

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Monday, 31 July 2017****ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B****Chair:**

Mr L.K. Odenwalder

Members:

Hon. T.R. Kenyon

Mr E.J. Hughes

Mr V.A. Tarzia

Mr D.C. van Holst Pellekaan

Mr C. Wingard

*The committee met at 09:00**Estimates Vote***DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT, \$683,049,000****ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT, \$13,911,000****Minister:**

Hon. K.J. Maher, Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Duffy, Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Ms A. Reid, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Mr J. King, Executive Director, Skills and Employment, Department of State Development.

Mr R. Janssan, Executive Director, Strategy and Business Services, Department of State Development.

Ms P. Chau, Director, Performance and Governance, Department of State Development.

Mr M. McKay, Principal Analyst, Department of State Development.

Mr C. Smith, Ministerial Adviser.

The CHAIR: Welcome, minister. As per the agreement, you are appearing from 9 until 10 as the Minister for Employment. Is that the agreement with the opposition? Excellent. The estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure, as you know, and as such there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions. You have agreed to an approximate time for consideration of the proposed payments. I will check that timetable throughout the day, to make sure that we are on the same page.

If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than Friday 27 October 2017 to be tabled in the house in the week of 14 November. The minister and the lead speaker for the opposition may have a 10-minute opening

statement, if they wish. A member who is not a part of the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair.

Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identifiable or referenced. There is no facility for tabling documents. However, documents can be supplied to the Chair. The incorporation of material into *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the House of Assembly, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length.

All questions must be directed to the minister. The minister may then refer questions to advisers for a response. I declare the proposed payments for the Department of State Development and administered items for that department open for examination. Minister, I now invite you, as Minister for Employment, to introduce any advisers you have with you and then proceed with an opening statement, if you wish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have with me today on my left Mark Duffy, the Chief Executive of the Department of State Development and John King, the Executive Director of Skills and Employment, part of that department. To my right is Alex Reid, Deputy Chief Executive of the Department of State Development. Sitting behind is Phuong Chau, Director of Finance, Department of State Development; Michael McKay, Principal Analyst for skills and employment, Department of State Development; and Rick Janssan and Cameron Smith are behind them. I do not have an opening statement.

The CHAIR: Member for Mitchell, do you have an opening statement?

Mr WINGARD: No.

The CHAIR: Do you have any questions?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, I do. I just want to clarify from the get-go, minister, are you happy to take questions on the Future Jobs Funds in this—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In any part that relates to my portfolios. Any part that relates to the Treasurer's portfolios, which is the vast majority of the Future Jobs Fund—there is one part, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, that has been extended. I am happy to take questions on that specific part. You may wish, however, to save those for the automotive transformation part of estimates later today, but anything as it relates to other ministers' portfolios, I am happy to take on notice and seek answers from other ministers.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you for the clarification. I greatly appreciate it. Can you perhaps outline for the committee the DSD employment programs that are in place? Do you have a list of those—

The CHAIR: Member for Mitchell, can you reference lines in the budget, please, so that we can all follow?

Mr WINGARD: Absolutely. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 97, where there is a statement about the program, which is to strengthen the economic prosperity and social wellbeing of South Australia through strategic employment skills formation and workforce development, implementing the WorkReady and Job and Skills policies. On the back of those jobs policies, what are all the DSD employment programs that you are responsible for?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for his question. I might use this opportunity, if you stay with me, to give a quite expansive answer. Last year, about 70 per cent of the questions in the employment estimates were related to things outside my portfolio areas, so what I might do now is give a rather comprehensive answer, to talk about areas in my portfolio area. However, I am sure that, as you have already outlined, you might want to touch on things outside my portfolio area which will have to be taken on notice.

However, in preparation for today, given that 70 per cent of the questions were not in my portfolio areas last time, I have some information about some programs in other portfolio areas, so it may be helpful, Chair. It may take a little while but it might be worth going through a whole range of areas that include ones that are within DSD.

First, the Investment Attraction agency, for which minister Hamilton-Smith, the Liberal Independent member for Waite is responsible. An additional \$60 million has been provided to Investment Attraction South Australia, comprising \$30 million in grant funding and \$30 million in loans. The additional investment will promote job creation, capital investment, construction jobs and increased economic activity.

The success of Investment Attraction South Australia includes investment attraction in new jobs at the international aerospace company Boeing, IT giant NEC, food processor Inghams, and IT service provider Datacom. The additional funding builds on the previous \$20 million over 2017-18 and 2018-19 provided in the 2016-17 budget.

Since its inception in October 2015, Investment Attraction South Australia secured 19 company investments equating to about \$1.12 billion of capital investment, \$5.5 billion in economic benefit to the state, and nearly 6,000 jobs in South Australia. I can outline some of the success stories of Investment Attraction South Australia, for example, TicToc. Investment Attraction has been working with SA-based Fintech company TicToc and the Bendigo Bank Adelaide to bring 200 new jobs in investment banking to South Australia.

They will develop the world's first complete online home loan platform, creating new jobs in South Australia, including relocations from Perth and Sydney to Adelaide. The platform will provide customers with home loan approvals much faster than traditional means. The state government has provided a loan to TicToc through the Investment Attraction agency's Economic Investment Fund, without which this venture may well have gone interstate.

Another example is PrimeQ, one of Australia's leading cloud IT specialists. PrimeQ will consolidate its global headquarters in Adelaide and create 72 highly-skilled jobs in South Australia. The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies has calculated the value of the project to the gross state product in its first 10 years will be almost \$70 million. The expansion will see the creation of an innovation centre and is being supported by the state government with a \$500,000 grant from the Economic Investment Fund.

Another example from this area under minister Hamilton-Smith's control is Costa Mushrooms, a \$60 million expansion of a mushroom production facility that will create approximately 200 jobs in the Murray Mallee region. Horticultural business Costa has announced plans to upgrade its Monarto facility to help meet growing national demand for fresh mushrooms, and has doubled production at the site from 120 tonnes to 240 tonnes a week. Costa's investment is being supported by the state government through grants and equal contributions from the Economic Investment Fund and the Regional Development Fund.

As I mentioned, Boeing—the world's largest aerospace company—will create 250 new highly-skilled technical advance research positions in a new hub in South Australia. The jobs will be created over a five-year period and include project managers, system designers, software engineers and researchers conducting aircraft support research and development, product support, systems and integration activities. The new facility will be established in the Adelaide CBD to support advanced military systems and leading-edge research and development. The state government is providing support via the Investment Attraction agency and also Defence SA.

Another area of government is the Regional Development Fund, which is providing significant support to companies and employment in the regions. I am advised that this fund, under the control of minister Brock, has over \$60 million in grants that have been awarded since 2014 to more than 90 regional economic development projects, estimated to have created more than 2,000 new jobs across the regions, supporting in excess of \$900 million