was give a very clear recommendation that, instead of having a large and increasing sum of money concentrated on one four-day event early in the year, what they wanted to see happen was that money ring-fenced and applied to the Leisure Events Bid Fund and applied throughout the year.

So what we would see, especially during this initial COVID period, is a movement away from one large event to a very much larger number of smaller events that could accommodate more

employment in South Australia. The independent analysis that was done on the employment effects of Supercars was showing over a period of time that the employment outcomes were diminishing. I think the most recent event that was held earlier this year had an employment figure of 353 full-time equivalents. The board did not feel that this was in any way in line with the expenditure that the taxpayers were making, and so they felt that if they could apply that to a larger number of events over the year they could increase that number.

I must also recount to the committee that I have run into people who were suppliers, many of them very disappointed that the Supercars is not going ahead, and we understand that. Most importantly, they said, 'You've got to make sure that we have more events that can employ us throughout the year.' In fact, one contractor said, 'To be quite honest, because this was such a large event, a lot of the contractors came from interstate because we just didn't have that capacity in South Australia.' So we hope to be maximising the return to South Australian businesses and South Australian employees by the redeployment of this money to the new strategy that we have.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who made the final decision to cancel the Adelaide 500? Was it the board of the SATC, was it the chief executive of the SATC or was it the minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. Ultimately, it was a matter I took to cabinet. We were kept informed by the deliberations of the board with regard to this because, as I pointed out, this was a renegotiation that we always knew was coming. I kept cabinet informed about the development, but ultimately it was a unanimous recommendation from the SATC, and we accepted that recommendation.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You could have chosen to save the Adelaide 500. If it was ultimately your decision and the cabinet's decision, you could have chosen to keep the event, invest in the event and grow the event.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the reasons that I have outlined, I am putting employment outcomes and South Australian contractors first. I think that there would have had to have been some very significant changes that we made to accommodate an increasing cost going forward. We knew how much it had cost us in the past; as I said, the net cost of that was increasing. The cost of it going forward would increase substantially more. I am not really sure what the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting—a further budget allocation or maybe just cutting out other really important programs.

Our focus is on delivering our state tourism and visitation strategy. We plan to significantly increase the number of visitors and the size of that market. When we came into government and when we released this strategy, which is one of our nine key growth state strategies, we started with a visitor economy around the \$7.6 billion mark. A year after we released that, we were up to \$8.1 billion, and our plan is to get that to \$12.8 billion by 2030, creating 16,000 new jobs.

We are not going to do that, we are not going to achieve that, we are not going to create the 16,000 jobs if we do not apply our finite capital to those programs that are going to have the maximum employment and visitation return for South Australia. It is a difficult situation with regard to COVID-19. Nobody says that we are jumping for joy with the decision that we have had to make, but I think it is a reasonable recommendation from the SATC board and it is one that we have accepted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier name one single event that has been announced since the decision to cancel the Adelaide 500 that is going to replace it, just one event that you have announced since the decision to cancel the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So where are those 350 people who are now out of work going to work next year if they are in the event sector? The decision you have articulated was being made to grow jobs. You have acknowledged that there were 353 full-time equivalent jobs working on that project, which is down on the year prior but not because of the decline of the popularity of the event because we know that the Supercars is growing in popularity.

So the decision has been made to effectively sack 353 full-time equivalent jobs—last year it was over 400—with no announcement of any event to replace it. Where are those people going to work if they are looking to you to announce new events?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to provide the Leader of the Opposition with some response to that. For starters, the original 353 was occurring at the beginning of the year. The very best scenario was that we were going to hold it at the end of next year, so I think we have plenty of months between now and the end of next year to announce and deliver our new event and leisure bid strategy for South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are we delivering any new events before the end of next year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would really like to continue and provide my response.

The CHAIR: Leader, you have asked your question and the Premier is answering.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One thing we have announced just in the last week is that we have reached a good outcome for South Australia with Tennis Australia in regard to the Adelaide International. That is now locked in for a 10-year period, and I think that is a great result for the people of South Australia. This was an event which we secured coming to Adelaide when we came to government. It is a fantastic event, a WTA and ATP event.

I think we all could see this was something that could grow and grow and grow, and in the most recent budget we announced approximately \$44 million to go to an upgrade of the Memorial Drive precinct, which will be used not just for the Adelaide International but for other tennis events and other broader events which can be allied to tourism and the arts.

In addition to that, since coming to government we have announced that we would bring a new winter festival to South Australia. This is something I spoke about earlier in the year. Adelaide Illuminate will be held in the middle of next year, and we think this will create additional jobs in South Australia. We have seen these winter festivals, in particular in Tasmania and New South Wales, be absolutely fantastic in driving interstate visitation, and we are hopeful this is going to be very successful.

In addition to that, we have now appointed an advisory group to provide expert advice to the SATC in putting together that program. We are seeking submissions from different groups right across the state to give us their innovative ideas for what we can be doing. Do not forget we have been in this situation before. When the Australian Grand Prix moved from South Australia to Victoria, there was a hole in our program and we formed a similar group to the one we have formed this time, and it provided advice to the government of the day.

Coming from that, we have had some great successes, including the Supercars, the Tour Down Under, Tasting Australia and a range of other events. I feel very confident working with this new group, which is chaired by Nikki Govan, who is also chair of Business SA. We will come up with a calendar of events that will achieve greater employment outcomes and spread those events across the year.

Some of those events, of course, will be motorsport events. We know that people in South Australia love motorsport and we know that we have a fantastic facility at The Bend. I am told that it is one of the best tracks in the world and one of the safest tracks in the world. I think that there are many opportunities for us to bring motorsport events to South Australia, whether they be bikes or vehicles, or I have even seen—and I know the member for Hammond is very interested in this—trucks and utes. I was not familiar with this particular element of motorsport, but he assures me that it is extraordinarily popular where he comes from, Coomandook.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much money has the government allocated to finding and hosting these new events that are going to replace the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have said that from next year all money that was previously allocated to this would be ring-fenced and put into the general events and tourism bid fund. In addition to that, you would have noticed in the budget we announced another \$27 million going into this Leisure Events Bid Fund over the next five years, so a massive increase which will be applied, rather than to one event, to a number of events throughout the year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much money has been ring-fenced and put into that fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information at hand. I will come back to you with that information. I think it would be better for me to provide that on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Because the piece of paper in front of you has embarrassing information or because you do not want to answer the question? The whole premise of the policy position of the government is to ring-fence the money. Presumably, you know how much that is.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just the way that it has been presented to me is in a total, which includes the money that has been ring-fenced plus what was existing in the Leisure Events Bid Fund plus the new money which is coming in, but I am happy to provide the detail for you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In the normal course of responding to this estimates process.

The CHAIR: Which, leader, will be 5 February for estimates questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just so that I understand, is there anybody from SATC present today who knows how much money has been allocated in terms of that ring-fencing exercise? With respect, Premier, this is a pretty fundamental question and a fundamental point.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The total I have here for next year, in the total for the Leisure Events Bid Fund, which is the information I have been provided, is \$24.8 million. There is also some work that we provide for sponsorship. The total budget for 2022-23 is \$26.4 million. There is some complexity to that because, of course, some events have already been allocated money even though they are quite some time out. It is not hand to mouth with these because some of these events you need to work on for a considerable amount of time. What we do is put in a bid for an event and when that is confirmed it is locked away even though it might be in a future period.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but the question is about the amount that the government has ring-fenced. The stated policy of the position of the government, you said today and you have repeated it publicly, is to ring-fence the amount of money expended on the Adelaide 500, and that will now be allocated. I am asking: how much money is that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: All I know is that it is part of that total, but I am happy to take that question on notice. I previously provided that. It is north of \$10 million; in fact, it is considerably north of \$10 million, but I am happy to provide that detail.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So 'considerably north' could mean double that or a few extra million?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am providing my advice to the committee, and that is my answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I look forward to getting that information. With respect, it does seem truly extraordinary that the whole policy is premised upon a principle of ring-fencing the money from the Adelaide 500 to invest in future events but no-one can tell us what that amount of money is. For all those people in our community who desperately rely on these jobs and the associated economic activity, they would be investing a lot of hope right now that the amount that is being ring-fenced and invested in new events will happen. They would be investing a lot of hope in the government and the commission to know how much money that is, and the fact that we do not, I have to say, does not bode well for the confidence and hope people are investing in the government's policy.

The CHAIR: Leader, the Premier has indicated he will take that on notice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that on notice. If you want to make a comparison, the Leader of the Opposition has announced a policy without knowing what the cost will be. He has actually said that he will reinstate the event if he is successful at the next election. He has not provided us with any indication that he has any knowledge whatsoever of what that will cost the taxpayers of South Australia.

What we have said is that we have a very significant uplift in the available Leisure Events Bid Fund going forward, and I think that is providing comfort to the sector. It might not be providing comfort to every, single motorsport fan—and I fully appreciate that—but what is most important to the sector is that we have a dedicated budget, which I have just been through, available for the bidding and running of events. I must say that I am very grateful to the team in Events SA. They have done an extraordinary job in an extraordinary situation. They have had to pivot. Many of the events they run each year are large events which have large crowds and are not COVID safe.

One such example, of course, is the National Pharmacies Christmas Pageant. There was no possible way that that could be run in the normal way, with up to 300,000 people lining the streets. They understood this. National Pharmacies as the major sponsor, a very generous sponsor, understood this. In fact, the people of South Australia understood this. EventsSA did not say, 'Look, this is all too hard. We are just going to cancel.' In fact, they said, 'What can we do to make sure that this goes ahead?'

Although it was a very changed event this year, I think it was a great pivot and that is what we are going to have to see. That is why I am grateful to the public servants who work in this particular area. We are very grateful to all the people within the statutory authority for the effort they are making this year. I know that uppermost in their mind and the mind of the subcontractors is supply into these events, because we do have an obligation to maximise as many jobs as we possibly can.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to the same budget line regarding tourism events and use the Premier's reference to the Christmas Pageant as a segue. As a preface to my question, I acknowledge the hard work done by the SATC to put the pageant on in pretty tricky circumstances. My kids were in bed but we had it on tape, thankfully. It was a good event. From memory, there were approximately 25,000 people at the event.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. My understanding was that the approved capacity was for 25,000 people to attend but, of course, we also broadcast and my understanding is that this audience peaked at 168,000. Yes, there was a smaller number who attended, but I think a large number saw the broadcast.

Again, I want to thank people for putting thought into the way that it would operate so that the viewing product was optimised for people who were at home watching. We did work to bring in some incredible performers, including Hugh Sheridan and Rachael Leahcar. I think there were more than 100 singers who were involved in the overall production. It was very different. I am hopeful we can go back to the previous format, but I think it was a good pivot for this year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many people participated in the expression of interest/ballot process online? Obviously, 25,000 were lucky enough to end up getting a ticket. Obviously, not all the requests could be accommodated, naturally. What was the total number of people who went through the expression of interest process, or however you want to characterise it, online?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have information in regard to how many applied for it, but I know that 20,000 tickets were made accessible via the ballot.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate you might not have the detail of how many people applied or expressed interest and so forth at hand, but are you able to take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very happy to take that on notice. I am also advised that the remainder of the tickets were utilised for a range of purposes including event operations, community groups, commercial partners, pageant participants, corporate hospitality and contingency holdings, as recommended by Adelaide Oval.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That process of applying or expressing interest online, the application process and so forth, was that conducted by SATC or was it done externally?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that it was done through Ticketmaster. The ballot registrations opened at 10 o'clock on Thursday 29 October and closed on Friday 30 October at 10pm and individuals were able to request up to five tickets when they registered.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That registration request process was prior to the ticketing process conducted by Ticketek, and that was done online; that was done through an SATC website, was it not, and then Ticketek did the ticketing? I just want to understand.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was told Ticketmaster—sorry, you were right and I was wrong: Ticketek.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The ticketing exercise was done by Ticketek?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that both the ballot and the ticketing were administered by Ticketek.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The website where people registered their interest, was that done through the SATC website or a Ticketek website?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that what could happen was that people could go onto the SATC website but were redirected to the Ticketek balloting system. I am advised the ballot system then electronically and randomly selected who would attend the event, with notifications provided to both the successful and unsuccessful registrants.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am trying to understand. Maybe I can make it a bit easier. So Ticketek did the random ballot and the issuing of the tickets—that makes perfect sense—but the process of getting the list of all the people who were interested in going, presumably that data was collated by the SATC website and then passed on to Ticketek to do the ballot and then the ticketing; do I have that right?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very happy to get a full brief to you on how that process worked, but I do emphasise that, in addition to that process, there was the management of all the volunteers who were involved in the performance, as well as the fact that we did reserve tickets for different community groups. I visited one group visiting from Kangaroo Island who came over with the support of SeaLink and the SATC so they could be there.

I also visited groups that were involved specifically with our emergency services and the CFS to thank them. Obviously, we could not open up to all our wonderful CFS, SES and emergency services volunteers, but we wanted to have a representation. It was pleasing on the night—not that I was there for very long—that I had the opportunity to meet with many of the volunteers who were involved in putting the performance on, as well as the people who came over from Kangaroo Island and volunteers within the CFS and the SES.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: To put some context around that, National Pharmacies, I understand, are the sponsor of the Christmas Pageant and have been for a while. After a family submitted their details to apply for a ticket and then Ticketek did the process—it is a unique process in comparison to previous Christmas pageants, naturally, because everyone just showed up previously—did any of that data or information go to any third party—for example, National Pharmacies?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there was no provision of that information. I should advise that National Pharmacies were very involved not only from a financial perspective but also in providing a lot of the volunteers. A lot of their staff and customers were offered the opportunity, as they have been with the street pageant, to participate as performers and in different roles.

In addition to that, I was advised on the night by the chairperson of National Pharmacies that they brought along as special guests some of their members of longest standing. It was wonderful to meet some people who had been members for more than 60 years. I met one 93-year-old member who was absolutely delighted to go along to that event.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent. I might move on to a separate item. I refer to Budget Paper 2, page 5, regarding the Great State travel vouchers. As the Premier would be aware, we suggested the government take up a travel voucher scheme, and we were grateful that the Premier again took up a constructive suggestion from the opposition. What was the final number of tourism vouchers redeemed under your Great State travel voucher scheme?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Great State travel voucher scheme was something that was suggested to us by the SATC executive and board. There have been schemes—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Maybe they took up our suggestion; either way, we are very grateful.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know you want to take credit for everything and, very occasionally, we do get good suggestions from the opposition, so keep them coming. Good, bad or indifferent, we will evaluate them all with great rigour.

Just to be clear, lots of other places have come up with this idea over an extended period of time. We evaluated the response from that and we tailored what we would do here in South Australia around the particular issues we had. We could see that regional travel was doing particularly well. Certainly in some pockets of regional South Australia we were being told that the results for this year

were indeed higher than they had been for many, many years, if not forever. We were very pleased with that.

However, we were hearing that earlier in the week there was an opportunity for increased capacity across regional South Australia and suburban Adelaide, but we were really looking to mainly focus our attempts to try to increase the return to accommodation in the CBD, excluding Saturday nights. That was the way this happened—the design, if you like—of this approach.

My understanding is that there were around 50,000 vouchers offered. As you can appreciate, we got information from other jurisdictions about what the redemption rate was in those jurisdictions, and so we set our vouchers at 50,000. In some jurisdictions I think the redemption rate was as low as 10 per cent. In South Australia, it was closer to 50 per cent, and I think in total we had approximately 23,600 redemptions. This compares very favourably with the redemptions of similar voucher systems that have been offered in other jurisdictions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In the context of comparisons with other jurisdictions, is the Premier aware that, I am advised, in the Northern Territory 21,000 out of 26,000 vouchers were redeemed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. Every jurisdiction has a different approach and, of course, a different market. What I can say is that in this situation it was designed to address the specific issues we had in South Australia, and I have had overwhelming support from the sector with regard to the Great State voucher. We will continue to look at these opportunities for interventions based upon need going forward.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given that presumably there are unallocated funds, or funds that were not expended though otherwise allocated to the 50,000 vouchers, has the tourism commission started planning another round or the next round of Great State vouchers? Is it going to expand the scope, given the less than 50 per cent take-up rate of the first round?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, and further to my answer to the previous questions on this line, we factored into our costing that we would not achieve the full 50,000. It was not as if we factored in that gross amount, but the leader is right that there is some money allocated to this that was not taken up. Our commitment at the time was that this would be put into other programs that would be put in place in the new year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might move on, given the time, to Budget Paper 5, page 122, and the departmental efficiency measures, which are \$10 million of cuts over four years. How can the agency—this is SATC—which has approximately 100 FTEs or thereabouts, make efficiency dividends or savings to the tune of \$2.5 million per annum without also cutting marketing or events or other tourism development programs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I addressed this earlier, but I am happy to go through it again. For starters, each government agency needs to make their contribution towards the overall efficiency target for the government. What I can say with regard to tourism, though, when we look at the actual expenditure for last year, is it was higher than the budget. I think we have a track record where, if we need to make further investments outside of that budget, we will.

But we do need to look for ongoing efficiency. As a government, we focus on outputs. Some governments focus on inputs and they beat their chest about how much money they are putting into something. As Liberals and, as this Liberal government believes, we have to focus on outputs—outcomes for employment, outcomes in terms of increased visitation—and we do need to spend that finite taxpayers' money prudently.

When we have to pivot, we do. One of the points of evidence of this was last financial year when we expended \$5.7 million supporting businesses in this sector which were adversely affected by the bushfire and then by the coronavirus. We are very proud of our response in this area and we will continue to apply that focus.

Mr PICTON: I have some questions for the Premier in relation to Adelaide Venue Management. You may want to swap advisers. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 196.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I remind the committee that I am now supported by Anthony Kirchner and Marie Hannaford.

Mr PICTON: Premier, how has it come about that Adelaide Venue Management staff are working in hotel quarantine facilities?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not restrict casual employees' work beyond a single site. I am not sure what industrial relations schooling the member has, but a casual employee can choose to work at multiple sites. In fact, a full-time employee can choose in South Australia to take additional work.

Mr PICTON: So there is no work being undertaken by Venue Management directly for the hotels; it would only be casual staff who would have secondary employment there?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We as a government want to do everything we can for our COVID efforts, and I think the member would be more than aware that we have passed a new direction (I can get the details) for a whole-of-government approach. Many people, for example, might be working in a department but might have been redeployed to be part of our effort with regard to COVID, whether it be in the tracing team, whether it be in our control centre team, whether it be in our testing team. We are doing everything we can as a government.

Can I say with regard to Adelaide Venue Management that I was very impressed at how quickly they pivoted to support that COVID need earlier in the year. You might have seen some media, sir, which showed that Adelaide Venue Management were using their considerable capacity and capability to produce meals that were needed at the height of the pandemic in South Australia. In fact, I have been advised that more than 300,000 meals were produced, mainly at the Adelaide Convention Centre I think, and then they were distributed according to need.

Mr PICTON: Are Adelaide Venue Management staff working in their capacity as Adelaide Venue Management staff working in or for medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that that is not the case, no.

Mr PICTON: Is Adelaide Venue Management providing services to medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am advised that Adelaide Venue Management have been providing meals, and that is an arrangement that was in place up until around 48 hours ago.

Mr PICTON: When did that arrangement start?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will get the exact date, but I am advised that it was put in place the day following the announcement of the stay-at-home order.

Mr PICTON: Who made that request? Presumably a request was made from SA Health?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that is correct.

Mr PICTON: And what was the nature of the work that has been undertaken?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The provision of meals.

Mr PICTON: So that is the only provision of services that has been provided?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr PICTON: Are those meals being provided in terms of kitchens offsite and delivered in, or is there any work that is being done on site at the medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that during the course of this changed arrangement, the meals were produced within the Adelaide Convention Centre and the Adelaide Entertainment Centre kitchens. They were basically then loaded up and transported to the loading docks of the quarantine hotels, so no staff were involved in the kitchens of the quarantine hotels with regard to the provision of these meals.

Mr PICTON: Were those delivery staff Adelaide Venue Management staff?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail, but I am advised yes.

Mr PICTON: Were they given additional training in terms of preparing themselves and making sure PPE and infection control was in place?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. I am advised that all relevant training had been provided.

Mr PICTON: Adelaide Venue Management CEO, Mr Kirchner, wrote an email to staff last Thursday stating:

It has come to AVM's attention that some AVM Event Staff have recently been seconded to work in relatively high-risk workplaces where the coronavirus has been known to be present...

What were those 'high-risk' locations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that some casual staff members of Adelaide Venue Management were also working as casual employees within the hotel quarantine arrangements. I am quick to point out that they were employed not as employees of Adelaide Venue Management seconded to those quarantine hotels. They were just working in their own capacity, and of course they are quite within their rights to do so.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So who did employ them then?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I presume they would have been employed by the quarantine hotels themselves because these would have been back-of-house roles.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I just want to clarify that they were not employed by Adelaide Venue Management: they were employed by the hotels themselves?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The hotels themselves, or sometimes they outsourced their services as well, so it could be with a third-party contractor.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What conditions were those employees employed under—the Adelaide Venue Management enterprise agreement or the respective industrial instruments of those other employers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That would be a matter for that individual but, as I have pointed out to the committee twice already, they were not doing that work in those quarantine hotels as employees of Adelaide Venue Management. Every casual employee has the ability to seek additional work over and above the casual shifts they have at Adelaide Venue Management. Of course, let's be quite clear: because of the stay-at-home order, the number of shifts that were available to casual employees at Adelaide Venue Management would have reduced significantly.

Dr HARVEY: Point of order: can the honourable member clarify which budget line we are referring to at the moment?

The CHAIR: Yes, we can. My understanding is that it is Budget Paper 4—

Mr PICTON: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 196.

The CHAIR: —Volume 4, page 196, yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, that budget line does not relate to the employment of Adelaide Venue Management staff in the quarantine hotel arrangements.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But it does relate to the employment of Adelaide Venue Management staff, which leads to my final question on this subject.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But, as have I pointed out to the committee now three times, those casual shifts at a quarantine hotel were not as employees of Adelaide Venue Management.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which goes to my final question on this subject before I hand over to the member for Kaurna: can the government confirm or can Adelaide Venue Management confirm that the Adelaide Venue Management enterprise agreement was not the industrial instrument that informed the conditions under which those employees were paid?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That has no relationship whatsoever to the budget line that we are interrogating at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: With respect, Mr Chairman, that is not right because I am asking specifically around an enterprise agreement to which the government is a party.

The CHAIR: Leader, I would point out that, to any question from any member, the responsible minister, in this case the Premier, can answer as he or she thinks fit.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but I am asking for an answer, not a commentary on the question.

The CHAIR: The Premier can answer as he sees fit and I believe he has done that.

Mr PICTON: The email from Mr Kirchner refers to people being seconded to work in high-risk workplaces, which we know now is the Peppers hotel. Were they seconded from Adelaide Venue Management or from another location or other workplace they had?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but what I can say is that they certainly were not seconded from Adelaide Venue Management. We have pointed out that they were not employees of Adelaide Venue Management, that employment was in their own right as an employee.

Mr PICTON: Why would Mr Kirchner have said in an email that Adelaide Venue Management event staff have recently been seconded to work in relatively high-risk workplaces?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided clarity to that.

Mr PICTON: Have any of the people who have been working for the medi-hotel then come back to work for Adelaide Venue Management at any Adelaide Venue Management location within 14 days?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised no.

Mr PICTON: Mr Kirchner's emails to staff expressed some concern that he was not aware whether people had been working in those high-risk workplaces. Is Adelaide Venue Management now assured that they know the entirety of all staff who worked in the Peppers hotel or other high-risk workplaces?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think most employers in South Australia would be very concerned, especially during this heightened period of focus, about where casual employees might also be working and I think that Mr Kirchner expressed that, but we are reliant on people coming forward to provide that information.

Mr PICTON: Can you assure the committee that no Adelaide Venue Management staff members have worked in the Convention Centre or the Entertainment Centre or any other state government facilities and have worked in the Peppers hotel in the past two weeks?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that there have been some casual employees who have worked within that hotel environment. I can also say, as we have repeatedly said in recent days, that there is a very good testing regime around all those people who have been working in that hotel quarantine environment and, as Mr Kirchner has said, none of the people who have been working there have come back to work at AVM at this point.

Mr PICTON: Have all those staff been tested?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information and I am not sure which budget line you are referring to.

Mr PICTON: Mr Kirchner also stated in an email that he identified that an AVM event staff member was wearing an AVM uniform while working for an employer in a high-risk location. Was that high-risk location where they were wearing an AVM uniform the Peppers hotel?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is yes.

Mr PICTON: Has any disciplinary action been taken in relation to that staff member?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure it is a hanging offence to wear the incorrect uniform to work. I am not sure which laws you are referring to or wish to introduce to the parliament. I do not see this as a hanging offence.

Mr PICTON: I am happy to help you in reference to Mr Kirchner's email. He stated:

Apart from the fact that this employee had stolen the uniform, it is also totally unacceptable for a person to wear an AVM uniform whilst working for another employer.

He further stated that all employees 'need to strictly comply with AVM's uniform policy'. I would suspect that there is, potentially, both a breach of criminal law in an allegation of stealing a uniform and a breach of the AVM uniform policy.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is all very interesting, but what is your question?

Mr PICTON: The question is: has any disciplinary action been taken in regard to the person?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr PICTON: Are you familiar with AVM's uniform policy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I have not worked at AVM.

Mr PICTON: Have you had a briefing in relation to the staff member?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr PICTON: What is the total income that AVM has derived so far for its work in medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice and come back with an answer.

Mr PICTON: Is there a contract in place between AVM and SA Health for the work in medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I am advised that, no, there is not.

Mr PICTON: This is a genuine query as to how that arrangement works if there is no contract in place.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice and come back with a detailed answer.

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurana, we have reached the allotted time, and there being no further questions I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the South Australian Tourism Commission, Adelaide Venue Management and the Adelaide Convention Bureau complete.

DEFENCE SA, \$14,880,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Mr P. Murdock, Manager, Finance, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: We now move to the Defence SA portfolio. The minister appearing is the Premier. Premier, would you like to make an opening statement and/or introduce your advisers, please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would certainly like to introduce my advisers. Richard Price is the Chief Executive of Defence SA and also the South Australian Space Industry Centre and Mr Peter Murdock is the chief financial officer of Defence SA.

I must say that we are all very excited within Defence SA today because we have the 10th Australian Space Forum on, and so there are a very large number of people who are today participating in that 10th forum virtually because of our restrictions. Both Richard Price and I have

been involved in that conference early this morning, but of course interrupted because of estimates today, and I am happy to answer any questions that might come forward.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would like to thank the Defence SA staff for being here as well. What is the latest advice that the Premier has received from the federal government regarding the future of the ASC's contract at Osborne to the full cycle docking work on the Collins class submarines?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Nothing has changed since our last update.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When was your last update?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have been providing commentary on this for an extended period of time since it was first raised in the media that there was a potential for the full cycle docking operation to move from ASC here in South Australia to ASC over in Western Australia. This is ultimately going to be a decision of the NSC, a subcommittee of the federal government's cabinet, not the national cabinet but the federal cabinet.

It was widely speculated that this decision would have been decided last year, or if not very early this year, but no decision on that has been made. We have obviously been in extensive discussions with the key members of the NSC and the Prime Minister himself with regard to the capability and the capacity we have here in South Australia.

I am still 100 per cent convinced that we have the very best place in the nation to provide that ongoing full cycle docking operation. We have done it very successfully here in South Australia. There are very good reasons why it should continue into the future, which I am happy outline to the committee, but I am happy also to take further questions from the leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When was the last time you advocated to the Prime Minister for this work to remain in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the exact date. Certainly, it has been very recently. What I can say is that there have been changes on the NSC very recently with the Hon. Mathias Cormann, who was previously on the NSC. As the Minister for Finance, he was the shareholder, if you like, of the ASC. That has recently changed and now the Hon. Simon Birmingham, a South Australian senator, is both the Minister for Finance and the shareholder of the ASC. Of course, now he is also on the NSC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Several weeks ago, the federal defence minister refused to commit to making that decision this side of the federal election, which of course raises the possibility that we will not have a decision until even mid-2022, if not later theoretically. Will you use your special relationship with the Prime Minister to ensure a decision is made before the next state or federal election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: These decisions are made in the best interests of the nation. The NSC has it on its agenda, and I think it will make that determination when it has all the information that it requires. Obviously, the NSC has been very concerned about other matters recently, most notably but not completely around the issue of COVID-19 but also cybersecurity, so I am sure they will make a decision.

What I will say is that South Australia has an excellent facility at Osborne where they have been doing full cycle docking for an extended period of time. It is not simple work. Mid-cycle docking, as you would be aware, moved to Western Australia under the term of the previous Labor government. That was a decision taken by the federal government at the time. I cannot remember any protests from the local state Labor government at the time regarding that move.

The ASC does have a significant operation in Western Australia to do the mid-cycle docking, but we strongly argue that full cycle docking is more akin to the construction of the submarines in the first instance. You are piercing a pressure hull. This is a very, very complex operation. The skills required to do this are extraordinary, and they exist in South Australia: they do not exist in Western Australia. Western Australia is probably doing a fine job with regard to the mid-cycle docking, but I think that the full cycle docking really can only continue to take place here in South Australia.

Of course, we as a government are fully supportive of the continuity of this work being done in South Australia. We have an excellent precinct on the Lefevre Peninsula. Part of that has been now purchased by the federal government, but still a large proportion of that is owned by the people of South Australia, and I think that was a very wise decision. It was a decision that was taken under the former government. In fact, the work was done by the then Chief Executive of Defence SA, Andrew Fletcher, who is now the chair of SA Water. I think a lot of work and effort were put into the consolidation of that precinct for future expansion.

We know that we are in the midst of a massive build down at Osborne; first, for the new sheds required for the Future Frigate program—the Hunter class, as it is referred to—and now we are in the build-up for 12 Attack class submarines. So there is a massive infrastructure build down at Osborne, but there still remains ample space for us to continue with the full cycle docking.

Infrastructure is part of that equation but probably the major area of concern is with regard to skills. Again, I refer this committee to the fact that there are not a lot of skills which exist worldwide that relate to the Collins class submarines. This was originally a Kockums design, but I do not think Kockums still produces these. I now understand that Kockums has been acquired by Saab.

These skills do not exist in Sweden. The major repository for skills regarding the Collins class are in Adelaide. We do not believe that those skills will move to Western Australia should full cycle docking be further entertained by the federal government because there are ample job opportunities for those skilled personnel to take up roles within the Hunter class or the Attack class in South Australia.

If they did not move—and for the reasons I outlined before, I do not think they will move—then this would leave our nation vulnerable. For all those reasons, we remain 100 per cent committed to continuing to deliver an excellent product in terms of the full cycle docking continuing in South Australia.

Membership:

Ms Michaels substituted for Dr Close.

Hon. A. Piccolo substituted for Mr Picton.

The CHAIR: Before I call the leader, there are a couple of things I need to do as Chair. I advise the committee that the members for Port Adelaide and Karna have requested to be discharged and have been replaced on the committee by the members for Enfield and Light.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier share my concern that if a decision is not being made until potentially the second half of 2022 that that will leave literally hundreds if not thousands of South Australian workers in limbo, not knowing what their future holds, without a decision being made?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are varying views on this. Some people think the longer the decision takes, the more likely it is to stay in South Australia. Some people have expressed an alternate view that they just want a decision to be made straightaway. The Prime Minister has been really clear on this: they will make a decision when it is in the best interests of Australia to make that decision. We respect the authority of the Prime Minister with regard to this issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Premier aware that Western Australian Premier Mark McGowan announced on 3 November 2020 that he will be stepping up his lobbying effort to get the Collins class to Western Australia? In light of that, has the Premier decided to invest any particular new effort to counteract the Western Australian bolstered campaign to move the work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I say there are probably two methodologies for advancing a case for a state: one is via the media and one is directly to the decision-makers. We have chosen to go directly to the decision-makers. It is up to Premier McGowan to decide how he would like to make the case for Western Australia, but what I would say is that this will not be a political decision. This will be a decision that is in the best interests of the country.

I do not think that running political campaigns is going to sway this decision and I certainly hope that it would not. Instead, we are obviously working extraordinarily hard in South Australia to improve our capacity to continue to deliver on not just the full cycle docking but, of course, the other major platforms I outlined in my earlier answer.

One of the things I feel very proud about since coming to government is the effort we have put into significantly expanding our apprentices and our trainees here in South Australia. In fact, on the most recent NCVET figures, South Australia remains way in front of every other jurisdiction in terms of new commencements for apprentices and trainees.

This is going to be vital for this program and for delivering the overall skills that we need in South Australia going forward. What I can say is that on the most recent figures every other jurisdiction went backwards. South Australia was the only one that went forward. When I provided that information to the Prime Minister, I did it with great pride. It was also a demonstration that we are focused on delivering the workforce required in South Australia for the full cycle docking and the two new maritime programs: the Attack class and the Hunter class.

In addition to that, we have many other opportunities in defence, and we need to factor them into the modelling as well because many people think that it is just the maritime programs that exist. In fact, there are huge programs and platforms here in South Australia, especially centred on Edinburgh, especially around the various programs we have there, with the Poseidon and the Triton. We are also looking forward to the Growler and the Reaper, work in systems integration, electronic warfare, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance work in South Australia. We are in an extraordinarily good position not only with maritime but also with these other platforms that the Australian Defence Force will need in the future, and that work is already flowing to our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 169. The federal defence minister, Linda Reynolds, announced more than 100 Australian companies had applied to Naval to manufacture 23 specialised items of submarine equipment for the Attack class program. The Naval Group estimates that these projects are worth \$900 million. How many of those 100 companies are South Australia-based?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the information. The Naval Group has been doing a huge amount of work engaging with the defence industry in South Australia. We have some incredible companies in South Australia with real expertise that should flow directly into the submarines program as well as the frigates program. One of the things which is peculiar to South Australia is that we do have a large number of smaller organisations, and so what we are doing is trying to work out ways that even the smallest of these organisations can come into the supply chain.

Some of them will need to partner with other organisations or work out arrangements with some mid-tier firms to be able to interact with the primes on this platform. I have every confidence South Australia will do extraordinarily well, directly, with employees through ASC Shipbuilding and the Naval Group and also within the entire supply chain.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given the Premier's and my common desire to maximise the opportunity of this Attack class work being here in South Australia, in terms of this initial round that I referred to being announced, does the government have a target of how much of that \$900 million of work we would like to have here in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, it is not just the Naval Group plan.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand that, but I am just asking whether or not you have a target or something that you are shooting for in terms of the volume of the \$900 million of work being local.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that target with me at the moment, but I am happy to refer back to the organisation and, if they do have that information, I am very happy to provide it. Because I think this is an area where we do need to act in a bipartisan way, I am also very happy that these platforms do not go just over a single term of government or even, often, over an entire government. They will very likely have multiple governments over the decades-long program.

Our commitment has always been to provide detailed briefings where required by the opposition. Some of those briefings, of course, need to remain confidential. We have not had any

breaches whatsoever of that confidentiality requirement because a lot of the information we deal with in this area is commercial. We get information from companies that needs to remain confidential. We do that. As I said, we are very happy to provide detailed briefings, and I am happy to get some information and come back to the leader. I am also happy for him to have a further briefing from Defence SA, if he requests.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. Do we have an estimation, if not an exact figure, of how many South Australians are currently employed in work associated with the Attack class submarine program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: How many South Australians are employed within the Attack class submarine—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many South Australians are currently employed associated with the Future Submarine program generally? It might not necessarily just be with Naval, but generally around that. The follow-up question was going to be: do we have an estimation of how many people are currently employed with work associated with the Future Subs program and do we have a number that we project would be the case in one, two, three or four years' time?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take the first part of that question first. In regard to the current numbers, my understanding is—I will come back to the committee immediately if I have this wrong—we have approximately 200 people currently employed within the Naval Group in South Australia across two sites. One is at Mile End and the other one is on the site of the Port Adelaide TAFE.

In addition to that, the commonwealth has significant personnel in South Australia who exist within the Department of Defence. My understanding is that they are at Hendon. I do not have a current headcount for those. This program is headed up by retired Rear Admiral Greg Sammut, who I understand is now the director of the submarine program. He has been involved with this program since the beginning. He has a team based in South Australia working with the Naval Group and, of course, with the federal government in regard to this platform.

I am happy to get the information on that, and I am also happy to seek a projection for the total number the Naval Group will have in South Australia, plus what potentially the Department of Defence would have located in South Australia. In addition to those two groups, there are a large number of people we project would be ultimately employed in that supply chain. Very few of them would be employed in that at the moment, but there would be some numbers in this area and I think you will now start to see this significantly expand.

The final group of people who are definitely employed at the moment in regard to this platform are those employed in the construction of the site. My understanding is (and I might be corrected in a second) this shed is around the size of the Adelaide Oval. I am now told it is bigger than the Adelaide Oval under cover. These are massive. When this new submarine yard is completed, it will be the most advanced in the world, just as our frigate sheds are amongst the most advanced in the world.

Part of my visit to meet with BAE following the signing of the agreement for the Hunter class was to visit the shipyards in Govan adjacent to Glasgow in Scotland. It was quite incredible to see the Type 26 frigates being built for the Royal Navy in a shed constructed in Victorian times. The entire bow and the forward deck were out in the weather. You can imagine that in winter, sir. What we have is really quite an extraordinary shed, so people who will be working on these incredible vessels for decades to come will have the latest technology, the best infrastructure and the most modern frigate in the world.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I, too, have seen that facility in Glasgow and it is unique. I might just return to this question around jobs and so forth. Given the Premier's reference to those different categories of employment, I fully appreciate that it would be difficult for Defence SA to know at any particular point in time the precise number of people who are employed by each of those organisations.

What I am trying to get a sense of is what work Defence SA is undertaking to monitor the number of people being employed in the subs program and what its intention is to continue that work

into the future. As you have rightly stated, this is a long-term exercise and presumably we all want to have a sense of whether or not we are getting the return we are looking for in terms of jobs in the state.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the National Shipbuilding College keeps that data and we may be able to do that work. I can also advise the leader that the job numbers are projected to be at 1,100 direct jobs, plus the supply chain, and that this submarine construction work should start in 2023. We have a mighty task on our hands that we are currently resourcing.

As I said, to build up the number of people in apprenticeships and traineeships, we are working extraordinarily cooperatively with three Australian universities to develop their capacity and capability. We are working with the existing workforce that is working on the offshore patrol vessels, and before that the air warfare destroyers, to upskill those people to take on some of the higher level jobs in South Australia. We are also working with our Designated Area Migration Agreement to make sure that we can bring in the skills that are required for some of those high-level technical jobs where those skills do not exist in Australia.

One of the critical areas with regard to this is around security clearances. This has been a detailed discussion with the federal government to make sure that we have the personnel not just with the skills but also with the relevant security clearances so that they can work on those platforms. I can assure this committee that this is a major focus, if not the major focus, for Defence SA and the NSC, the National Shipbuilding College, not the National Security Committee—well, probably both in reality. Both NSCs are very much involved in this task.

The early indications are that South Australia is well on track to deliver an expansion of our workforce in line with the projected requirement. More than that, I must say that we have done it before. People sometimes forget this. We have significantly increased our workforce to deliver the Collins class submarine. We significantly increased our workforce in South Australia to deliver the air warfare destroyers. We are more than happy to be able to do this again. It is not going to happen by hoping it happens, and very significant resources are now being directed to this task.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In terms of those resources, what is Defence SA doing to monitor those? Is there a particular unit within Defence SA? Is there a particular allocation of funds within Defence SA to do that monitoring exercise, or does Defence SA take the view that it is principally the task of the college?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have a dedicated person who looks after this task. She has a team around her and she has very good depth relationships with all the major defence companies in South Australia, not just the Naval Group. As you could imagine, we do not want just one primed to keep advertising and taking people from other defence companies in South Australia. We have to grow that overall size.

Last month, we had quite an extensive advertising campaign in very targeted areas on the eastern seaboard, talking to them about the job opportunities that will exist for decades here in South Australia. This was done and designed in consultation with all those primes that sat around that table. Also, those primes themselves put their campaigns out for recruitment. These primes are putting significant sums of money behind these programs but, from Defence SA's perspective, we are coordinating those efforts so that we are all heading in the same direction.

As I said, it would be very, very suboptimal if somebody in the Naval Group were just taken from BAE, and then BAE took somebody from Saab, and then the Saab person took somebody from Raytheon. We would not be getting any of the additionality that we require. I have to say that what we have is a very sophisticated, cooperative approach with those primes, for us to spend state taxpayers' dollars on the recruitment program and then the primes to augment that with their own direct programs.

We are also doing a lot of work with our three universities. I recently chaired a meeting with the three vice-chancellors and the chief executives of our primes in South Australia to again get that ability for the primes to go onto campus, to meet with lecturers, to promote the great job opportunities to the next generation. We want our best and brightest people looking at opportunities right here in

South Australia, and there are certainly a lot of opportunities in that defence and space sector going forward.

In the past, the defence sector has had a little bit of a bad rap because often what was happening was that a platform would be decided and it might run for six or eight years or maybe a decade, but when that platform finished people found themselves out of work. This was not as attractive an opportunity, a clear opportunity, as maybe some other sectors.

Since the Coalition was elected, at the most recent time they were re-elected, they set about developing a continuous shipbuilding program. In fact, they made two very important decisions on behalf of the nation: number one was to increase defence spend to 2 per cent of GDP; the second, though, was to consider the defence industry as a strategic defence capability.

The consequences of that were, essentially, that we developed a continuous shipbuilding program. Rather than the stop-start nature of what occurred before, we basically moved to a continuous shipbuilding program, which I absolutely know makes it more attractive for people to want to go into this sector going forward. We are very happy that is the case, and we are selling that to people who are at schools, people who are at universities and people out in the broader jobs market.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier provide the committee with an update—the Premier mentioned the 2023 figure earlier—on when Defence SA or the government believes we will see major construction start on the first of the Future Subs? Is it the 2023 year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. The contract was awarded to the Naval Group and there were detailed negotiations, which led to the signing of the Strategic Partnering Agreement, which was signed in Canberra with France's defence minister, Florence Parly, and our defence minister, Christopher Pyne. We are now doing the detailed design work for the construction of the infrastructure down at Osborne ahead of essentially beginning construction in 2023.

Ultimately, I have to remind the committee that this is not a project of the South Australian government. It is a project of the federal government, so those details need to be provided by the people who are more intimately involved. Our responsibility at the state level is really around infrastructure, any planning requirements and the provision of a skilled workforce, so we have applied ourselves diligently to that.

We have always remained very interested in the broader issues that of course need to be administered by the Naval Group and the federal government, but our primary responsibilities are really, as I said, infrastructure here in South Australia, which might require some planning changes potentially, and the provision of the skilled workforce as required.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So 2023?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The commonwealth government has had a few different numbers out there about local procurement and local content associated with the Future Subs program. Does the state government have a local content target or a local content objective for South Australian work associated with the Future Submarine program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Australian industry content has been the subject of quite a lot of scrutiny.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Indeed.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that the expectation is that there is a minimum of 60 per cent Australian industry content. That has not been broken down state by state, but it is fair to say that, because this work is being done in South Australia, we would expect a very good proportion of that budget.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is that figure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The original budget was as a \$50 billion project. I can find out if there has been a further update since then, but of course originally it was a \$50 billion project.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate that, and the minimum 60 per cent figure is the most recent one that has mooted, but does the state government have its own figure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand the Premier's response and acknowledge that it is consistent with the most recent remarks that have been made at a commonwealth level regarding minimum local content, but I am asking: of that minimum 60 per cent, does the state government have a target as to how much of that work would be in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we are about to release is the final of our Growth State strategies. On coming to government, we decided that we wanted to target 3 per cent economic growth, and we identified nine areas. This morning, we released our space sector report and very soon we will release our defence sector report.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will that contain a target?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It certainly will provide targets in terms of our growth trajectory between now and 2030—it does not go beyond that—in terms of the size of the defence sector and the employee numbers in the sector. It is pretty consistent with the format that we had with the previous sector plans. What I would like to inform the committee, though, is that these are sector plans, so they have required huge consultation with people in the sectors. These are not the government's plans. They are not stretch targets. I think these are very achievable targets that the sector has had input in the development of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to the growth agenda, we very much support government policy orientated towards growth because goodness knows we desperately need it. We had the worst gross state product figures in the last financial year of negative 1.4 per cent. Obviously, that includes part of coronavirus, but to have the worst in the nation is of grave concern. Clearly, these projects represent enormous opportunity for the state.

This will be the last time I ask the question because I do not want to be impertinent with my persistence on it, but I am just trying to get an understanding. Of that 60 per cent local content work in Australia that is of that \$50 billion program, does the state government have a policy or a target, albeit it might be released in the document the Premier refers to, about how much of that 60 per cent we anticipate, hope, expect, or target for—use the language that you will—is going to be in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have not broken that down at this stage by platform, but we do have detail, which will be in the defence sector strategy. What I am told is that our approach to this has really been to look very strategically at what type of work we can do here in South Australia: what do we currently have the capacity and the capability to deliver and also what might we be able to attract?

This is highly sophisticated. The supply chain for submarine maintenance is very advanced in South Australia, but we are talking about a brand-new submarine design. That supply chain needs to be created. Some of our existing firms will be able to go into it directly, but some will need some assistance and some will require us to essentially bring in partners. They could be partners that already exist within South Australia, they could be partners from interstate, they could be partners from overseas.

When I talk about 'partners', I talk about that in the broadest sense. Whether it be a strategic alliance, whether it be a merger or whether it be an acquisition, we want as many jobs in South Australia as we can. As I previously outlined to the committee, South Australia has very good global primes domiciled here with their headquarters in Adelaide. We have some very large local firms, but the vast majority of the sector in South Australia is made up of the SME sector.

What we lack in terms of the overall pattern is mid-tier firms in South Australia. We will try to create as many of those as we can, but if we cannot create them we will look to see whether we can bring them into South Australia. We need to create a workable supply chain, not just for a transaction on an individual component but for the decades-long work that will be in the construction and then

ultimately the sustainment of the air warfare destroyers, the offshore patrol vessels, the Future Frigates and the Future Submarines.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I take it then that there is not a particular target or figure, but we will move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 169, sub-program 1.1. I refer to the Defence Industry Employment Program for Ex-Service Personnel. Can the Premier advise if the Defence Industry Employment Program for Ex-Service Personnel is active?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is a little bit of complexity to this. Originally, I think we went to the election saying that we would fund the DTC to do this work. It really sprang out of an opportunity that we thought existed to transfer the significant skills of serving men and women of the ADF over into the defence industry.

We could see that there was a projected shortfall of skills, especially with security clearances, going forward into the defence industry. We know that there is a pool of people who retire from the ADF each year and we thought that we could have a matching arrangement. We expanded that to say that there would be other veterans who could do this work.

These may be men and women who have served in the ADF over a long period of time. What we know is that members of the ADF are very trusted people within society. They have all acquired extraordinary skills during their time in service to our nation. Many who leave that service are then employed in roles that I think do not fully tap into the capability and capacity they have, so we thought this was an ideal way of doing this. We thought that we would run this program through the DTC (Defence Teaming Centre).

I understand that sometime last year a decision was made to bring that program in-house with the acceptance of the DTC. This was not an issue with the DTC, but we thought that it would be good to bring that in-house. This is a program that I think is best suited internally because we have a good relationship between Defence SA and Veterans SA. They are co-located. We have very good relationships with many of the ESOs (ex-service organisations) in South Australia and nationally. There are some excellent programs for employment provided by these ESOs, and we believe that it is better for that to be provided in-house.

I do not have an update in terms of the number of jobs that have been created. I can say that it has not been as strong as we would have liked, but I am happy to take that question on notice and come back with an answer and also provide further details on whether there are other things people are considering with regard to this budget allocation regarding this program.

The CHAIR: I remind the committee that we will have the opportunity to examine Veterans SA this afternoon after 5 o'clock. Is that relevant to your questioning now?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Because it is a Defence SA program, it made sense to do it within Defence SA. The Premier took on notice a question that I had not asked.

The CHAIR: Would you like to ask it now just to put it on the record?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: For the record, because it is a question the Premier quite rightly anticipated I would ask, what is the number of people who have been employed through the program? Are there any jobs currently listed on the Veterans' Employment Program website? Is the Premier aware of the last time a vacant job was advertised on the website? Does the Premier have any other statistics about how many jobs the Defence Industry Employment Program has delivered in the past? If the Premier is willing to take all those on notice, I am happy to move on to another budget line.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have those numbers. I am happy to follow them up, but I am the first to admit that sometimes when you try things they do not work. We tried this within DTC. We set up our own website, but I am advised that the current thinking is that it may be better to work with some of the existing ESOs to deliver the same outcome which we were seeking and which we have not been able to effect ourselves. I do not have a detailed understanding of that program, but I am happy to get some more information and come back.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you happy to take those questions on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, absolutely.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: For clarity, though, in light of the Premier's most recent answer, is the program still active?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, it is still active and it is still funded, and it is funded as a line of Defence SA at the same number.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might move on then. I would like to ask a couple of quick space questions. I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 5, page 33, regarding the Space Discovery Centre and Mission Control facility at Lot Fourteen. What will the total state government contribution end up being to the Mission Control facility?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The total for the Mission Control Centre, which will be in that McEwin Building on the ground floor, is \$6 million, which is \$3.5 million from the Australian government and \$2.5 million from our government here in South Australia. My understanding is that this work will be now delivered by Saber Astronautics. They are currently in the Landing Pad on Lot Fourteen, and they will be establishing a dedicated office and, I think, its Australian headquarters here in Adelaide following winning that contract. My understanding is that the—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is that for the construction or the construction and operation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Saber Astronautics is the operator. My understanding is that the \$6 million is for the construction, but mostly the equipment for that Mission Control will be operational, I am advised, by the second quarter of next year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The operational, all being well, will be in the second quarter of the next calendar year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am thinking in the second quarter next year; so sometime between April and June—probably more towards June, because, to be quite honest with you, everything that happens in a building that was built so long ago tends to blow out, but it is going to be fantastic when it is there. The Space Discovery Centre and the Mission Control will be extraordinary.

Saber Astronautics is a great company. They are excited about this opportunity, and I think this will be fantastic not only for filling out and developing the ecosystem but also the public can visit our Mission Control on the ground floor of the McEwin Building. Directly above it, of course, are offices for companies like Myriota, the SmartSat CRC, Leonardo and, of course, the Australian Space Agency, so it is really starting to fill out as a beautiful precinct.

The CHAIR: There is something quite exciting about being able to utter the words 'Mission Control'.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Hence the questions, Mr Chairman. Is there an estimated usage rate of other organisations of Mission Control?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We know that, obviously, the Australian Space Agency will be using Mission Control. It is also an area which other companies here in South Australia and around the country will be able to access. There will be a combination of confidential tracking and control, as well as information that can be made more readily available to the public.

I just know that what this will do will inspire a next generation of young people who want to get into the space sector, and because it is co-located, or located alongside would probably be a better way of putting it, at the Space Discovery Centre I think it is going to attract a lot of interest from young people visiting this site.

The Australian Space Discovery Centre is also a \$6 million investment. It is part of that City Deal that we announced with the Prime Minister. It is administered through the federal government, through Minister Alan Tudge, and that centre will be delivered in partnership with Questacon, which many people would know as the National Science and Technology Centre. They would probably be most familiar with its operations in Canberra; and, again, we are very hopeful that this facility will be opened in the middle of next year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many FTEs do you expect to be employed at the Mission Control facility?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice and come back to you, but it will be a shared facility. So some people who will be working in there will be essentially employees of Fleet or Myriota, people who are tracking their devices, as well as a core who will be there, but I am happy to get that estimation and come back to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to the South Australian Space Industry Centre, what is the total number of applicants to the \$4 million Space Innovation Fund. I am referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 172, program 2.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am going to have to take that question on notice. What I do know is that we have a large number of projects administered by the South Australian Space Industry Centre that are really designed for one purpose, and that is filling out the ecosystem, supporting via the Venture Catalyst Space program administered by the University of South Australia. We are trying to fill out the ecosystem in South Australia, accelerate those innovative and disruptive ideas around startups and scale-ups in the space sector.

We have some wonderful companies on Lot Fourteen, and more broadly. I am informed that we now have 80 companies in the space sector ecosystem in South Australia, so it is really starting to develop very quickly. Dr Megan Clark AC, the head of the Australian Space Agency, is always quick to talk about the capital investment in this sector. When we look at those capital investment statements going into this sector, we can see that South Australia is now achieving a massively disproportionately high amount of that capital coming into our state and that is something that is very exciting for the future.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate the Premier taking that question on notice in terms of the number of applicants to the fund, and I appreciate the Premier may need to take this on notice, but I am also interested in any estimation in terms of economic activity that has been generated around the applicants to that fund, particularly around jobs. I might put one other question in there to round it out: how many other businesses are now engaged in the supply chain as a consequence of that particular grant or that particular fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice, but I think it is going to be difficult to separate out that fund versus all the other programs. To give the leader some insight, we have the Gravity Challenge, which we had the awards for last night. This is our second iteration of the Gravity Challenge. This was something which was brought to me about three Australian space forums ago, when Larry Keeley came out to address the forum and talked about getting companies involved in the space sector so that it is not just agency, not just academics and not just government, but it is actually the space sector. I think this is the guts of what the leader is asking about.

Deloitte paid for Larry Keeley to come out to South Australia, and I challenged Deloitte to tell us what we should be doing to fill out this ecosystem. They came up with a project called Gravity Challenge. I flew to Washington in May 2019 and met with Amazon Web Services (AWS). They agreed to come on. They are one of the principal sponsors providing that data that would facilitate this challenge. In the first iteration, which was decided on November last year, 10 challenges were put forward by organisations or companies in that first challenge. Eight of them have now resulted in companies with ongoing relationships to deliver against those challenges.

Last night, we had the awards for Gravity Challenge 02. There were 300 applications to participate in the project. This was narrowed down, ultimately, to 25. We now have companies in South Australia because of these challenges, because of the Venture Catalyst Space program, because of the scholarships that we are operating, because of the work of the University of South Australia and their Innovation and Collaboration Centre, because of the work experience program that we are offering here in South Australia and because of the very positive way that the sector around Australia is now gravitating to Lot Fourteen.

It is difficult to apply the exact number of jobs or companies coming out of one program, but they all form part of this ecosystem, and I would direct this committee to take a look at the space sector plan. It was launched at 8.30 this morning. It is on the SASIC website. It is an excellent document. Again, it is not the government's plan; it is part of our overall Growth State agenda. It is actually the industry saying to us that these are the opportunities, and the principal opportunity that we feature in that space sector plan is the opportunity around small satellites operating in

constellations, and that is a great opportunity for our state for future employment and also productivity improvements.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is there a figure that the department or the Premier may have in terms of what South Australia's current share is of the space industry nationally?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail, but I am happy to come back with an estimate. I think some of that detail is in the space sector plan. I know that the federal government's ambition is to treble the size of this sector and to create thousands and thousands of jobs. That is a very important question, and I will come back with a detailed answer as quickly as I possibly can.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time and there being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Defence SA portfolio agency complete. Further examination of the proposed payments for Defence SA relating to Veterans SA will continue after lunch.

Sitting suspended from 13:30 to 14:30.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$266,003,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET,
\$9,289,000
PREMIER, OTHER ITEMS, \$5,426,000
DEFENCE SA, \$14,880,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Conway, Chief Executive, Infrastructure SA.

Ms C. Bierbaum, Deputy Director, South Australian Productivity Commission.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, members of Estimates Committee A, to this afternoon's session. There are various portfolios under consideration in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the minister appearing is the Premier. I remind members that the proposed payments for the examination of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Defence SA remain open for examination. We are going to be considering for the next half hour the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA; from 3pm to 4pm, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation; and from 4pm to 5pm Arts SA. Premier, do you wish to make an opening statement and introduce your advisers, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is with great pleasure that I introduce Christine Bierbaum, the Deputy Chief Executive of the South Australian Productivity Commission. I first met Christine when I was on the manufacturing industry advisory board as a young person and Christine was working for I think it was probably the department of trade and economic development or all its other iterations over the last 20 years. Christine is a longstanding and highly credentialed public servant who has been very instrumental in helping to set up the Productivity Commission in South Australia.

We also have with us for further lines of examination, Jeremy Conway, who is the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA. I would point out that normally we would have Dr Matthew Butlin, who is not only the chair but the Chief Executive of the Productivity Commission, but he is in Victoria at the moment and not permitted to come into South Australia, but he sends his regards.

The CHAIR: Leader, do you have an opening statement, or do you wish to go straight into questions?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to go straight to questions, Chair. I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 33, regarding the Productivity Commission. How many times have you met with the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just the last part again.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many times have you met with the South Australian Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: With the commissioner, on a very regular basis, I would think probably monthly, but with the commission itself, no, I have not met with them at all as the entire group coming together. Basically, what we have is the commissioner, who is also the chair and chief executive, and the remainder of the commissioners are all part time. So, whilst I have caught up with them individually, some via Zoom meetings, for example, Professor Edwina Cornish. I have not met her personally, but I have met the other South Australia-based ones on a reasonably regular basis, but I have not met them together as a full commission.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Premier able to inform the committee how many reports have been commissioned by the government and how many reports has the Productivity Commission completed since it was established?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In the year the budget relates to, in February this year the South Australian Productivity Commission commenced two new inquiries: the research and development health and medical research inquiry and also the review into institutional arrangements to manage regulatory burden in regard to extractive industries. I do not have that list with me.

In the 2019-20 year, I am advised we completed two inquiries. In the earlier years, I think the first referral was in regard to procurement. Then there was a second stage of that in the 2019-20 financial year including local government costs and efficiency, and then also a three-month commissioned report into the transparency of fuel pricing.

In February of this year, there were two new inquiries—research and development and health and medical research—and then a review into the institutional arrangements to manage the regulatory burden of the extractive industry. There are some other matters which cabinet is considering at the moment, with a possible further referral to the South Australian Productivity Commission. At the moment, it is basically resourced to handle two inquiries simultaneously.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the most recent inquiry, the extractive industry, complete?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. We have now received the final report into this. This is being considered by cabinet and we will respond in the normal time frame to make that fully available. I think an interim report on that was put out; I am just not 100 per cent sure about that. I have just been informed that the government's response will be on the 26th of this month, tomorrow.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What inquiries is the Productivity Commission currently undertaking?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am also advised that the inquiry into the health and medical research program, which was not exclusively focused on but somewhat centred around SAHMRI and how we attract health research doctors into South Australia, has now been completed, but the government has not put its response out yet. Certainly, the interim report is out there, but we still have the general report on research and development. This is the way we go about research and development here as a state and what sorts of settings we could put in place to encourage more in the private sector and a more coordinated approach in the public sector.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are there any current inquiries the Productivity Commission is undertaking?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The research and development one is the one that is currently underway. At the moment, cabinet are considering some further topics, and they have been in discussion for the last couple of months. I have met with Dr Matthew Butlin on these, and we should have that finalised to begin work very, very soon.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How far progressed is the research and development inquiry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has been a fully resourced inquiry that the commission is working on. I believe that we might see the final report by 6 January next year, so it is in the final stages.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you have the interim report?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it is on the website. I do emphasise to people that, whilst we go out with the interim report, we seek a lot of further information at that point, so sometimes the final report can vary, but the interim report is currently on the website.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It just goes to my question around \$2.9 million. At the moment, it does not have any current inquiry beyond what occurs between the interim inquiry and the final report. Does that sound like a prudent use of taxpayers' dollars just at the minute?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, we are considering what those are, and I think we will probably have those finalised in the coming days.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given a not insignificant budget allocation to the Productivity Commission, would it not be prudent to ensure that there is a pipeline of work that the cabinet is providing the commission to ensure that taxpayers are getting the best possible return on that \$2.9 million investment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are very grateful for the work of the South Australian Productivity Commission. We are very grateful for the work of the chair, the chief executive and the executive who work there and also the three part-time commissioners. We are very satisfied with the return we are getting on this. This was a Productivity Commission we attempted to introduce and protect by legislation of parliament. That attempt was not successful.

So we have set it up separately. It was established as a supported office attached to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on 22 October 2018 and, since then, I think they have worked extraordinarily hard to deliver reports for the state. I am not aware of any hiatus between the work of completing and finalising the reports that are currently outstanding and the beginning of the new work and we should have some new work to provide very soon.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier mentioned the legislative instrument that was sought to be passed by the government in regard to the Productivity Commission to establish that body. The opposition was providing bipartisan support for the passage of that legislation up until it was withdrawn. It is worth noting that it was withdrawn by the government, mind you. Has the Productivity Commission been requested to conduct a review or a report or inquiry into the sale, privatisation or outsourcing of any government assets or services?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Productivity Commission provided any advice to the Premier in relation to the privatisation or outsourcing of any government function whatsoever?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, all the advice that they provide to the government is published on the website, so they are not providing advice separately from that. Just to go back to an earlier point, I hope the Leader of the Opposition is not extrapolating that perhaps because we have not announced what the new inquiries are, that essentially the members of the Productivity Commission are sitting around thinking, 'I wonder what we are going to get next?'

In terms of putting forward suggestions for further investigation, a huge amount of pre-work needs to be done to see that we can actually add value in an investigation. With the things that we are considering at the moment, work has been going on for probably three, four or five months in terms of that pre-work. That will continue, but ultimately we will be in a position to announce those new references, or referrals I probably should say, to the Productivity Commission in the very near future.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who does that pre-work, the DPC or the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Productivity Commission.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What pre-work is currently being undertaken? Can we get a sense of the pre-work in terms of inquiries that have not yet been announced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As you can imagine, the Productivity Commission is made up of people with great expertise in terms of looking at work that other jurisdictions have done as well. We often ask for opinions on whether or not these are things that could lend themselves to inquiries in South Australia and extract a value for the people of our state. Whilst I will not go into those specific areas, you will probably find out in the coming days exactly what they are. I think they are all in line with the types of things we have been able to identify as well.

You need to have an inquiry that is plausible to undertake and that would be of value to the people of South Australia and produce recommendations that can be put in place. There is no point in doing an investigation into something where the jurisdiction that would be responsible for implementation is not the South Australian government or it is beyond the capacity of the South Australian government to consider. So a lot of thought is put in so that when we do commit the resources of the Productivity Commission we are in the best place possible to extract some value for the people of our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the cabinet determine the inquiries?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I certainly keep cabinet fully apprised of the matters that are under consideration. Yes, they go to cabinet as a note.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As a note, but you decide as the minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We run a cabinet government. I have been through this on multiple occasions. In some jurisdictions, the person at the top makes all the decisions. In our government, our cabinet meets twice per week and we make collective decisions on these types of things, but ultimately I am the person who signs and authorises—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if it is a pink in cabinet, or a note, you are the person who ultimately decides though?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If it is a note in cabinet, are you the person who ultimately decides?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would be ultimately the person who signs off on it but, as I have tried to convey, we are a true cabinet government and we make these decisions based upon the collective input of the entire cabinet. I am very grateful to my cabinet colleagues for their support for the Productivity Commission. Some of these have related to specific cabinet minister's portfolios and they have been very supportive, but we make decisions as a cabinet collectively.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Indeed, I am very cognisant of the fact that every one of your cabinet ministers and you have been party to all the decisions that you have made on policy and then subsequently changed. In terms of the 2019-20 financial year, the target for the financial year is also to promote public understanding of the objectives and functions of the commission. What will this entail?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The website and also some public statements from the Productivity Commission in the annual report. These are the things we are doing to educate the people of South Australia about the valued work of the Productivity Commission in South Australia. I encourage all South Australians to have a look at the website, check out the annual report, see some of the previous work that has been done and, of course, take a close look at the interim reports in particular because they are the ones that still remain unresolved. Getting feedback from people is very valued.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might move on to Infrastructure SA.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I now have Jeremy Conway, the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, how many times have you met with Infrastructure SA over the last 12 months?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a similar answer to the previous answer inasmuch as I have met with the chair and occasionally the chief executive, but I have not met with the board at any point. I do meet with the chair on a regular basis. The chair of this board is Tony Shepherd. Tony Shepherd has actually been coming to South Australia as an essential traveller, even when there were some reasonably harsh restrictions earlier in the year. He has kept doing his work with regard to this but, of course, he is very well supported by Jeremy Conway and his team within Infrastructure SA. I meet with the chief executive on a very regular basis—in fact, yesterday.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Infrastructure SA assess your key election promise of GlobeLink before you decided to scrap it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What was Infrastructure SA's view of GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that has been well canvassed. I think that has been in the public for quite some time. Independent consultants, I understand, were engaged to look at that proposal, they made their recommendation to the government and we accepted that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Those independent consultants being KPMG?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was KPMG engaged by DPC, Department for Infrastructure and Transport, Infrastructure SA or another organisation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that they were engaged by DPTI at the time, which of course is now the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The consultancy exercise that looked into GlobeLink and decided that it should be scrapped was independent of Infrastructure SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As seen from the consultants' view about GlobeLink, obviously recommending it should be scrapped, what was Infrastructure SA's view of GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the government's perspective is that we are not proceeding with it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, but what was Infrastructure SA's view of GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it was probably similar to that of KPMG and the government.

Mr CONWAY: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was there anyone apart from you who thought that GlobeLink was a good idea when you promised it at the election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure which budget line you are referring to.

The CHAIR: No, leader, I will bring you back to the budget papers, please.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to the principal infrastructure promise that you took to the election, the principal big, bold plan/promise for infrastructure that you took to the last election, is it a surprise to you that Infrastructure SA thought it was a bad idea, given that you promised it to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is really not a budget-related question. I have no idea which budget line the leader is referring to. He is fully aware of how this committee works and this just is not relevant to the budget as presented.

The CHAIR: I concur with the Premier. Leader, I have directed you previously back to the current budget under investigation.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am asking questions regarding Infrastructure SA.

The CHAIR: Yes, you are.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Infrastructure SA provide advice to the government on the upgrade of the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The primary function of Infrastructure SA is to develop the 20-year state infrastructure strategy. That was prepared, and it was presented in May 2020. They also developed and presented the five-year Capital Intention Statement. That will be upgraded on an annual basis; it will be a rolling five-year Capital Intention Statement. They will also be doing some assurance work on a range of projects that are currently underway, and my understanding is that they are making good progress with providing that assurance framework for those important projects.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I take it that there was no view provided to the government from Infrastructure SA regarding the upgrade of the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that assurance work is done on a range of projects. These are prioritised by Infrastructure SA, and that assurance framework, that gateway analysis, is provided to cabinet in confidence.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I did not hear any reference to Portrush Road or Magill Road there, so we will move on.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is just that we do not divulge cabinet confidential information, but you can probably extrapolate. They are looking at projects over \$50 million in value. I will leave that to your imagination.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am very happy to allow my imagination and the response of the community to fill in the blanks. Did Infrastructure SA assess the \$185 million Fleurieu Connections Improvement Package?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer you to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Infrastructure SA assess the \$250 million Hahndorf traffic improvements?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I refer you to my previous answer. I might be able to find some further information for you on that assurance program. Infrastructure SA now has a legislative obligation because this was an agency that was established under statute, and we did have the strong support of the opposition—in fact, from memory, I think most members of both houses, but I stand corrected if I have that wrong—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You certainly had our support, yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is very good; thank you for that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: A pleasure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Part of that was that there was an obligation to review and evaluate major infrastructure projects undertaken by public sector agencies with a capital value of \$50 million plus or as otherwise determined by me, as the responsible minister in this case. To facilitate this work, Infrastructure SA developed an assurance framework that was approved by cabinet in March of this year, and that is supported by a new DPC Circular, PC049 and amendments to Treasurer's Instruction TI 17. I am advised that all this work is provided to cabinet in confidence. ISA conducted six assurance reviews in 2019-20 and a further nine to date for 2020-21.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you tell us what those six and nine projects are?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just outlined that this advice is provided commercial-in-confidence and so—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Commercial-in-confidence or cabinet-in-confidence?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Cabinet-in-confidence, sorry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand the government's policy position in regard to Infrastructure SA. We set up a body, Infrastructure SA—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We fund it with taxpayer dollars—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The task of Infrastructure SA is to make sure that we are getting the best bang for our buck in terms of capital expenditure on infrastructure. Infrastructure SA does assuredness work looking at individual projects, but no-one gets to know what those projects are and what the advice is that is given to the government about whether or not that value is occurring.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that Infrastructure Australia do not provide that detail either, with regard to the detail of the assurance work they do or the valuation work they do. What I can say is that we are absolutely committed to, as the Leader of the Opposition refers to it, 'bang for our buck'. This is why we set up Infrastructure SA—to develop a 20-year strategy for capital investments in this state as well as to develop a five-year Capital Intention Statement.

We were the last jurisdiction in the country to set up an iBody—the last in the country. We were very much aided in that because we were the last. We could go to a large number of people who had already set this up and review the legislation and the arrangements that they had put in place. We were assisted in this work by Mark Birrell, who is a former chair of Infrastructure Australia, and Sir Rod Eddington, who is a former chair of Infrastructure Australia.

They presented us with an excellent framework which, as I have pointed out before, we have legislated. Now we are set up and we are running that organisation. We were very pleased that we could present that 20-year strategy in March of this year, and we will now have these rolling five-year Capital Intention Statements going forward. The alternative was that we just continued to operate the way the previous government did, which was pet projects around marginal seats and electoral cycles, but that was not serving us well. So we have significantly—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You mean like Portrush Road and Magill Road, Hahndorf traffic improvements, GlobeLink—those sorts of projects you are talking about?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting to this committee and indeed to the people of South Australia that they do not support the Portrush Road, Magill, upgrade or the Hahndorf project, I think that is a very, very sad situation. We know that the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection is an extraordinarily busy intersection, with a huge number of people inconvenienced on a daily basis, so it is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition does not support that project. Since coming to government—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, you have a habit of mischaracterising our position, and that is unreasonable.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, I do not know whether I am finishing my—

The CHAIR: Order, leader! The Premier is responding.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —answer to this. We have, since coming to government, very significantly increased our focus on an increased infrastructure spend. We now have a very, very large commitment to infrastructure in South Australia, in excess of \$16 billion in the current forward estimates. This is the largest in the history of the state, and of course you have to have a framework to determine where you get the best return. We should not be spending a cent of taxpayers' dollars without making sure that we can get the highest value and highest return for the taxpayers.

This has meant that we have proceeded with projects that are not in marginal seats and are projects that are very, very important for our state. These include projects like the dog fence, which had remained neglected for a long period of time. There are not too many votes in a dog fence, but it is a very important piece of infrastructure for our state.

I know the previous government talked a lot about upgrading infrastructure in Whyalla, in particular around a new school, but they did not do it. We were very pleased when we came to government—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We committed to it and funded it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to actually apply the money to building a state-of-the-art facility in Whyalla. This is not a marginal seat, it is not a Liberal seat, but it is an important project for the people of Whyalla—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Hear, hear!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and ultimately for the people of our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which is why we did it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The previous government had 16 years to deliver on that project. We prioritised the finalisation of the Gawler line electrification. Again, this is a project that is not going to benefit many of the Liberal constituencies; it is very important to many of the Labor constituencies, so we are making these decisions in an apolitical way based upon what is going to be the best return for the people of our state.

That is why we established Infrastructure SA. We are very pleased that we could establish it under statute, and now they go about the important work of providing advice to the government and assuring the people of South Australia that we are spending their money wisely.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to the Hahndorf traffic improvement proposal, has the government now got a plan for that proposal? Has Infrastructure South Australia been able to assess that proposal even though the government has not thus far announced what their actual plan is?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a good question, and the government has answered this question in question time very often and made the point that when we came to government the detailed design work just did not exist. The previous government operated on what could best be referred to as a hand-to-mouth approach to the design and development of projects, which meant that often projects were undercosted and they failed to meet their delivery milestones.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is just not true.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: So we have a huge amount of work to catch up—a massive amount of work to catch up. You might have noticed in the most recent budget that on the recommendation of Infrastructure SA we created a pool of money so that individual departments could bid in to get that detailed design work done so that, as more money becomes available, we can get on and deliver those projects.

Nevertheless, with regard to the project that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to, work needs to be done. We are very committed to working with the commonwealth government on this project. The amount of money is going to be divided up on an 80:20 arrangement, so the commonwealth government will be wearing the vast majority of the costs associated with this project. Nevertheless, we do think it is an important project for the people in that area and so we will certainly be supporting it. As that detailed design work and full consultation work is done, we will be releasing those plans to the people of South Australia and cracking on with delivering that project.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Infrastructure SA review and approve the state's Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan before it was released?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that Infrastructure SA did receive a briefing on this. It is important to note that Infrastructure SA does not just do work on projects like roads and bridges and ports, but also social infrastructure as well—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Like receiving a briefing? You are telling me that the extent of Infrastructure SA's involvement in your State Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan was to receive a briefing regarding it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We sought input. Let's be clear: if you read the 20-year strategy that was put out, one of the primary recommendations of Infrastructure SA was to make sure that we had the best utilisation of our existing facilities before—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if they are just getting a briefing on something, that is not really providing input, is it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The requirement under the act is that they have a role with projects over \$50 million. You would see, with the state sport infrastructure plan, there is no project which has currently been announced that is over that threshold. Nevertheless, Infrastructure SA have extraordinary skills and we are always tapping into them. We are developing items like the state sport infrastructure strategy in line with the recommendations that we have received from Infrastructure SA and their 20-year strategy. We are very proud that there is good alignment between that strategy and the work we are doing on the state sport infrastructure plan

The CHAIR: We have reached the time allotted. We are due now to move, at two minutes past three, to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation.

Membership:

Mr Szakacs substituted for Ms Michaels.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms R. Ambler, Executive Director, Cabinet Office and Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms K. Parker, Director, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: I need to inform the committee that the member for Enfield has requested to be discharged and has been replaced on the committee by the member for Cheltenham.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the next hour, we will be looking at the important portfolio of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can I say that the chief executive of this particular agency, Nerida Saunders, will not be with us today. She is currently on leave and we all wish her the very best with her recuperation and hope that she is out swinging again very soon. When I say 'swinging', sir, I am of course referring to her interest in golf.

We are joined today by Kirstie Parker, who is Director, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation; Steven Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate; and Ruth Ambler, who is Executive Director of Cabinet Office and also Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. Do you wish to make more of a statement than that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just make a brief statement that I am very grateful to all of the Aboriginal communities right across South Australia for their extraordinary response in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. Communities acted very swiftly to protect their communities in these unprecedented times. I know that it was often a very difficult decision within communities to effectively shut them down. These were not always decisions which had unanimous support, but I genuinely believe that communities acted in what they believe were the best interests of their communities and we commend them for that.

I also want to commend officers within the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation department because we know that when we did our planning for the coronavirus this was one of our most vulnerable cohorts in South Australia. This was often because they were so remote from Adelaide and from health services. I genuinely want to thank the officers within the department for keeping up

the lines of communication with these remote communities through their weekly telephone meetings, to which I was invited on several occasions. It was a great opportunity to meet with some of the leaders we have within the Aboriginal community across South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is regarding Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24. Has a request or inquiry been made by the federal government about any Aboriginal heritage sites on or near the proposed nuclear waste facility near Kimba?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I did not quite hear that, sorry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has a request or inquiry been made by the federal government about any Aboriginal heritage sites on or near the proposed nuclear waste facility near Kimba?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can take that question on notice. I have not been provided with any briefing with regard to that. We are not aware of any request that has been received, but we will take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you aware of any concerns from traditional owners over the nuclear waste facility proposed near Kimba?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. I have met with different groups with regard to the siting of a low and medium-level nuclear repository in South Australia. It is fair to say that there is a variety of views that exist across communities in South Australia. Some groups were relieved when their site, which was under consideration, was eliminated.

The CHAIR: Leader, can you furnish me with your budget line again?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Before we go on to the next question, I can confirm, because we have confirmation now, that we have not received a request from the commonwealth.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have or have not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Have not.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will the provisions of the Aboriginal Heritage Act apply to the nuclear waste facility near Kimba?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not an expert in this area and we have a unit that sits within Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation that actually deals with this, so we will consult with them and we can come back with an answer. So we will take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same line, a number of traditional owners would like to know if you support giving traditional owners a right of veto over any nuclear waste facility on their land. Do you support this? Will it happen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think we have always had a bipartisan approach to this. Neither of the major parties support that right of veto. I am not sure if there has been any change from the Labor Party's perspective, but certainly we still maintain our position that we held previously.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No. We went to the last election with a position on this and we have maintained that position. We do support traditional owners having their voice heard and a substantial say, in terms of what happens to a nuclear waste facility near Kimba, but I appreciate that that is probably not contextual.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, I did not think that there was any position from the Labor Party to provide Aboriginal community groups with a right of veto, which was the question that I was asked. Of course there must be consultation and, of course, people must be heard, but the question I was asked was whether or not I supported a right of veto. My answer to that question was very clear, that I thought we had the same position as the opposition, but I could be wrong and I invite the Leader of the Opposition to correct the record if he thinks he has a position where they do now provide a right of veto with regard to these types of applications.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to do that, because the position, as I said—maybe I did not enunciate this clearly enough—that we took to the last election was that we do support a right of

veto and that is a position that we have maintained since then. I am very happy to reiterate that and enlighten the Premier so that traditional owners have some consciousness of the policy differences between the Liberal government and the Labor Party.

Regarding Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24, specifically this question relates to the descriptions and objective of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation including 'to support the state's Aboriginal land holding authorities'. Who provides funding for municipal services in the APY lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that it has now been transferred to the Office of Local Government in the Attorney-General's Department. I will take that question on notice and provide further information, but that is my understanding.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is not the case that the commonwealth government is responsible for municipal services funding in the APY lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would be very pleased to take that question on notice because—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Presumably you know who is responsible for the funding of municipal services in the APY lands.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, municipal services were previously funded under federal agreements, and then there was a transfer to states. There was a winding-up of that funding, and I just need to see which state government minister is responsible for that area.

What I am advised is that municipal services were transferred by the federal government some time ago to the states. There is just a query now with regard to whether they are continuing to provide that money directly to the APY lands. I am happy to take that up. The Leader of the Opposition could be correct that it is funded still directly from the commonwealth. I am happy to take that question on notice and come back.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who provides funding for municipal services for Aboriginal communities outside the APY lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that I just answered that. My understanding is through the Office of Local Government, which sits within the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much money is provided for municipal services for those Aboriginal communities outside the APY lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information because it is not within my budget area, but I am happy to ask the Attorney-General and come back, or that could be a question that could be asked directly to the Attorney-General. What I would say is that, as part of the COVID response, the leader would note that we increased that funding and in fact brought forward MUNS funding from future budgets into this budget to try to accelerate some of those projects, some of which have been waiting for quite some time.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the funding that was allocated from the commonwealth, which is due to expire, been replaced by state funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, this would be something that would be best directed to the minister responsible, who is the Attorney-General. As I said—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Presumably you or your department know what is going on with funding arrangements regarding the APY lands and Aboriginal communities generally.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to my answer two questions ago, when I said that we had actually increased the MUNS funding in the most recent budget and brought forward projects from future time periods. However, I do not have that exact information, but we are very happy to get that detail. It is not a line of expenditure I am personally responsible for.

I am very intrigued by the leader's line of questioning on this. What we have done since coming to government is to move in the direction of having a whole-of-cabinet approach to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Under the previous model, Aboriginal Affairs was moving around as a

portfolio. Virtually every time there was a reshuffle the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation changed—not providing any great continuity.

The reality is that the minister who ultimately has responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs is not responsible for the vast majority of expenditure that benefits Aboriginal people in South Australia because, if you think about it, there is a lot of expenditure that goes through the departments of health, education, corrections, the Attorney-General, courts, police, human services, child protection—every, single minister, quite frankly, has a responsibility in this area.

We have developed a whole-of-government approach. We developed an Aboriginal Action Plan in consultation with all our chief executives and in consultation with Aboriginal people right across South Australia. I do not think it is reasonable for the Leader of the Opposition to be asking me detailed questions about the very substantial investment that South Australians make in Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation right across every, single government department in South Australia, but I am happy to take any detailed questions like that on notice.

Can I say that as a government we are very proud of our approach to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. We are supported in that by the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council and the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement in South Australia. In fact, we are held to account by the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council. They come to cabinet. In fact, they are the only group that come to cabinet. They come twice yearly to cabinet to hold us to account on our progress against the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan.

They meet between those meetings with ministers, where they again not only hold the minister to account for delivery against the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan but also provide direct input to the minister. Our response is a whole-of-government response, rather than just having one minister responsible for everything that occurs for Aboriginal people right across our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24. What was requested from the government by representatives of the Black Lives Matter movement during the meetings you had earlier this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was not a meeting; it was a series of meetings, and there was a range of issues. Again, I do not have all those issues in front of me, but they related to a whole-of-cabinet approach. Some of these were dealt with directly by the Attorney-General, some by the police commissioner, and we have had some discussions recently with the ALRM about putting in place some of the recommendations. They have not been finalised yet.

Certainly, the custody notification system was one of the key requests, and that was one we have progressed quite significantly. Another one was the re-establishment of the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee (AJAC), which was removed under the previous government, but a lot of people within the sector found it very useful. We have been discussing the re-establishment of something along those lines with the ALRM. They are considering it at the moment and we hope to have something to advise very soon.

We are very proud in South Australia of the way we dealt with the Black Lives Matter movement and the rally. In many jurisdictions around the country and around the world, we saw this being an event of great friction. In South Australia, it was a powerful expression of protest, but there was not a single injury, not a single arrest and no violence whatsoever. People predicted that around 7,000 people attended that rally that was held when we still had very significant restrictions in place.

In South Australia, unlike many other jurisdictions, the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens, allowed that rally to go ahead because we knew it was so important and because we knew in South Australia that we could manage it from a safety perspective and also as an expression of protest against issues that were very, very important to Aboriginal people and to the broader population.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier have a view about the presence of institutional racism in the state public sector or government generally?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just say that I am very proud of the way the public sector in South Australia has worked very diligently to promote Aboriginal employment in South Australia. We have more Aboriginal people employed in South Australia than we have had at any time in the

history of South Australia. Often, though, Aboriginal people are employed at lower levels of the Public Service than we would ultimately like them to be. Since coming into government, we have instituted an Aboriginal leadership program, which I think is now in its third or fourth iteration and which we are very proud of.

We have some extraordinarily talented Aboriginal people right across the Public Service and we plan to develop their skills for higher office. What I would say is we often develop their leadership skills and then they are picked up by the private sector, which is good as well, but we do want to have high levels of representation of Aboriginal people in our Public Service in South Australia. I am very pleased that chief executives take their responsibilities in terms of reconciliation very, very seriously.

I was very pleased earlier this year to participate in our very first cultural awareness program, which was conducted with both the cabinet—all cabinet ministers—and all chief executives present. I am not aware of that ever occurring before in South Australia. I am sure there will be other events like this. I do not think you can just have one three or four-hour session and tick a box; I think there is a lot more work to do. I had enormously good feedback from all those who attended and, of course, many of those chief executives have their own extensive programs within their own departments.

In addition to that, we have established a group called the Aboriginal Affairs Executive Committee, which is chaired by David Brown, the Chief Executive of Department for Correctional Services. This committee meets on a very regular basis and advances the work we need to do within the Public Service in South Australia. In addition to that, I know that the work that this group is doing will help inform our response to the Closing the Gap refresh.

Recently in parliament, I was asked a question on this by the member for Florey and I did not have the information there at hand, but I did follow up immediately after question time with the detailed information. I am happy to provide that to the committee now. That group is basically now breaking up into a series of subgroups that directly reflect the four central themes in the Closing the Gap refresh. The four themes are: overrepresentation of Aboriginal South Australians in the criminal justice system; building capacity in vulnerable families; economic participation, employment and procurement; and supporting the growth in community-controlled organisations.

In each of these we have co-chairs, Aboriginal public servants and chief executives, and the chief executive allocated to these is not the one who would normally take responsibility. For example, in the over-representation of Aboriginal South Australians in the criminal justice system, we have David Reynolds, the Chief Executive of Treasury and Finance as one of the co-chairs with Scharlene Lamont, so they work together on that working group to respond there. I think it is a really innovative way of working and it gets all the members on the senior management council understanding the real challenges and also the opportunities for improving Aboriginal lives in this state.

The CHAIR: It looks like the member for Florey has a question.

Ms BEDFORD: Thank you, sir. It follows on from something the Premier just spoke about.

The CHAIR: I thought it might. Your call.

Ms BEDFORD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, program 4, page 24. Targets 2020-21 for program 4 included the development of a jurisdiction action plan for the Closing the Gap agreement and the development of an updated South Australian government Aboriginal affairs action plan, which you have spoken about.

Given reducing the disproportionate number of Aboriginal young people in the criminal justice system is a national Closing the Gap priority, why can the South Australian government not do something to reform the law to raise the age of criminal responsibility to the age of 14. Across Australia, I understand that more than 60 per cent of children between the ages of 10 and 14 in prison are Aboriginal.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This was one of the other issues raised by the organisers of the Black Lives Matter rally, which I failed to report on earlier; it slipped my memory. This is an issue which has had a lot of coverage in recent times. My understanding is there is a Council of

Attorneys-General who are looking at this issue as we speak. There is no final position but this is something that is on their agenda.

This is not an easy issue. Not everybody agrees with raising the age of criminal responsibility, but it is certainly one for which we hope to get a resolution very soon. I am happy to ask the Attorney-General what the likely date is for that. I think some jurisdictions have said they are prepared to move outside of that COAG decision, but we have decided to work as a COAG. When I say 'COAG', it is not the Council of Australian Governments but the Council of Attorneys-General.

Ms BEDFORD: Following on from that, I understand the ACT is already moving to raise the age to 14. Would it not be possible for South Australia to help move things forward by taking the lead?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, there is a range of views, and we have taken those views into account. Some people are not supporters of this. It is an area in which there are a lot of good intentions with regard to this issue. We are just going to be reserving our position until we hear all those submissions and arrive at a decision point. It is not that we are trying to delay, but sometimes there can be perverse outcomes from these types of changes in policy. We just want to hear from everybody. We have a responsibility, if we are going to change that, to not make matters worse but actually improve the situation. The last time I asked the Attorney-General, in South Australia there were very few people between the age of 10 and 14 in custody. I am also very happy to take that matter on notice and come back to the member with those details.

Ms BEDFORD: Could I just finish by asking what sort of perverse outcome there could be? Do we all think crime will rise exponentially in the 14-year-old age group? I do not understand why we cannot be leaders in this. I do not know who can oppose it, really.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Some people believe that if there are—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can see you mouthing 'who?' I am happy to come back with the details and forward articles. There are people who suggest that there could be very serious ramifications if people cannot be taken into custody and they have serious behavioural problems and there are consequences of those serious behavioural problems when states have not been able to put those people into custody. There are children in this state, Aboriginal and non Aboriginal—this is not a matter of—

Ms BEDFORD: It is not a matter of race at all.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —race at all, but there are children with very severe behavioural problems who can cause massive damage to property and persons. There needs to be some way of protecting the child from themselves as well as protecting the broader society. I am happy to forward some of the information and correspondence we have received. It is far from a consensus position, and some very serious and learned people are cautioning against us making a snap decision in this area.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will move on to questions about the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan in Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24. How many actions are there in the plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just make a correction to an earlier answer I gave? I was advised at the time that there had been no request from the commonwealth. I have now received advice—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: This is with regard to Kimba?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —correct—that the heritage section has now advised that the commonwealth did request a search of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation's central archives some years ago, with regard to Kimba, and they will check exactly when that occurred and provide that detail. We will take that question on notice, but I would like to correct the record of what I provided earlier.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. I might ask the leader to repeat his question, please.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many actions are in the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are 32; they are all on the website and we update those on a very regular basis. The vast majority are progressing extraordinarily well. There are some delays. I think that most people would appreciate that COVID-19, for all the reasons we outlined before, has probably disproportionately affected Aboriginal communities in regard to our officers being able to access remote Aboriginal lands.

We remain committed to all those 32 actions, but we are in the midst of determining the refresh. I can advise this committee that we will be looking not just at the issue of refreshing our own Aboriginal action plan but also at whether or not we bring together the work that will go into the national Closing the Gap refresh into a single document. We are yet to make that decision. The original action plan was published in December 2018, in the December of our first year in government., so it is due for a refresh at the moment. I am hoping that we can provide that refresh either late this year or early next year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What part of government coordinates the action plan? Is it your department?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it is through Cabinet Office, actually. Sorry, it is DPC-AARD.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: DPC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What are the targets or actions in the area of child protection within the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the Aboriginal action plan in front of me, but all that information is on the website. I note that at the moment we are looking at the arrangements in regard to child protection for increasing the number of foster-parents because we need to make sure that we have culturally appropriate support for Aboriginal children who are taken into the care of the minister.

This is a department that already had a very extensive plan in terms of looking after Aboriginal children in South Australia. We did not have a range of additional areas across the government, so the Aboriginal action plan did not replace work that was already being done in individual departments; it was in addition to that. As I said, child protection had a very advanced strategy in regard to Aboriginal children.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What are the targets or actions in the area of Aboriginal heritage protection within the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is an area that already had its own act and its own unit within AARD. We are not looking to supplant work that was already extensive and underway. This was additional to in our action plan. We were not patting ourselves on the back for work that had already been done on an ongoing basis. These were additional projects we thought we could deliver within a two-year period.

When we designed this approach, we said that we did not want to have just a regurgitation of programs that were already underway and that we did not want to provide goals that were long term and did not have an action orientation. We wanted plans where we could say we have either achieved it or we have not achieved it within a certain period of time. We set ourselves approximately that two-year period. For the reasons I outlined before in regard to COVID, some of those have slipped, but the vast majority of those 32 remain on track or have been achieved.

In the area of Aboriginal heritage, this is an area that has been established under its own act in the South Australian parliament. It is well resourced and it is well understood, so I am not sure whether there were specific items, I would doubt it, but I am happy to go and check.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Would it surprise the Premier if he learned that two-thirds of the so-called actions listed in your action plan were actually initiatives of the former Labor government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I know the previous Labor government like to say they were doing everything—curing cancer and a whole pile of other fantastic projects that you were

working on. All I can say is that as a government we are taking our responsibility in this extraordinarily seriously.

For an area like Aboriginal affairs, which I consider to be probably the most complex area and the most difficult area of public policy, we need to have an approach where if one party, an individual Independent member or a member of a minor party, has suggestions they should all be considered. I do not really know that this is a portfolio where we should be trying to say that this is what one party has achieved and this is what another party has achieved.

If I can be quite frank about this, I think the two major parties both have highlights and lowlights of their administration in this area. We are always happy to support areas where the Australian Labor Party or other members might have useful suggestions. This should be an area where we all have a joint focus on delivery, and we welcome any suggestions that come from the opposition in this area.

If there are areas in terms of this that relate to work that was done previously and we are building on that, I think that is great. Hopefully, if the opposition form government again in the future, they will not be throwing the baby out with the bathwater but will be building on the work established under the term of this government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am sticking with the theme of the Aboriginal action plan. In terms of the Tika Tirka student accommodation, where is the recurrent funding for this currently allocated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I presume it would be through the Department of Human Services, but I am happy to take that question on notice and come back to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: While you are doing that, can we also find out how much there is for recurrent funding, wherever it may sit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very happy to do that. I think this was something originally envisaged under the previous government, and it addressed a long-term concern where students who were coming from regional or remote South Australia down to Adelaide were finding it difficult in the private market to get accommodation. This was very seriously and adversely affecting their ability to complete their studies.

This was an issue that was quite rightly identified by the previous government. We were very happy to deliver that project, and I commend the opposition for their work in this area, identifying an issue and taking action. I am advised that currently approximately 16 students are now living in that accommodation in the centre of the city.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent. Regarding another part of the plan, the Ceduna Service Reform, the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan simply states that that exercise is going to be extended. When you say 'extended', does that just mean not cancelled, or has additional resourcing been provided to expand its activities or replicate the model elsewhere? What is meant when it says 'extended'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think this is a project, if I am right, that is jointly funded by the federal government and the state government. I visited their offices in Ceduna recently. We are providing resources in terms of personnel, but it is really trying to coordinate the various government services in Ceduna.

The member for Flinders and I visited there recently. It has only recently been stood up, so it is not something that has been delivered several years ago. This is something that is very fresh—in fact, probably in the last three or four months, is my understanding. They are looking at coordinating a range of state and federal government services for the people who are living in and around Ceduna. This is a community that has been doing it pretty tough recently.

One of the things I learnt when I was in Ceduna was that there were a large number of people who had, during the COVID lockdown, gone back to community, whether that be Oak Valley, whether it be Yalata, whether it be Koonibba or Scotdesco. There was an accumulation of money for individuals through the enhanced JobSeeker payments, and when that biosecurity determination was lifted many of those people went into Ceduna and were dislocated from their communities and the support structures around them.

Ceduna is an incredibly resilient and capable community, but they have been under real pressure in recent months since the lifting of that biosecurity arrangement. We are very pleased that these services are in place, and we are working together with the Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation and other various state and federal government organisations to address some of these concerns.

Ms BEDFORD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24, targets 2020-21. Following on from the line of questioning we have here, I have been told that a lot of good work was done to support homeless people, and Aboriginal homeless people in that cohort, during the first wave of COVID. What is being done now, and what is being planned into the future to get Aboriginal people back to their communities on the lands and for the people who are already on the lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is very good question because one of the biggest areas of concern we have is when Aboriginal people are dislocated from their normal support groups. The member quite rightly identifies that there were people who were excluded from the biosecurity arrangements, so they were dislocated. The member also quite rightly points out that during that period we went through a range of supports for people who were homeless or dislocated—and they are two separate groups.

The question really is: what are we doing to support people who remain dislocated? I am advised that DPC-AAR, the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation division agency that sits within my department, has been working with Health and Wellbeing as well as Human Services to try to repatriate those people back to their country. I specifically asked Kirstie Parker how that actually works: well, where possible, we are providing transport services back to those communities.

I know this is a real concern for many people on country. I recently visited Oak Valley and shared the concern of some of the elders there that some people have left their country, have travelled and not returned. They are very keen to get those people back into their community as much as possible. There are state government supports, but we are looking at all and every way we possibly can to repatriate those people back onto their country, where they have their best types of support, but also, if they do remain in South Australia, to have services that are going to be supportive.

Ms BEDFORD: Just a quick follow-on from that, I have not been in the city a lot lately, but if there are groups of people coming down somehow is there some quick action being put into place to help identify them, where they are from and what we can do with them? It would be awful if they were wandering around, because there is no way of contacting or speaking with them, and a week later we realise there is an issue because they have been wandering up and down the city for a week.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a very difficult and complex issue to deal with because, of course, some people who come down do not want to be back on country. We have to be careful with this because we are not trying to move people on. What we are trying to do is identify people who are genuinely stranded, and if they are genuinely stranded we will put state government resources towards helping them get back to country.

Sometimes we find what happens is that people will come down because there might be a family member in hospital, sometimes they might be down here having renal dialysis and might be down for an extended period. Many Aboriginal families move almost as a family: if one person is in hospital, they are not going to leave that person to go down to Adelaide by themselves; they will all be going down. This does have ramifications because often members of that family will then not have those support structures around them, and that is when some of the problems I have been told about arise. One thing we have been trying to do is get renal dialysis closer to the demand. Members should be aware of the four chairs that have now been established in Pukatja, often referred to as Ernabella. There are now four chairs there, operated by Purple House.

My understanding is that those chairs are now back up and running after the biosecurity zone was lifted on the APY lands. I would have to now check, because my understanding is that the APY Executive has now put another order, under their act, on people who are living on the APY lands. We are also currently looking at whether this is a possibility for Coober Pedy. This would be a shared renal dialysis arrangement, not just for the Aboriginal communities but for the broader

population in Coober Pedy. We will continue to look at opportunities to put those renal dialysis services closer to communities, as diabetes disproportionately affects Aboriginal people.

Ms BEDFORD: I am keen to know the police or whoever are equipped to approach groups of Aboriginal people just to make sure they are okay. What plans have been put in around that sort of early approach to make sure they are not just left on their own while they are down here?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that SAPOL is one of those groups, along with SA Health and Human Services, that is involved in talking to Aboriginal people within the CBD about whether or not they do need to have transport services to return them to community. I am very happy to also go back to South Australia Police and ask whether there are any other specific projects over and above that.

This is the type of question that we quite often get from the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council (SAAAC), when they meet with individual ministers or chief executives or, in this case, the police commissioner. I have to say, I am very pleased with the way all the chief executives—of course, the police commissioner sits on that senior management council—have interacted around this joint responsibility, challenge and opportunity that we have to improve Aboriginal lives in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the Umuwa multi-agency facility, the federal funding required delivery by 3 June this year. Has anything been delivered on time, or do we lose money if there is a failure to deliver on time?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that that is one of the projects that is not on track at the moment. This is the multi-agency facility at Umuwa. For those people who are not familiar, Umuwa is essentially Canberra, in that it does not have a local community: it is basically where the public servants are. Instead of putting another government multi-agency facility in Umuwa, we determined that it might be better to put it closer to the action, so an alternative plan was developed.

This has been discussed with the federal government. Essentially, it relates to a series of pop-ups that can be activated on need within communities that do not have police stations. For example, in Fregon, where there is not a police station, we would build a facility that could essentially be operational if there was a need identified for a police presence, or another state government presence, to be there for a period of time but then for it to close down.

One of the concerns that some people raised with me was that, because of the sheer distances involved getting from one community to another—there might be police officers being deployed from Ernabella or maybe Mimili to Fregon—if it was towards the end of the day police or other services would not be able to return before dark. As one could appreciate, even though there is an extensive road project upgrade on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands, it is still far from complete.

By having these facilities, state or federal officers could be deployed. They could open up the facilities and they could stay in that community for a few days or, if there was an increase in the population (for example, around sorry business or maybe a football carnival—they love their football on the APY lands), then this might be an opportunity. It was felt that what was envisaged regarding the multi-agency facility in Umawa, although it was a good idea at the time, could be enhanced. I am happy to find out final details on the progress of that, but I am quite convinced it is a much better outcome for the APY.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In that change of plan away from the multi-agency facility out at Umawa, has that necessitated a renegotiation of the federal funding agreement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my understanding, but I am happy to take that on notice. I am advised that this is a project which is being negotiated by Corrections and SAPOL. Whilst the information that I provided to the committee is accurate, we do not have an accurate update in terms of that negotiation with the federal government because that is a negotiation which is occurring with those other two agencies of government. We will immediately find out and come back to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In that case, we will move on to the Aboriginal Interpreter Service. With regard to that service, the funds that have been budgeted since mid-2017 I understand that amounts to \$1.5 million. Does the Premier know what has been achieved with that funding to date?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As the leader has identified, the funding has been available. It is really the final design of that project. I am advised that the consultation has not been completed on that but that is in the final stages. We do recognise a very significant need in providing improved interpreter services, which we believe will have improved outcomes right across interactions that the Anangu and other groups have with state government and federal government agencies and private services as well.

It is probably not really well known in Adelaide that for many of the Anangu English is not their first language; in fact, it is often their third language. Most people on the APY lands speak fluent Pitjantjatjara or Yankunytjatjara and then English is third. Whilst we are working very hard to try to improve outcomes in terms of literacy on the lands, there is still a very significant need for improved and enhanced interpreter services. This is a project that has not been without a significant budget increase but it has not progressed as quickly as we would like. We will find out more details on exactly where this project is at the moment and come back.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same subject, given the substantial need that I think we all agree exists—should that need be addressed, it has the potential to really break down a number of barriers in terms of people getting to services, amongst other things—how does the Premier explain that we have been consulting on this since 2017? That raises a whole range of follow-up questions. What has happened to the money that has been allocated so far? Has it been carried over? What has this money been doing apart from paying for consultation for three years? Three years is a long time for consultation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The first point I would make is that we still have interpreter services in place; it is not like we are without them. What we are saying is that there is a projected increased need for these and we are just doing the work at the moment to increase our capacity as a state to respond to that future need. I do need to assure the committee that we do have interpreter services in place. I am just advised that recruitment of personnel is current underway in this area, and that there are very good talks at the moment between the Department of Human Services and TAFE SA to try to expand the pool of people with these skills going forward.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Moving on to the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project, the action plan update states that less than 3,000 square kilometres has come back into production and that 12 jobs have been created. Will the full target of 50,000 square kilometres and 50 jobs ever be achieved?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I had a meeting with the people who were looking after this project recently. It is fair to say that this has been a project that has had some delays in the early stage and they are coming up to the end of the allocation for budget. This is something the government is considering going forward. We are committed to creating more jobs in South Australia. I am very pleased to report to this committee that one area that is massively improving is the uptake of Aboriginal apprentices and trainees in South Australia. Last year, it increased by 10 per cent—the highest in the nation—so we are very pleased with that work.

But with regard to the project that the leader is referring to, the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project, that project has not achieved all that it set out to achieve. It has made very good progress. It is very well structured and managed at the moment, but it is coming towards the ending of its project funding and it is something the government is looking at at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When you say 'looking at it', are you looking at it in terms of whether or not it will continue or whether or not it will change? When you say 'looking at it', is it theoretically possible that that project will conclude?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We make an evaluation of all the projects we have and we have to form an opinion as to whether or not it offers the best result for Aboriginal people in this state. From that perspective, we are evaluating that at the moment. As I said, I had a very good meeting

with the people who are running the project only last month, and I must say that I was very, very impressed with what they presented.

Despite the fact that the project was delayed and, to date, had not achieved what it set out to, it gave me confidence that this was something that could be a good project going forward. We just need to see how that stacks up with other projects and we do not have an announcement for the committee today.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am conscious of time, Mr Chairman. As always, we tend to run short, but I will move on to the Community Transition and Learning Centre. How much state funding has been allocated to this program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In the interests of time, can I take that question on notice and come straight back to the leader with an answer on that?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure—and the same with commonwealth funding and how much native title funding was involved as well.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We will split that out between state and federal government funding.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you.

The CHAIR: I might remind the leader that, at some point during the day, I assume you have omnibus questions to read in. I am not suggesting that it be done now but sometime between now and the end of the day.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I think we were planning to do that right at the end of the day, or would you prefer it—

The CHAIR: It does not matter to me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the Statewide Aboriginal Fishing and Aquaculture Program, how many people are employed under this program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail. This is a project that is being advanced by Fisheries, which sits within PIRSA. I am making a visit to Wardang Island, which is one of the areas that has put forward programs under this strategy. I feel quite strongly that this is a great employment opportunity for Aboriginal people.

We have recently seen some fantastic successes in this area—in particular with PipiCo, which recently won an award at the 2020 Premier's Food and Beverage Industry Awards. This is a company I visited only a few months ago, and it was a very, very popular winner of the most prestigious award on the night. I think there are great opportunities with regard to our fisheries, and I think in particular the fisheries that relate to the Narungga nation are another key priority for us that will build on the success we have seen in the Goolwa region.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you take that on notice, then?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many Aboriginal rangers have been employed year by year since 2010, and does the Premier know how many Aboriginal rangers are currently employed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I thank the leader for that question. We have very, very significantly increased the number of rangers that we have in South Australia since coming to government, and we have significantly increased the number of Aboriginal rangers. I do not have those numbers with me, but I can have the Minister for Environment and Water update me on that. I am very happy to get those numbers through.

Some rangers also operate under the commonwealth program. There is one commonwealth program that relates to this area as well. We have Aboriginal rangers within the Department for Environment and Water through our National Parks and Wildlife Service, headed up by Mike Williams, and we also have some rangers who I visited recently at Oak Valley with the member for Flinders and who are funded under a commonwealth program.

I will consolidate those two groups and we can get that information through, but we feel very strongly about the opportunity to have more Aboriginal people employed on country, and the very precious country that we have here in our state. I know that this has been a program that has been very well regarded by Aboriginal people across South Australia.

The CHAIR: Once again, we have reached the allotted and agreed time for the finish of that examination. We now move to Arts SA.

Membership:

Ms Stinson substituted for Mr Malinauskas.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms J. Layther, Director, Arts SA, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Premier, you have swapped advisers. Would you care to introduce your new adviser, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank very much, sir. Today, I have with me the fabulous Jennifer Layther, who is the Director of Arts SA, and also with us still is Steven Woolhouse, the Executive Director of Communities and Corporate within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Can I just say that we all appreciate that this is a sector that has been disproportionately hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. It has been a real area of priority for our government since we first learnt about COVID-19 because, of course, live performances, and in fact even just visitation to museums and galleries, have been highly problematic. This has very significantly affected our institutions but, of course, most importantly it has affected artists in South Australia.

We have been pleased to be working with the industry on developing a comprehensive response, but I do want to acknowledge Jennifer Layther and her outstanding team at Arts SA for their hard work and dedication through this year and the various industry associations—state and federal—who made themselves available to us so that we could tailor our response. I also acknowledge our own state government statutory authorities that work in this area and, finally, but most importantly, all the artists in South Australia who have endured much. There have been some very, very trying times this year.

I have seen the looks on the faces of people on our various Zoom meetings and I have seen great strength and resilience across this sector, a sector that has not wasted a second of time. They have looked at innovative ways to engage and develop audiences, innovative ways to develop new partnerships and collaborations, innovative ways to deal with the often complex and changing COVID-19 rules that exist and also the outstanding product that has been developed right across this year.

Of course, in recent weeks we have seen the resumption of many of the performing arts across our state, and this has been a moment of great joy for the artists and the organisations, and, I think, mostly for the audiences. I cannot tell you how happy people across South Australia have been to return to live performances or visit a museum, our State Library, the Art Gallery of South Australia or one of our other fabulous collections or institutions—public or private offerings—in South Australia. There has been a lot of relief.

The arts have always been critically important to our state. They are a major point of differentiation for our state. But I think going forward in this current period of transition and post pandemic, they are going to be even more important than they have been in the past. We have tried to develop a cooperative arrangement with the federal government so that we are not duplicating the stimulus and support they have been putting in but, instead, complementing their work, so that we can address areas that are not covered off in their \$250 million specific industry response.

I would remind this committee that, although I am the Minister for the Arts in South Australia, there are many other cabinet ministers who have responsibilities for aspects of the broadest arts offering in South Australia. We try to have a whole-of-government approach to everything that we do and, in particular, a whole-of-cabinet approach to everything we do, but many of the areas that would be traditionally in the arts portfolio are now in other portfolios, and I think that has served us extraordinarily well. Whilst I will try to answer any questions from across the broadest scope of the arts, I may have to take some questions on notice, particularly those that relate to expenditure in other portfolios.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. Member for Badcoe, do you wish to make an opening statement or would you like to go straight to questions? You have the call.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much, sir. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 29, support and assistance to artists during COVID. How much money in total in 2019-20 went to assisting arts organisations and artists to deal with COVID? How much money is being budgeted in total in 2020-21 for the same?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The amount for immediate stimulus and support was \$2.9 million. It was originally announced as \$1.5 million, but it was significantly oversubscribed very early and so we made a further allocation which took that up to \$2.9 million. In addition to that, there were some other announcements last financial year—in particular, the new winter festival, Illuminate Adelaide. There would have been some early expenditure related to that, but I can find out that more detailed amount for you.

Ms STINSON: What amount was that expenditure for Illuminate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Ms STINSON: What amount was dedicated to Illuminate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I just said I do not have that detail but I am happy to follow that up.

Ms STINSON: Okay, that is fine, thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just continuing my answer to the previous question, as I was saying before, there were some additional amounts that were allocated from other departments—so through the Music Development Office, through the South Australian Film Corporation. There could be some also through the education department. I should point out that, in addition to that, there were very substantial payments made by SAicorp, the government's insurer, to finalise some of the 2019-20 claims.

I advise the committee that there has been no payment to date for the 2020-21 financial year, but I think I am correct in saying that all the claims that relate to the 2019-20 financial year have been paid. That would be an issue the Treasurer has responsibility for, but I know that, unlike some states where many of their major companies are facing financial peril, in South Australia many of ours are backed by the state government and, in particular, backed by SAicorp.

Where they have been able to demonstrate losses which are caused by a lack of audiences because of COVID-19, in many instances they have been able to seek a payment from SAicorp. There will be further applications. There could be some that are already pending. That would be something for the Treasurer.

Ms STINSON: My question just now was in relation to both 2019-20 money and 2020-21 money. I understand you have explained that that is spread over a number of different agencies. Would you mind taking that on notice and coming back with the total figure for the arts sector over those two separate years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am happy to do that, although I can provide the committee with some information with regard to the 2020-21 year now. Recently, we allocated a further \$10.2 million worth of funding, which was really directly in response to the consultation we did with the Arts Industry Council here in South Australia and other organisations, so this is money that particularly goes to supporting artists in South Australia.

In addition to that \$10.2 million, I know that other agencies of government have continued to provide additional support, as per my previous answer, and also ongoing rent relief, where that is appropriate for organisations. I understand the Illuminate money is a further \$4.1 million allocation and, as I said, there are some quite substantial upgrades for arts organisations, particularly in regional South Australia, which was capital provided to Country Arts SA to upgrade a range of facilities that are either owned by Arts South Australia or, in the case of Mount Gambier, council-owned facilities.

Ms STINSON: Are you confident that the amount that has been dedicated over 2019-20 and that is budgeted for 2020-21 is sufficient, and do you anticipate that further funding or specific funding allocations may be required in the lead-up to Mad March to enable events such as but not limited to WOMAD, Adelaide Fringe festival, Adelaide Festival, Writers' Week and other events to go ahead?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In my previous answer, one of the things I highlighted and drew the committee's attention to was working in concert with the available money from the federal government. They announced \$250 million in their package, and part of that was what was called the Restart Investment to Sustain and Expand fund, which is referred to as the RISE fund. One of the things we have done in South Australia is that we have supported all applicants to that fund so that they will get some funding to support their application. We were told this was extraordinarily important to increase their chances of getting that money now.

It is not for me to announce what money is coming from the federal government to those organisations, some of which were referred to in the question, but I am convinced that the federal government has money available for this restart, sustainment and expansion fund and I think South Australia will do well. We represent 6 per cent of the nation's economy. I am hopeful that we will get significantly higher than 6 per cent of the RISE funding.

I say that because I think other elements of the overall federal government's package will not be elements particularly targeted by South Australian organisations in terms of loans and also that sort of emergency payment to stop organisations from going into imminent closure. We do not have so much of that in South Australia. It has been tough times, but we do not have that same problem.

The events the member was talking about—for example WOMAD, the Fringe and the Festival—are a real challenge because they attract large crowds. What we know is that there will be a big difference between those events in 2021 and the events as they were in 2000. We just cannot have mass crowds like those we loved during the 60th anniversary of the Adelaide Festival, the 60th anniversary of the Fringe Festival and, I think, the 20th anniversary of the WOMAD festival in Adelaide.

I am convinced that each of the people responsible for putting in place the COVID management plans has had access to SA Health; they have developed new plans. Often, frustratingly, those plans had to change, as restrictions have had to change. I am convinced that we will have sufficient money to make sure that we have great events, but I do caution this committee that they will not be the same events and that they cannot be the same events; nevertheless, they will provide great opportunities for artists in South Australia early next year and beyond.

Ms STINSON: I refer to the same budget reference but the bullet point at the top in relation to local government libraries. Will the Premier commit to renewing the funding for local government-run libraries at the current level plus indexation—I understand that agreement expires in June next year—or, indeed, will the Premier commit to increasing the funding beyond indexation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think we have a resolved position on that at the moment, but we certainly value our public library services in South Australia and, of course, the State Library in South Australia. I am a regular visitor. I have had great opportunities, even during this COVID time, to visit the State Library of South Australia. We have a new director, Geoff Stempel; in fact, he has probably been in place for quite some time now.

Ms STINSON: Before I had this role, indeed.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He is doing a great job. We have a new chair of the State Library, and we will work through all these issues with regard to that contract. As the member would be more than aware, the vast majority of these services are provided by the various local

governments, and often libraries are critical to local communities. We take all those things into consideration as we negotiate the extension—or a new contract, in fact.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 16, Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery. When will the doors open for the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That final business case is being done at the moment. We have established a very senior advisory group to look at the final work being done on that. I am happy to take that question on notice and provide an update to the member. With regard to this, I know there is a lot of excitement about this project and I know there is a lot of anticipation; in fact, probably a lot of people are thinking, 'Hurry up and get on with it.' I am more concerned about getting it right.

This, I think, will ultimately be an iconic international destination. We have an obligation to the Aboriginal people to make sure that this is the right solution, rather than a rushed solution. We have an obligation to preserve all the Aboriginal art and artefacts we have in state collections but, most importantly, I think we have an obligation to share with the rest of the world the wonderful stories and songlines of the oldest living civilisation. This is a very important project, a very important reconciliation project, and I am very grateful for everybody's input into this process.

Ms STINSON: Lot Fourteen's project manager, Di Dixon, said on ABC radio Adelaide on 11 November that the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery would be operational in 2025; is that incorrect?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I would not say that is incorrect. Di is very close to this. I know that we hope to start construction after the next election. We are still working through the very extensive site works. As the member would be aware, until four years ago this was a functioning hospital and we have moved very quickly. We have now completed probably 80 per cent of the adaptive re-use of the six heritage buildings on the south and south-western part of that seven-hectare parcel of land. The final work is now being done on the Bice Building, which I am advised will be completed in the first half of next year.

There is still quite a huge amount of demolition and remediation required before we can get on site to start that construction. Of course, what we are proposing is not a simple structure. It is not a tilt-up, cement construction. I think it will be quite stunning and reflective of what Aboriginal people see as their heritage. It is not obviously going to be done using traditional materials, but it will reflect the heritage and the aspirations of Aboriginal people. It is an important project. It is going to take some time to deliver.

David Rathman AM has now been appointed as the ambassador for this project. He is working diligently with that key advisory group, as well as the Aboriginal advisory group which has been established. There will be a very significant Kurna input to this project. The Kurna people, of course the custodians of the land on which this Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre will sit, need to have very significant input into what is going to happen, but we are also talking to Aboriginal groups from right across the state and beyond.

Ms STINSON: Premier, you have previously indicated to InDaily that the facility would be open by 2023; now it obviously appears it will be 2025. Why has it been delayed by two years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, I think my approach has really changed on this. In the first instance, I was really push, push, pushing—let's get this done. I suppose what I have learnt from the consultation that has been done with the Aboriginal people and also the institutions in South Australia is that it is much better to get this right than to have it rushed.

I do want to acknowledge the people who are on that Aboriginal reference group. They include Jack Buckskin, representing the Kurna people through Kurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation, the native title, heritage and language custodians; Sandy Miller, who is on the South Australian Museum Aboriginal Advisory Committee; Karl Telfer; Cara Kirkwood; and Kirstie Parker, who appeared in the earlier committee investigation into Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation and is the Director of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation within the South Australian Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms STINSON: You mentioned earlier the business case and I think you indicated that it was not complete. I had understood that the business case was complete and delivered to government

in August. Could you clarify whether or not the business case is complete and also whether it will be released publicly and, if so, when?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know when it will be released. I think the member is right that the work has been completed. It has not been fully considered by the government. I think that there were some queries that were raised about various aspects of it that are still being finalised and we may be awaiting the final report. If that has been received by government, it would only be very recently.

Ms STINSON: You did list a number of people from the Aboriginal community who have been consulted. Have any changes been made to the design or any aspect of the project in response to feedback that you have received from members of the Aboriginal community?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. The Aboriginal community has had a huge amount of impact on and input to the final design. Aspects included issues such as the orientation of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre, not having the entrance on North Terrace but coming from the Botanic Garden. It was felt that this aspect was important. It was important that the galleries were not like traditional galleries, which are sort of boxed in and you cannot see out. The Aboriginal advice we received was that this would not be appropriate and that there needed to be vistas out from the gallery across the Botanic Garden, an important piece of land for the Kurna people.

There was also quite a lot of work put into what the final finish of the gallery would look like. Many people were quite keen that it was not just a single hard surface but more reflected the types of designs that you might see in Aboriginal communities historically. I want to assure the committee that there is no suggestion that this is going to be a replica of what Aboriginal structures might have looked like in centuries gone, but it is really taking elements of that and putting it in to a modern interpretation. I think there is still work to be done on that, but I am convinced that that work is being done sensitively and very respectfully.

Ms STINSON: Why is an additional \$50 million needed? What do we actually get for that additional \$50 million? Is this additional money a reflection of indications in the business case about the need for additional funding? Also, if I may just add, I do expect it to require more funding above the \$200 million that is currently allocated from state and federal funds.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can first of all say is that we want to ultimately deliver a world-class gallery for our state and for our nation. When we first talked about a budget for \$150 million, I think it was always envisaged that more would be needed. It is a very significant gallery.

In the current iteration I have seen, it is actually larger than the Art Gallery and the SA Museum footprint added together. We are talking about a very significant—a globally significant—structure that we believe will be the appropriate repository of many of our great treasures in South Australia and an incredibly important showcase for tens of thousands of years of Aboriginal stories and songlines. We think this is a prudent investment for the people of South Australia and I certainly look forward to sharing the final design with the people of South Australia.

I would say that, like with every piece of architecture, there will be people who love it and there will be people who do not love it. We have seen this before with the design of the Sydney Opera House, for example. There were plenty of people who were violently opposed to that piece of architecture. I know that this piece of architecture will be a great statement and I know that it will be something that will really reflect on the wonderful heritage that we have and also speak to the aspirations of Aboriginal people.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 16, in relation to the Adelaide Festival Centre precinct. The previous budget stated that this project would be delivered by June 2021. This year's budget suggests it will be June 2023. Why has the time line for this project been delayed, what is going on in that extra two years and why is it behind schedule and requiring additional funds?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: First of all, can I say that there has been a change in scope to the surrounds. The previous government invested significant funds to significantly enhancing what happens inside the Festival Centre and, in particular, the Festival Theatre. That was a facility that

needed considerable attention; in fact, I was advised by Minister Snelling at the time he raised the upgrade with me that in fact some of the original air conditioning and mechanics within the Festival Theatre were the original air conditioning and mechanics. In fact, it was not wise to ever turn it off because you might never get it restarted. There is no doubt that was a very much-needed expenditure.

On coming to government, we learnt there was more work to be done on the final design for the surrounds. On coming to government, we learnt, from consultation, that certain things needed to be incorporated that previously were not incorporated, things like escalators to bring people from one level up to another level, lifts, and so on. That work was completely rescope.

I am not critical of what the previous government did in this area; it was something where there was ongoing consultation with people regarding the project. I am quite convinced that what the final design looks like will be outstanding. Some of that will be complete in the next four weeks, in fact, so we can have people accessing down Station Road and down towards the bridge to go over to the Adelaide Oval as part of the day-night cricket test between Australia and India.

This will, of course, complete the work adjacent to the revamped SkyCity, but there is still extensive work that needs to be done on the surrounds of the Festival Centre, including some additional work that has come to light due to structural issues relating to a section surrounding the southern perimeter of the Festival Theatre building itself. All those things are being worked through at the moment by my department and by the Department of Transport and Infrastructure. I am very confident that we will end up with a fantastic product, but it is going to take a considerable time.

I note there have been lots of different versions of when this will be complete. I think that in the budget that led up to the last election there was a very significant seven-figure sum allocated to the reopening of the precinct, a sort of 'Welcome back to the precinct.' This was hugely ambitious, and I think the previous government had to reallocate that money to another project.

The best laid plans of mice and men often go astray, and in this case this has been a project that has had some delays. However, I am advised the car park is nearing completion but, of course, there are significant building works that are going to be on that site for an extended period of time.

Ms STINSON: You mentioned significant structural issues on the southern perimeter of the Festival Centre. Can you elaborate on that? It sounds a bit concerning.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The member might recall that much of that area, which I suppose you would describe as being to the south and east of the Festival Centre, has been, if you like, cordoned off for an extended period of time. There were some things we could do—

Ms STINSON: Sorry, has it been cordoned off because there is a safety risk there or—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This was in place under the previous government for years. You might recall some green fences were put up under—

Ms STINSON: Was that because of structural issues, though, or just because construction was happening in that space?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, it was put up at the time because of structural issues and the potential, I understand, for aspects of the concrete there that was moving around at the time. I think that under the previous government there was one view taken of a remedy. We have since had further advice, and we are working through that at the moment. I am happy to—

Ms STINSON: Is there any risk to the public? If someone were to get in there is there a risk of it collapsing at all?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, it is completely inaccessible at the moment, and it has been for quite some time. I think what has happened is that the previous government made best endeavours to get structural advice, but once it has been closed off further extensive work can be done, and this changes some of those arrangements. However, I am happy to provide the member with further detail on that.

Ms STINSON: I want to ask a bit of a threshold question first. I can give you a budget page reference if you like, but it would be helpful to just understand this first. I want to clarify whether what

is referred to in the budget papers as the 'arts storage Netley project' is separate from the cultural institutions collection storage facility. Are those two separate projects?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Without a reference, I am not sure, but I can—

Ms STINSON: I can give you a reference for both of them.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If I can just finish the sentence, I will just explain to you what I know about this. When we came to government, we were presented with a requirement that had existed for a long period of time. We thought, 'There is probably a short-term, a medium-term and a longer term response to that,' so we set about delivering that short-term response, which in many ways was planning for the medium and longer term response.

That related to two specific areas: one was the repatriation of Aboriginal remains and the second one was the longer term storage options for that collection. Some of that money could be spent without determining what that final solution was because it related to digitisation, new packaging, new storage and new racking, which had to be spent regardless of whether it was going to be at Netley or finally. So we put that money into the budget.

What came out in this budget was the finalisation of the budget for the new permanent repository for these items. This did take a long period of time. It needed a lot of consultation because it was not just the Museum or it was not just the Art Gallery but it included the State Library and it included the History Trust in South Australia, so everybody had to have their input into what we needed as a longer term solution.

It is an expensive solution, but we do have an extraordinarily valuable collection in South Australia. We do have very significant benefaction in South Australia. I certainly believe that if somebody is going to invest and provide our state with an item, an object or a work of art, then we have a responsibility to look after that. More than that, I think everybody appreciates that Netley was completely beyond its life, so we wanted to get the optimal solution whilst simultaneously, in parallel, working on everything that we would need to do.

Some people have been quite alarmed at the cost of the new storage facility, but I want to emphasise that a lot of that is actually to do with the pre-work and the transfer of the collections as well. It is not like we can back up a ute and start transferring goods out there. A very sizeable amount is actually with how we package up those items for permanent storage and how we actually effect that transfer to the new facility.

Ms STINSON: I have a few questions in regard to the Netley facility and then, if there is time hopefully, a few in relation to the new facility. As you might appreciate, the boundaries have been redrawn and Netley will actually be in the seat of Badcoe, so I have a particular interest on that front as well. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 16, refers to art storage Netley. Could you tell me when the lease expires on the Netley facility and also how much in total has already been invested or will be invested by the time those upgrades at the Netley facility are complete?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure. I am happy to take that question on notice, but the previous government sold the Netley facility. It is owned by the private sector. I do not think I have been provided with any information with regard to what the term of that lease is and if there is any alternative use for time that is not used after we transfer out to the new site.

Ms STINSON: Do you have an estimated date when you will transfer to the new site?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is it would be in 2024, but I will happily come back with further information on that. It could be slightly earlier. It could be 2023 or 2024. I am sorry I do not have that answer.

Ms STINSON: I would be glad to lodge that as a question on notice with you, Premier. On that same budget page reference that I mentioned, why was none of the \$1.6 million that was budgeted in 2019-20 spend in that financial year for the Netley project?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice, but I think it is to do with the repatriation of Aboriginal remains. We set up a program, I think I have reported to this committee before or, if not this committee, certainly the parliament, about the large number of Aboriginal remains

that are in our custody in South Australia. These were stored completely inappropriately for decades and decades down at Netley, often in appalling condition. We thought that we had a moral obligation to give them a proper burial.

There has been a significant expenditure to date on a trial which I understand was very successful. This was done on Kurna land. Within that large number of Aboriginal remains at Netley, there are some remains that are easily identified—Kurna, Ngarrindjeri, Narungga—and there are some that are very difficult to determine. We are trying to work through what the ultimate resting place for those remains will be when we cannot make an identification. I am happy to just get an answer to that specific question, but I am 90 per cent sure that that is the reason.

Ms STINSON: Just to clarify what I mean, because obviously you have more information about this than I do, and maybe I am just not connecting the dots here, but I wonder why there was \$1.6 million budgeted in the last financial year and then none of that was spent. I understand you are saying that might be something to do with the repatriation, but I cannot understand why. I am trying to make the connection about why the repatriation would affect the spending of that money. I understood that money was for upgrades that were not necessarily specific to Aboriginal remains, so I am struggling to understand what the connection is. I am happy to give it to you on notice; I understand it is a particular question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me take that on notice. Also, I am advised that some of that was just a delay in the project. They did some of the areas that did not have expenditure attached to them in the earlier part, possibly because we accelerated a lot of the digitisation work when the Museum, for example, was not open, and then flipped the purchase of other items that might have been held up during COVID into the following year. I think there is a carryover, so none of that money is lost and will just carry over to this current financial year, but the same budget is still to be applied to that.

Ms STINSON: In Budget Paper 5, page 108 is the page that talks about the cultural institutions storage facility. Can you shed any light on the time line for that project, when it will be complete and also whether you are looking at building it on the current Netley site, whether you are looking at other sites and, if you have identified an alternative site, where this will be built?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said before, I think it would be in the 2023-24 frame, but we will get the exact time. In terms of the site, I do not think that we have decided that, but the state government owns significant land. It certainly would not be at the Netley site, because that is one piece of land we do not own anymore, but I will provide that information. And with regard to it—

Ms STINSON: Are you aware if a site has actually been chosen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that we are working through various options at the moment. I also want to advise the committee that this is really in response to one of the core recommendations of the Arts and Culture Plan South Australia 2019-2024: recommendation 12.1.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much. On Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 29, it appears that there are 8.1 FTEs being cut in this budget. What are those roles being cut, in what divisions, and maybe you could take on notice what the position titles are for those roles that are being removed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, I am not sure that they are positions that are being cut. If you look at what the budget was for last year and what the budget is for this year, I think they are almost identical. It is just that we did flex up that number for different projects this year, but there is no cut. We have a budget and, as I said, I think the budgets for last year and this year are exactly the same or certainly thereabouts.

Ms STINSON: It is at 55 or 55.1.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, so they are the same, but we do sometimes flex that up, depending on the workload, and we obviously could potentially do that again this year, depending on that workload.

Ms STINSON: Essentially, you did not meet the target of 55 last year and instead had 63.2, so you have just resumed the same target. Are you actually intending to meet the target or is it more of a notional idea if you are saying you are flexing up and down staff?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not 100 per cent sure whether you are advocating for removing—

Ms STINSON: I am just asking. I am certainly not advocating for job losses, but I am inquiring as to what the intention is with those staff.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the budget is set based upon the normal course of the department, but this year there was an additional workload, which was identified and funded within that budget, which was basically designed to assist to deliver the Arts and Culture Plan and also to assist our COVID response. It is quite possible that we will be above that budget for the current financial year for some part of that as we finalise all of the grants—the very significantly enhanced grants program—of the \$10.2 million COVID response. That is a lot of work because there are a huge number of applications. They are all assessed. They are quality assessed, they are peer reviewed and, ultimately, there are contracts put in place with a very significantly larger number of people than we are used to.

I am not going to guess the answer and neither is Jen, but let's just say that, on the original \$1.5 million and then \$2.9 million for last financial year, there were a very significant number of individual artists and the same amount of work goes into doing a contract for that work as there is for a significantly larger one as well, so it was a very significantly enhanced workload for Arts SA.

Ms STINSON: I have a few questions regarding the performance indicators. They are at Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 31. Firstly, to the SA Museum, why is the 2020-21 external revenue target for the Museum reduced by such a large proportion, compared to the actual that was delivered in 2019-20? I ask that question because such a large drop has not been applied to like organisations, for example, the Art Gallery, and other exhibition-type spaces? I wondered why you are predicting both an external revenue drop and also, it appears, a significant drop in visitors for the SA Museum when you are actually predicting a rise in audiences in other gallery-type institutions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice, but, as you would be more than aware, COVID is really significantly affecting visitation to cultural institutions and it can also affect the exhibitions that are held. I am not sure what the Art Gallery had planned and organised and could still come in versus what the SA Museum had planned and organised and cannot come in. That may be an explanation, but I am more than happy to take that on notice.

Obviously, whilst we set these targets, if matters change and circumstances change, we are always very welcoming to people to come back into our institutions. I am very proud that South Australia was one of the first places in the country to reopen our institutions. To the best of my knowledge, they have all reopened again this week, although I think many of them were closed until today, so I am very pleased that we have been allowed to open them up. I know that when the doors sprung open for the SA Museum, the Art Gallery, the State Library and the Botanic Garden, people were absolutely delighted, so we will try to keep them open. I will follow up that specific question as to why the projection for those indicators is lower for the SA Museum than the other institutions.

Ms STINSON: I have put Budget Paper 3, page 81 here—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Do not worry about the reference; that is alright. We know where you are.

Ms STINSON: This is a question in relation to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. The budget papers are predicting a huge jump in the number of new FTEs in 2021 for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, but a massive drop in revenue and attendances. My question is: why are you forecasting rehiring or, indeed, expanding the workforce by some 147 FTEs, when the outlook for revenue and crowds is actually dropping at that facility?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the figure for the actual for this year is a number at a point in time, 30 June, and that the forecast is just back to where it was sitting with the casual employees, FTE equivalents included. That would be the difference.

Ms STINSON: That is basically what you expect to get to by 30 June next year, by 2021?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is the estimate Treasury has made, I am advised, but it is for a point in time, not an average over the year.

Ms STINSON: Do you think that is ambitious at all, considering that the revenue and the attendances are way down, which is to be expected, or have you applied some sort of worst-case scenario from now until June next year as far as revenue and attendances go? They just do not seem to match up, so I am trying to get a sense of how the numbers were calculated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The revenue is calculated over a period and the number of FTEs is calculated on a day. As you could imagine, the revenue would be very significantly affected, or has been very significantly affected for all of this year to date, to the end of November, and I expect that is going to be the case for some time. However, I am hopeful that we will be able to increase that going forward in the second half of the year and that the projection for the number of employees is based upon 30 June next year, when I am hopeful we will be back to a more normalised arrangement.

I note that Live Performances Australia (LPA) has recently projected that we should be moving back towards audiences above 50 per cent in the new year. In fact, it has produced a set of guidelines, and I note that the Queensland institutions have recently adopted those. You would have noticed that often arts in some jurisdictions follows sport, and in Queensland—

Ms STINSON: Sometimes it leads it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I think it should, but anyway we will leave that aside. In some jurisdictions—in Queensland, for example, where I think they had 100 per cent attendance at its State of Origin final—there was then a call within the arts community for this to be mirrored with ticketed seating performances. I think they have actually heard that call and I think they are implementing that in Queensland.

We are not at that position in South Australia, but it is certainly something Professor Nicola Spurrier and her team have been willing to listen to. I think it will require the wearing of masks in South Australia to go beyond the 50 per cent, which we hope to be back to by 1 December.

Ms STINSON: With reference to the Arts Recovery Fund, Budget Paper 5, page 108, which obviously you have mentioned a few times today, is it possible to get a list of each organisation or individual these grants have already been granted to, and could you indicate whether there are further funding rounds out of that and, if so, the time lines?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that we certainly published the recipients of the funding for the original \$1.5 million, which was expanded to \$2.9 million. The \$10.2 million has not been finalised yet.

Ms STINSON: So no money has been spent out of that \$10.2 million yet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that \$6.8 million of the total pool of \$10.2 million has now been committed. Some of it has been expended. Some of it relates to events that occur next year, but it is committed, if that makes sense. The funding would not be acquitted until the event is held or not held, but \$6.8 million of the \$10.2 million has been allocated and the remainder is still under consideration.

Ms STINSON: Is that a grant-type program, or has the government used its discretion to decide where the \$6.8 million goes from the Arts Recovery Fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a similar arrangement to the first two rounds, where people make application. There is a quality assessment and there is peer review for a lot of this. Some are commitments that we made under the RISE funding. There would be an arts organisation from South Australia that would put in an application. We learnt that the organisations that had some input from their state government would be assessed at a higher level, so we wrote letters of support for all applicants. As that RISE money is allocated, then part of our money is automatically allocated towards those projects. Then we have some residual money that is not allocated on either of those streams that is still to be determined.

Ms STINSON: How do you intend to spend that residual money? Will you be calling for grant rounds, for example, or will you be allocating that to festivals that I know are asking you for money coming up to Mad March?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the first round of applications has closed. They are being assessed at the moment and will be announced very soon. There will be a further round in March next year. That money will be expended this financial year as well.

Ms STINSON: I also want to ask about the Arts and Culture Plan at Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 28. How many of the Arts and Culture Plan recommendations have been fully delivered?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that 12 of the 45 recommendations have been completed. By mid-2021, we expect that 31 of the recommendations will be completed, with the balance completed by mid-2022.

Ms STINSON: Would you be able to provide a list or guide as to which of those recommendations you are referring to in each of those answers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are all on the DPC website.

Ms STINSON: So that is up to date now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. Well, we constantly update it. As I said, we are on track to deliver it. It is a five-year Arts and Culture Plan: 2019 to 2024. It is the first plan for the sector we have had since Di Laidlaw was the Minister for the Arts—a fabulous minister. I do emphasise with regard to the Arts and Culture Plan that this was the plan from the sector; it was not the government's plan, to be quite honest with you. In fact, I did not change a single word, comma or even full stop. This was the work of the arts sector. A huge number of people were involved in this, and now we are just effectively getting on with delivering that plan, and then we will start work on the next iteration.

Ms STINSON: In relation to the Arts and Culture Plan, how much funding has been spent so far on implementing the recommendations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I might take that question on notice. We have obviously put some work into the development of the plan and the ongoing monitoring and execution of the plan. For example, I am happy to work through all the things we have budgeted for to date—for example, the storage facility—and we can add all those up, but I do not really have a number that has been included overall. If we do have a number that we envisage will be for the entire plan, we will do that, but of course some of it is still in that work plan to be delivered. I can certainly provide details of the things we have committed to to date. It will be a very significantly large number because there are a couple of big items.

Ms STINSON: I would appreciate that. I would be grateful if you could provide what has been spent to date and the total estimated cost of implementing the recommendations.

The CHAIR: Final question, member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: The Premier mentioned earlier that \$4.1 million is allocated for Illuminate. I wonder if you could tell me where that funding is coming from, as in what funding pool, and whether it is coming, for example, from the \$12 million fund to attract new events to South Australia, or some other place, for how many years it is funded and for how much each year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that it is funded for three years. Obviously, we envisage it to go longer, but we think it is prudent to evaluate whether it is successful or not. It will not continue to be funded if it is not successful, but we have great confidence in the artistic direction that has been appointed to this important project in Rachael Azzopardi and Lee Cumberlidge.

With regard to where that money comes from, I am advised that of the \$10.2 million Arts Recovery package in South Australia \$1 million went to Illuminate Adelaide. There was no other funding for Illuminate Adelaide out of the Arts SA budget, but I will get the exact detail of which budget that comes from and come back to you.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: We have reached the allotted time, member for Badcoe and Premier. Thank you both. We are about to break, so I declare the examination of the portfolios of the Productivity Commission, Infrastructure SA, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, and Arts SA to be complete.

Sitting suspended from 17:01 to 17:15.

Membership:

Mr Boyer substituted for Ms Stinson.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms C. Walsh, Director, Veterans SA.

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Mr P. Murdock, Manager, Finance, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: Welcome back everybody. We will now go to Veterans SA. Premier, would you like to introduce your advisers and make a short statement in relation to the Veterans SA portfolio.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is with great pleasure that I introduce Catherine Walsh, who is the Director of Veterans SA, to her first estimates committee here in South Australia. She is joined by Richard Price, who is Chief Executive of Defence SA, and Peter Murdock, who is the Manager of Finance within Defence SA, both of whom are appearing for the second time.

By way of introduction, I very much acknowledge our veterans in South Australia for the outstanding service and sacrifice they have offered to our nation. I also acknowledge that this has been a particularly tough year for them. We know that isolation has very significant problems attached to it. We know that many former serving men and women of the ADF look forward to the opportunity to reflect on their service and sacrifice and have the entire community come together to commemorate important milestones.

This has been very much affected this year. We saw this with the ANZAC Day dawn service, which was a very different dawn service than we have experienced before. We also know that many RSL sub-branches were not available for members to attend for an extended period of time. I want to commend the work of Veterans SA in supporting our veterans in South Australia. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the ESOs, the ex-service organisations in South Australia.

I know it is always wrong to single out any particular group, but I will just say we are grateful for the fantastic work of the RSL here in South Australia. They had a huge number of disruptions to their ordinary course of business. They have had to move and change and pivot almost on a weekly basis, and it has been a pleasure working with their president, their chief executive and all the members of the RSL.

Finally, a great shout-out to our veterans. I know with the release of the Brereton report recently this has brought back some very painful issues for many people who have served in Afghanistan and overseas more broadly. I want them to know that the government acknowledges how difficult this period can be and we are looking forward to continuing to serve them.

The CHAIR: Member for Wright, do you wish to make a statement or would you like to go straight to questions?

Mr BOYER: No statement, thank you, Chair, but I just want to echo the words of the Premier, that 2020 has obviously been a difficult year for lots of people and that certainly includes our veterans.

The CHAIR: I invite questions.

Mr BOYER: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 174, Veterans SA, highlights 2019-20, the South Australian Veterans' Employment Program. Can you tell us the cost of the

establishment of the website and any other costs associated with the running of that program and site to date?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that we dealt with some issues regarding this in Defence SA earlier in the day. I would like to provide a broad background to this program because it has had a few twists and turns since it was originally envisaged. From opposition, we saw the need to connect men and women who are serving or have served in the ADF to better employment outcomes post their service. We identified this as a problem and we provided a line of funding through Defence SA to the Defence Teaming Centre. This was revised last year, and that money came back into Defence SA—not a Veterans SA budget line but into the Defence SA budget. They are now working through the options for how we allocate this money.

I can say that none of this budget has been lost. Veterans SA advised me that they have employed somebody, or allocated somebody, to the task of presenting us with options. We have not achieved what we set out to achieve with regard to this program. We did set up a portal, which allowed the defence industry in particular to put up jobs. Whilst we had limited success, we did not think that this offered value for money and that we needed to go back and look at other opportunities for achieving our outcomes using different methodologies.

I am advised that there are ESOs (ex-service organisations) across Australia that have done particularly well with veterans' employment and we are considering those options at the moment. As soon as I have something to update the parliament on, I will be back here. With regard to the specific question about the website portal, I will take that question on notice and come back to the committee as soon as I can.

Mr BOYER: Am I right in assuming that the website itself is clearly still operational but is not listing any positions on the site at the moment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that we will close down that website almost immediately. The pilot was not as successful, for the reasons that are outlined before. We now have personnel allocated to the task of presenting us with the best way to spend that budget to achieve the outcomes as quickly as possible. We remain 100 per cent committed to the objectives of this project. We just have not been successful with the two approaches we have had to date, first, through the DTC and, secondly, through the Veterans SA portal, but we remain committed to trying to finding appropriate employment post service.

We know that men and women of the Australian Defence Force acquire significant skills, capacities and capabilities while they are serving our nation. We want to make sure that we optimise their ongoing contribution post their service in civilian settings. We are particularly interested in the opportunities within the defence industries, but we are not limited only to the defence industry, which was the original incarnation for this budget line. I hope to come back to this parliament very soon with some suggestions about how we will achieve our objective. This remains a very important objective for the government.

Mr BOYER: I refer to the same page and budget line. For those employers who did register on the website, has any feedback been given to them yet, Premier, about your plans to do something different in this area instead of a portal?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that will be done as part of the closure of the website.

Mr BOYER: In relation to the Torrens Parade Ground, there are references in the Budget Speech, Budget Paper 2, page 3, and also in Budget Paper 4, Volume 2. When will further information be provided about what I take to be stage 2 of the upgrade of the precinct?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Torrens Parade Ground is a unique and iconic part of our history in South Australia. It is a very special place; in fact, it is a very sacred place for many people in this state. We believe that it is a particularly underutilised precinct and that there are many options for the optimal use of this site. We commissioned some work to develop a master plan, which we broke up into various stages. It is fair to say that we continue to consult on this master plan so that we come up with the very best use of this site, but there are some aspects of it that need to be done regardless of the subsequent stages.

For stage 1, \$1.2 million in this current budget will be spent on a range of projects, mainly focused on upgrading kitchens, bathrooms, some storage facilities and some dividers, so that we can have a better use of the drill hall in particular. These are the major components of stage 1. We are still very committed to the subsequent stages, but there are a lot of moving parts when it comes to this site and who should be on it now, who should be on it in the future, where they should be located and the interactions.

I believe that, despite the fact this is quite a complex negotiation and consultation, we are still very confident that we will get a good outcome and there is a huge amount of goodwill from the various ESOs in South Australia. They recognise that this is a very important site. They recognise that it is a very underutilised site. For example, there are many rooms that go off the main drill hall, which are basically used for storage.

These could be fantastic facilities to bring groups in for meetings, whether they be school students or the general public. These could be better utilised by some of the current tenants within the Torrens Parade Ground buildings. We hope to share those plans more broadly very soon, after we get that next phase of consultation completed.

Mr BOYER: Thank you, Premier, for your answer. On the same budget line and the same topic, in reviewing *Hansard* for this committee last year, there was discussion around a veterans' hub potentially being placed at the Torrens Parade Ground. Is that still a live option and, if so, what do you think that could look like?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: At the moment, the major focus is for the ESOs on that site, and we are just looking at how we can have an optimal engagement with the ESOs and their constituencies. Whilst we do not have anything to report today on that matter, we certainly are not ruling out all and every option in regard to that site. This has taken some time, but we have some really good details on that building that did not exist before and so, once that consultation is completed, I think we can move relatively quickly.

This financial year we thought, 'Let's just try to get the things out of the way that there is no conjecture on, that there is no lack of clarity on.' We need to bring the toilets and the kitchens up to a standard that meets all the current standards. I think that will give a refresh and give an indication to the veteran community of how committed we are. We will continue this important work, and then we should have further plans to announce in the coming months.

Mr BOYER: If I could take you to Budget Paper 5, page 77, which is the Veteran Wellbeing Centre, the table on this page talks about investing payments of \$4 million for 2020-21. Could you give us a little bit of detail around what that \$4 million figure is for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is the Veteran Wellbeing Centre at the Repat redevelopment site, yes?

Mr BOYER: Yes, correct.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Strictly speaking, this relates to another portfolio, the Department for Health and Wellbeing, but I know that there has been extensive consultation about what will go onto that precinct. There are very important elements of that site that will be preserved in perpetuity—in particular, the chapel, the memorial gardens, the clock tower on the main building as you go through the Daws Road gates and the SPF Hall. Those elements will be preserved.

In addition to that, a Veteran Wellbeing Centre will be incorporated into that site. I do not have the final design elements of that, but I am very happy to provide them. I think it is also fair to say that there will be a great integration across that site, in particular with the village square, for our veterans' community. I will find the details of that Veteran Wellbeing Centre and I will come back to the member.

Mr BOYER: If I could take you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 167, and more specifically the merging of Veterans SA with Defence SA, I am sure you recall questions asked in the last estimates committee for veterans about whether or not there would be any savings found from that merger of the two units. Now, 12 months on, can you tell us about whether or not that has been costed and if that was the case or not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have been advised that the contrary is the case. There has not been a reduction in the headcount within Veterans SA; in fact, there has been an augmentation with Veterans SA being able to access some of the back-of-house capability within Defence SA. Obviously, all departments have to make their contribution towards the efficiency dividend requirement from time to time, but I believe that this machinery of government change that was effected is a positive outcome.

I certainly have not had any representations that I can recall regarding this. I know that there was some media comment at the time of the change, but we are certainly well down the track since then. I think that Defence SA has very much enjoyed working with the team from Veterans SA. There are a lot of differences between the two, but there is also a lot of commonality between the two. By way of example, when we have Remembrance Day breakfasts and different commemorative events, often it is the defence industry companies that are major sponsors of these events. They are nearly always sector events or VSO events, like the RSL sub-branch or The Road Home, which has recently changed its name. I think there is a lot of crossover in this area.

I am not aware of any efficiencies over and above the general government efficiency that has been instigated in this area; in fact, I think quite the opposite is the case: there has been more value created by the two agencies working together.

Mr BOYER: On the same page, 167, it states that when Veterans SA relocated to be part of Defence SA there were 5.4 FTEs. Then, looking on page 175 of the same budget paper, it has the FTE count for 2020-21 down to 4.4 from 5.2. Can you tell us why the difference between those two figures?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a similar reason to questions we have received in other estimates committees today. You would see that the budget for 2019-20 for FTEs is exactly the same as the budget for 2020-21. The actual is higher. From time to time we do flex up those numbers, based upon requirement, and there was a heavy requirement in terms of COVID relief. Sometimes in a small agency there are changes that are just to do with personal circumstances; somebody may take leave, and then there is a backfill operation. However, the underlying budget 2019-20 of 4.4 is exactly the same as the underlying budget for 2020-21, which is 4.4.

Mr BOYER: I refer to Budget paper 5, page 32, and the bottom line there. I accept this is Defence SA but, in reference to your earlier answer about whether or not there would be any savings imposed upon Veterans SA, is it true that, for the full-time equivalent reduction across the forward estimates of one position per year, the saving through that FTE reduction will not be coming out of the Veterans SA component of Defence SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Defence SA has its own budget savings measure. I have just been updated that one of the reasons for the higher than expected number for last financial year was that one of the members—it is a very small team—was on maternity leave and there was a requirement for backfilling during that person taking leave.

Mr BOYER: I go back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 175, under Veterans SA and the explanation of significant movements. The final dot point on that page talks about the Veterans Perpetual Grave Lease program. I am happy to be proven otherwise, but there appears to be some confusion around what the term 'perpetual' actually means in terms of the period it would cover. In terms of renewal of leases are we talking about 10 years, are we talking about 25 years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would have to take that question on notice. What I do know is that there is a significant amount in the forward estimates. I am advised that with the current profile there is \$300,000 allocated in the current year's budget, \$300,000 in the 2021-22 year budget, and in fact I am advised that there is \$565,000 in the 2022-23 year budget.

I am also advised that there are quite significant differences in the way individual cemeteries charge, so there is some lumpiness in the payments. Some do their arrangements over 50 years, some over 10 years and some over 99 years, so there is some lumpiness in those payments because we are dealing with seven separate RSL-approved cemeteries here in South Australia.

We have a different number of interments in each of those, and some of those costs are met entirely by the cemetery and some are funded by Veterans SA. As I said, some of them are 99-year

interments and some are as short as 10-year interments. There is quite a lot of lumpiness in our being able to achieve and project those arrangements.

Mr BOYER: Has the program, if I am to call it that, actually commenced? Has it started now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, what was that?

Mr BOYER: Has the program actually commenced now? Has money been spent so far on the program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As those requirements come up, then they are paid. For example, last year payments were made to both the Port Lincoln and the Goolwa RSL-approved cemeteries, but some of them are not due for some time. That projection is in place. Last year, my understanding is that it was approximately \$35,000 for the extension of those. They are at the lighter end compared with some of the others; they have fewer bodies in those cemeteries.

Mr BOYER: Can you tell us how many applications have been received so far by members of the public to access the program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure that it works like that. I am going to take that question on notice, but of course the vast majority of the expenditure that we are talking about is for already identified sites and for plots that are long existing. We will take that question on notice and come back to you with an answer on that. We are happy to do that straightaway.

Mr BOYER: I guess what you are saying is that in some cases they have been identified and no application is necessary possibly.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just would prefer to get a detailed briefing on that. If we speak to the person who is responsible for this quite complex arrangement—and there is some complexity to it—then we will get a full detailed briefing and come back to you straightaway.

Mr BOYER: Chair, I understand that the omnibus questions have not been read in yet for the Premier.

The CHAIR: That is correct. Are you offering?

Mr BOYER: I could use my remaining three minutes to give the MP who is following me a bit of a breather from it. Can I do that?

The CHAIR: If you begin, member for Wright, I am going to encourage you to go right the way through.

Mr BOYER: I read the following omnibus questions into *Hansard*:

1. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
 - What is the actual FTE count at 30 June 2020 and the projected actual FTE count for each year of the forward estimates?
 - What is the total employment cost for each year of the forward estimates?
 - What is the notional FTE job reduction target that has been agreed with Treasury for each year of the forward estimates?
 - Does the agency or department expect to meet the target in each year of the forward estimates?
 - How many TVSPs are estimated to be required to meet FTE reductions over the forward estimates?
2. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
 - How much is budgeted to be spent on goods and services for 2020-21, and for each of the years of the forward estimates period?

- The top ten providers of goods and services by value to each agency reporting to the minister for 2019-20; and
 - A description of the goods and/or services provided by each of these top ten providers, and the cost to the agency for these goods and/or services.
 - The value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers.
3. Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, 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 has either (1) been abolished and (2) which has been created?
4. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing:
- the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier;
 - cost;
 - work undertaken;
 - reason for engaging the contractor; and
 - method of appointment?
5. For each department and agency for which the minister has responsibility:
- How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2019-20 and what was their employment expense?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 and what is their estimated employment expense?
 - The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2019-20 and budgeted cost for 2020-21.
6. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, please provide a full itemised breakdown of attraction and retention allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contracts between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020.
7. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2020, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices?
8. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, could you detail:
- (a) How much was spent on targeted voluntary separation packages in 2019-20?
 - (b) What department funded these TVSPs? (except for DTF estimates)
 - (c) What number of TVSPs were funded?
 - (d) What is the budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year), and how are these packages funded?
 - (e) What is the breakdown per agency/branch of targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year) by FTEs?
9. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2019 and what is the value of executive termination payments made?

10. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2019, and what is the annual salary, and total employment cost for each position?

11. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many employees have been declared excess, how long has each employee been declared excess, and what is the salary of each excess employee?

12. In the 2019-20 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on operating programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2020-21?

13. In the 2019-20 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on investing or capital projects or programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2020-21? How much was sought and how much was approved?

14. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years:

- (a) Name of the program or fund;
- (b) The purpose of the program or fund;
- (c) Balance of the grant program or fund;
- (d) Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund;
- (e) Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund;
- (f) Carryovers into or from the program or fund; and
- (g) Details, including the value and beneficiary, of any commitments already made to be funded from the program or fund.

15. For the period of 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, provide a breakdown of all grants paid by the department/agency that report to the minister, including when the payment was made to the recipient, and when the grant agreement was signed by both parties.

16. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budgeted expenditure across the 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

17. 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.

18. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what is the total cost of machinery of government changes since 1 July 2019 and please provide a breakdown of those costs?

19. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new sections of your department or agency have been established since 1 July 2019 and what is their purpose?

20. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:

- What savings targets have been set for each year of the forward estimates?
- What measures are you implementing to meet your savings target?
- What is the estimated FTE impact of these measures?

The CHAIR: Well read, member for Wright. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Veterans SA portfolio to be complete.

Membership:

Ms Stinson substituted for Mr Boyer.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms J. Kennedy, Director, Multicultural Affairs, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Now we come to Multicultural Affairs. Premier, would you like to introduce your advisers and make a short statement, please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would. I would like to introduce Justine Kennedy, who is the Director of Multicultural Affairs in South Australia. Of course, Steve Woolhouse is making his third, fourth or fifth appearance today. He loves this estimates committee and looks forward to it all year. He is a little bit perturbed that he has not had too many questions—

The CHAIR: That is why he stayed there for most of the day, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —so I am keen for the opposition to ask him as many direct question as possible and I do—

Ms STINSON: I would like to direct all my questions to Steven.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Exactly; please. Can I also say, as I have with Veterans SA and also Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, the multicultural community has been very significantly affected this year. It has many vulnerable citizens who do not have the language skills that help them to easily navigate what is required. It is a sector that has had to cancel many of its events and also cancel many of the weekly support services that exist for this sector, so it is a sector that has had to very significantly pivot during COVID-19—and pivot it has.

I am very proud of the work that the department has done in this area, so I am grateful to Justine Kennedy and all her team. I am very grateful for the advice that we have received from the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and community leaders right across South Australia. This has been one example where we have learnt from what has happened in other jurisdictions and we have worked very quickly to constantly look at our support for multicultural communities in South Australia, so I am very happy with the performance in this area.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. I am going to advise the committee that the member for Wright has been requested to be discharged and has been replaced on the committee by the member for Badcoe. Member for Badcoe, it is your call.

Ms STINSON: I might start by saying that I am delighted to have been given this portfolio only quite recently and also that the Labor team has appointed an assistant shadow minister in Joe Szakacs. We are very much enjoying the opportunity to engage with the multicultural community even more than we already do as local MPs. My first question is in relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 26. How many events that are funded or part funded by the state were cancelled this year due to COVID and from how many organisations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly there were a huge number. I will see if I have some specific statistics, but I am not sure that I have. We might need to take that question on notice. Of course, with COVID restrictions in place from the end of March, a large number of events that were scheduled for last financial year had to be cancelled at very, very short notice. Sometimes, organisations that had already received money were given the opportunity to repurpose that money to put towards other important programs as we refocused the grants program for this current financial year.

I am still very hopeful that we will be able to have multicultural events in this COVID environment. We have seen multicultural events increasing in recent weeks. Obviously, with the current situation with the Parafield cluster again, multicultural communities have had to cancel

some of their events, but I am hopeful that, as we restore COVID management plans and lower level restrictions from 1 December, we will see some very happy celebrations that relate to this program in the lead-up to the end of this year and through the first six months of next year.

One of the things that members may note is that we implemented a changed arrangement to our multicultural grants program in 2019. There are four streams: Advance Together, Celebrate Together, Expand Together and Stronger Together. Although this is a difficult situation, we are always astounded by just how flexible these organisations are during this difficult period.

Ms STINSON: The reason for the question is that Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 26 states that the government supported organisations to address COVID 'through re-directing funding from cancelled events'. So my follow-up question is: what was the total amount of funding from the cancelled events that has now been redirected to other purposes?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that in the 2019-20 year there was \$234,532 in grant funding, which was provided to support 21 organisations to deliver COVID-19 outreach projects. This was redirected funding that would be normally under the grants program. In the 2020-21 year, it is envisaged that around \$250,000 in grant funding will be redirected from the Celebrate Together Grants budget to implement a new Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund.

Ms STINSON: Just to clarify, if that money is then being transferred through to the Celebrate Together Grants, does that mean that this is additional money on top of what was already being allocated, or is it just getting brought into that same funding stream? Is the total the same for the Celebrate Together funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was just felt that the events were going to be significantly impacted—well, they already were, because of course the financial year started on 1 July—so we took that into account, and in this year's budget we took \$250,000 from the Celebrate Together Grants and put them into the Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund.

These are very likely to go to similar organisations, or in many cases the same organisations, but they will be for different purposes given the fact that many multicultural organisations had planned events that might have been held in July, August, September, some of them with very large mass gatherings that just could not be accommodated with their COVID management plan. So, rather than just cancel them and return that money to the Consolidated Account, they were kept within Multicultural SA.

Multicultural SA came up with an alternative for how we could continue to support these organisations through this very tough year, and this was their recommendation to establish the Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund.

Ms STINSON: Thank you. Just on that Celebrate Together funding stream—I can give you a budget reference if you would like it—the website states that events after 1 October this year would be considered for funding under that Celebrate Together fund. Is that program open again as Celebrate Together, or are you still spending the money you have brought over from the cancelled events, and, if so, can you tell me when the funding round is restarting for Celebrate Together?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is open now. There is still money in that Celebrate Together account, so that is open at the moment. We will give you more detail about when that closes off and further details with regard to it. It is not that it has been completely removed; it is just that some of it has been better allocated to achieve our overall ambition with this portfolio, but there is a round which is open at the moment.

Ms STINSON: Will there still be two rounds in 2020-21, this financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that that is correct, two rounds this financial year. However, it is a diminished total budget because that \$250,000 has moved off into that other fund.

Ms STINSON: With respect to a different funding pool, I refer to Budget Paper, Volume 4, page 26. The Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund of 2020-21, which I understand is different from the one we were just talking about, what is the funding allocation under

that program, and is that core funding within Multicultural SA or is that being drawn from another fund or department?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the fund that we were referring to. That is the \$250,000. My notes say that it is called the Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund. Is that what you were calling it?

Ms STINSON: That is what it is referred to as in the budget. I might just clarify that then. The Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund 2020-21, as it is referred to in the targets section on page 26 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4 (it is the last bullet point under that title), are you saying that that is the same as the pool of money that we were just talking about, which I understood to be—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Celebrate Together.

Ms STINSON: —well, the general multicultural grants program of which Celebrate Together is one of four.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, we have four grants funding programs. One of them is the Celebrate Together Grants. That has been diminished by \$250,000 for the budget for this current financial year, and that \$250,000 has not been returned to the Consolidated Account. It has been kept within Multicultural SA and it has been applied to that Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund. We just felt that obviously there was going to be a very significant underspend because of cancelled events from July through to about now, so, rather than not proceed with that expenditure, we would just redirect that \$250,000 for this year only out of that account.

We still think that there will be a significant amount of money in that original Celebrate Together Grants budget for two rounds but, because there was a whole pile of traditional budget allocations from that account to various projects that we knew were going to be cancelled, we thought this was the best use of that money for the remainder of this financial year only and it would return to its normal level in the subsequent financial year.

Ms STINSON: Am I to understand then that the Celebrate Together round for 2020-21 is now the multicultural emergency COVID-19 fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, it has diminished by \$250,000, but it still has—

Ms STINSON: What are you calling the money that was the Celebrate Together money for this financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What are we using that money for?

Ms STINSON: What are you calling it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The same—Celebrate Together. It is just that—

Ms STINSON: In that case, what is the Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund for 2020-21?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, a range of projects that are more outreach oriented rather than celebrating together, because with the Celebrate Together there are a lot of mass events.

Ms STINSON: How much is in that fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is \$250,000.

Ms STINSON: I am a little bit confused here. I will just give you a moment to confer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This might be a better way of explaining: usually the Celebrate Together is \$1 million. It has been reduced down to \$750,000 this current financial year because \$250,000 is taken out of one bucket and it is put into this once-off Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund. The reason for that is that events were not held in July, August, September and October.

Even though a lot of people sometimes qualified, they said, 'Well, there's too much uncertainty. We're going to give it a miss this year.' Or, when they tried to submit their

COVID management plans, people said, 'Look, you can't have 10,000 people at an event.' So, instead, we did a projection of what money would still be required to fulfil the two rounds under the Celebrate Together, which was diminished from \$1 million down to \$750,000. Rather than return \$250,000 to the Consolidated Account, it was put into this new fund as a once-off fund, which is more outreach rather than getting people to come together in mass events or celebratory events.

Ms STINSON: Is there still \$750,000 in the Celebrate Together fund, and do you intend to still have two rounds that you will call for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, correct.

Ms STINSON: Got it. Just to finish off on that little area of questioning then, you obviously also have the other three streams, which are Advance Together, Expand Together and Stronger Together. How much money is allocated in this year for each of those streams? Is what is allocated this year the same as what was allocated under the last financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that we have not been splitting them out because there is some movement between them, but the budget for all multicultural grants program funding for 2019-20 was \$2.919 million across those four, and the budget as it stands printed in the budget for 2020-21 was \$2.85 million.

Ms STINSON: How are decisions made about how that money is divided between the four different streams, or three as it might be at the moment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is still definitely four. I am not really quite sure why you are not understanding that; it is definitely still four. It is just that one of them is diminished down.

Ms STINSON: Okay, I accept that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have explained that four times. The review was published in 2019. Essentially, the Advance Together Grants assist multicultural organisations to improve their governance and to strengthen their capacity and build skills. The Celebrate Together Grants assist multicultural organisations to host festivals and events to celebrate cultural diversity—so that is the big one, \$1 million down to \$750,000.

The Expand Together Grants assist multicultural organisations to expand their capacity by upgrading community facilities or purchasing equipment to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse communities. The fourth area is called Stronger Together Grants, and these assist multicultural organisations to develop and deliver projects that strengthen families and communities and improve their access to better social and economic opportunities. I am advised that they are all competitive grants, they are assessed, and then ultimately a decision is made.

This is a particularly difficult year because many of the applications are affected by COVID-19. Nevertheless, we remain, as I said in my opening remarks, ready to pivot where possible. However, as you can imagine, we had a very significant decline in the applications for a large part of the financial year which has already come and gone because of a lack of activity. We are still confident that we will be able to achieve that budget of \$2.85 million worth of grants to be administered this year. That was handed down in the budget in November.

Ms STINSON: Obviously this year's grant money is less than the previous year, going from what you just said. Have you made it less because you are anticipating there will be fewer applications?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 26, still under targets, the last bullet point says that focus will be given to multicultural communities that are 'most vulnerable within South Australia'. Can you indicate which groups have been identified as the most vulnerable and how those groups were identified as the most vulnerable?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For all the reasons we outlined before, there is a \$250,000 budget for this year and there was a \$532,000 budget for last year. Basically, events that could not be held created this opportunity to support our most vulnerable communities during this period of time.

The government received a large number of requests from organisations seeking funding to deliver emergency COVID-19 outreach programs to support their communities—for example, outreach projects involving setting up community helplines, translating of authorised official COVID-19 materials and engaging social workers to support community members through these challenging times.

Based on these urgent needs of South Australia's multicultural communities to address the impacts of COVID-19, my government redirected multicultural affairs funding from cancelled events to support the delivery of COVID-19 outreach projects in the 2019-20 year and, of course, that will continue into 2020-21. Funding proposals submitted in writing go to the assistant minister to me as the Premier, the Hon. Jing Lee MLC. They are then assessed by Multicultural Affairs on a case-by-case basis, with grant agreements entered into and funds disbursed in accordance with Treasurer's Instructions.

Ms STINSON: On the website there is a published list of successful applicants under the 2019-20 Celebrate Together funding stream, but there is not a list of winners for the other three funding streams. Is it possible to get a list of the successful recipients in the last financial year for each of those remaining three streams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I certainly will take that question on notice because I do not have that information. A lot of information is on the website, but if it is not on the website I will make best endeavours to get that information to you.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 5, page 8. How many international students have applied for a \$500 emergency cash grant? How many were approved? It would be helpful if that could be split between 2019-20 and the current financial year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is something that was originally suggested to me by the three vice-chancellors with whom I had very extensive discussions right throughout the COVID-19 and continue to this day. They developed their own very extensive and targeted approach to supporting students. We announced \$13.8 million in what we referred to as the International Student Support Package to support international students currently residing in South Australia and facing financial hardship. We also expanded the criteria for the Residential Rental Grant Scheme to include temporary visa holders and international students. I do not think I have the total number who received that, but I am very happy to take that question on notice.

Ms STINSON: Has that program now closed, or are grants for the \$500 cash amount still being distributed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, this is a grants program which is actually administered through the Department for Trade and Investment, because it really related to the cohort supported by StudyAdelaide, but I am very happy to get that information on a rapid basis and get it to you.

Ms STINSON: In that case, would you also be able to take on notice, in relation to the once-off \$200 payment, which I assume is administered under the same method, how many students applied for that \$200 grant, which was eligible for homestay students, how many were approved, whether any were denied and whether all that money has now been paid out?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to do that.

Ms STINSON: Just to clarify, the other question I was asking about is the \$500 Emergency Crash Grant. I understand that there are two rounds. I understand that at least one round has been done. I am inquiring whether the second round has been opened and if the money for that has been paid out in this financial year, but I am happy for that to be taken on notice as well.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We will take that question on notice.

Mr SZAKACS: Premier, can I just take you back to the same budget lines but to your answer in respect of the multicultural emergency COVID-19 outreach project; this is emergency funding. Do I take it from your answer that all funds have been expended or allocated for that? Even though it is set as a target for 2021, have all funds been allocated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, the 2019-20 was for \$234,000. I am not sure about the—

Mr SZAKACS: No, this is a new project.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is still open.

Mr SZAKACS: What are the guidelines for applicants to apply against? As the member for Badcoe noted, there is some information on the website; certainly in respect of this grant there is not. Are you able to table the guidelines and assessment criteria?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be clear, it is in response to a large number of communities who came and said, 'Look, we are significantly disadvantaged. We need these translation services immediately,' or, 'We need the supports built around our community.' Some of it was in regard to specific outbreaks that might have occurred, where specific communities needed urgent and significant support—for example, with the communities around the Thebarton cluster. There is no real hard and fast criteria like there are for grant programs.

This is again what I was referring to in my opening remarks and the subsequent answers to questions—that this is an area of government that has had to really pivot to the changing needs. This particular \$250,000 is more discretionary, based upon need at the time. I am advised that \$234,000 was expended last financial year. There is a budget for \$250,000 this financial year. That has not been expended yet so there is still money available.

If there are specific issues of an acute nature that different groups have, then they should feel very welcome to make that application. It is really as an emergency response to COVID. This is not an adjunct to the other grants programs that might be around facilities or building capacity within their governance structures or, indeed, events to celebrate. There are still budgets for those, but this is really a discretionary account to deal with emergency expenditure as it is required by individual groups.

Mr SZAKACS: Premier, are you able to take on notice a list of organisations or bodies that have been successful in the application and, putting aside the semantics, those that have been allocated funding out of this pot?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, certainly. I am very happy to take that question on notice. I cannot imagine why I would not be able to, but there are some cultural sensitivities with some of these groups, but I will certainly provide that information if I can.

Mr SZAKACS: Taking you to the same budget papers under project highlights, there has been significant reporting this year both through parliamentary processes through the wage theft inquiry and through various media around the specific and acute exploitation that workers of a multicultural and migrant background face, particularly in the area of wage theft. Would you inform the committee what projects were undertaken in 2019-20 and those that may be undertaken in 2020-21 that specifically address the acute exploitation and vulnerability of those multicultural and ethnically diverse workers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not 100 per cent sure that that relates to the scope of Multicultural SA. I think that would be an issue to direct to the Treasurer. I am happy to take up that question with him. Certainly there is no budget line within Multicultural SA for that type of investigation and I am not sure whether the Treasurer has any money allocated to that, but I am happy to ask that question.

Mr SZAKACS: Have you taken any advice or sought advice from SAMEAC in respect of the question or the evidence that has been put to the parliament this year or that has been reported in the media around, again, the acute exploitation of multicultural and ethnically diverse workers? Again, it may be a matter of remedy for the Minister for Industrial Relations, but from a policy setting those workers in the multicultural spaces certainly are within your orbit.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I meet with the chair and various members of the SAMEAC on a very regular basis and that specific issue has not been raised with me, but I am more than happy to follow that up with them. I am also very happy to follow this issue up with the Treasurer to see if there are any issues that we need to be following up within Multicultural Affairs.

The objects of this agency of government probably would not lend themselves to that type of industrial issue. It could be that there are issues raised by SAMEAC or directly from individual multicultural groups in South Australia, but they would ultimately be referred to the appropriate minister—in this case, the Treasurer.

Mr SZAKACS: Finally, the winding back of the Labour Hire Licensing Act that this parliament passed this year had specific evidence that was led, particularly in the committee stage, again around the specific risk and exploitation that migrant workers and temporary visa holders have within labour hire. Did you seek or did SAMEAC provide any advice in respect of that bill?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There was no advice provided by SAMEAC to me and certainly not through Multicultural SA. I am happy to follow up whether they provided advice to the Treasurer directly.

Mr SZAKACS: Premier, in respect of the government-wide labour hire task force, which, again, I respect is not overseen by you but rather by the Attorney-General, I am interested in whether your department, Multicultural SA, participates or provides any advice specifically regarding ethnically diverse and multicultural communities into that government-wide labour hire task force.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We provide personnel to various task forces that exist; in fact, we have people currently on secondment to the COVID response within the State Control Centre on this. I am not aware of any secondment to a task force, but I am happy to make an inquiry and, if there is, I am happy to come back.

Ms STINSON: In relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 26, under highlights, which talks about the COVID response, can the Premier give a bit of an idea—or quite some detail, in fact—around how many languages COVID-related state information was translated into and whether any advice was provided to him about communications to non-English-speaking communities throughout the COVID crisis and continuing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely, and I thank you for that question. It gives me an opportunity to go through quite a lot of detail in terms of how Multicultural Affairs has supported SA Health during this COVID-19 crisis. Certainly, Multicultural Affairs has assisted SA Health to plan two online fora attended by more than 40 community leaders to discuss the issues affecting the communities and the best way to engage with individual communities.

As I have previously outlined, we have seconded a staff member—that transfer occurred on 29 July—to SA Health to work in the State Control Centre Health as a multicultural liaison officer, and that role continues to this day. That director is the key point of contact seven days a week for providing SA Health with cultural advice.

Multicultural Affairs is working closely with my assistant minister to arrange the translation of COVID-19 posters into 30 community languages and audio transcripts of different videos into six community languages. We are collaborating with SA Health, the Interpreting and Translating Centre and non-government service providers to develop a series of resource materials about COVID-19 that are factual, clear and, most importantly, culturally appropriate.

Multicultural Affairs has provided advice and support to SA Health during the Thebarton cluster to quickly engage with the Afghan community to minimise the spread of COVID-19. They are also very regularly disseminating SA Health communications and materials to communities through their very long-established networks and rapport with various community leaders.

Ms STINSON: Did you receive any advice about whether particular multicultural groups were particularly at risk of COVID and, if so, what was that advice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think we had any specific advice with regard to an area of specific vulnerability. Our role was to disseminate the information as quickly and as culturally appropriately in language as we could and make sure that all the communication was very clear, factual and provided in a timely manner.

We really did learn from other communities around the world. Where people thought about the obvious—providing advice in English—we thought very carefully about what we could be doing

to support the efforts of our COVID response. As I said, I am very proud of the entire team within this agency of government for responding and supporting the overall government's efforts.

This ultimately means that South Australia has been the beneficiary of this quick action and we have not seen some of the problems that have existed in other communities. With specific regard to your question, which was whether there is any specific community that is particularly disadvantaged or vulnerable, no, I do not have any information to suggest that.

Ms STINSON: You mentioned translation services. Obviously, we have seen at the federal level Google Translate being used. Have you had any complaints in relation to the translation of materials and, if so, what have those complaints or concerns been?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of any, but I know that in South Australia we have been working with SA Health, the Interpreting and Translating Centre and a range of non-government service providers. Often, through that emergency fund, we have been providing information and clear details to communities to provide and disseminate their own information, because we believe that probably gives greater impact to those specific communities.

Ms STINSON: I realise this is under DHS, but you have mentioned interpreting and translating services. There is \$267,000 in the budget for upgrading that service. That does not seem a great deal of money. What will that actually achieve? What is the benefit or the outcome that will be delivered for that \$267,000?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot speak to that item, but I do know that SA Health has also had its own budget allocation in this area. I think this has been, if you like, a combined whole-of-government approach, whether that has been through services provided by SA Health, Human Services or multicultural services. There has been a combined approach to this.

Ms STINSON: Can you inform us of the demand for interpreting services from the interpreting centre facility? I understand that in the past there have sometimes been requests that have not been able to be met, and I also understand that the centre does service a number of different areas of government. Do you have any information or data on just how many of the requests are being fulfilled or how many are being unfulfilled?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information because it does not relate to my portfolio. I can say that Multicultural Affairs has worked very diligently with the sector to be able to provide them with support for those interpreting services or money for communities to do that interpreting work themselves. Sometimes they just need extra money for outreach, and that has been provided.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 27. Under income, grants and subsidies, you are anticipating a drop in income in grants. Can you explain why that is, where those grants come from and why they are no longer coming in?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Mr Woolhouse is looking for his moment to shine.

Ms STINSON: I can see; you should just invite him forward, finally give him his moment of glory. He has been waiting all day.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Would you like to come forward and explain it? Come and sit in the big chair.

The CHAIR: Thank you for your patience today.

Ms STINSON: I tried to find a good question for you.

Mr WOOLHOUSE: I thank you for this moment. What it is—and we have made reference to this in previous years—is to do with the corporate overheads that are allocated across the department. Corporate overheads are, essentially, finance, procurement, people like me, and so forth. The cost of us gets spread over all the programs. We have some of our own grants and income sources as well, so an element of it is just that; it is the allocation of the program.

The other component is that we do get some sponsorship to do with the Multicultural Festival, but because that is biennial—there is no Multicultural Festival in 2021—there will be less. Put the two of those together and that is why you get a lower number.

Ms STINSON: Excellent; very well explained. Thank you very much.

Mr SZAKACS: Sadly, this one is for the Premier. I take you to the same budget papers and budget line and the multicultural review—not the bill, but just the process of the review itself. I know that was completed in June 2019. Is it your view that there is sufficient currency, considering the significant amount of time that has been taken between the consultation and the report being completed to the bill being introduced into this place, considering the events of the world in that time? Is there sufficient currency based upon the feedback you have received from stakeholders?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is a very good question. Obviously we were hopeful of introducing the bill much earlier, but with COVID we just had to change priorities for our legislation this year. I am still very keen to update that legislation, and I believe it is before the parliament at the moment. However, we are very keen to have input from all and everybody, and if there are suggestions for improvement that can be made that would be great.

I think it is an opportunity to update this. Some of the language in this is outdated. Some people find some elements of it slightly offensive, so I think that there are opportunities to improve it and also incorporate some of the new ways that we engage with linguistically and culturally diverse communities in South Australia. This is really looking for a whole of parliament approach to this reform.

I think it is the first significant change to this legislation in 40 years. I think we were the first jurisdiction in Australia to move and the first to even coin the phrase 'multicultural affairs' in legislation. That is something that every South Australian should be very proud of. One of the great developments in this one is the inclusion of the word 'interculturalism', which I think is really a highlight of the way we approach this particular opportunity in South Australia. We are very open for any suggestions.

The CHAIR: Final question.

Mr SZAKACS: This may be a question that you wish to take on notice. In the consultation report that was published there was a note that, amongst the other consultation and processes, there was a 'one invitation-only workshop for key stakeholders'. Could you please take on notice those bodies that were both invited and those that attended?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. Thank you to your advisers. Thank you to the leads for the opposition and all committee members. I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; the Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; Premier, Other Items; and Defence SA to be complete.

At 18:31 the committee adjourned until Thursday 26 November 2020 at 09:00.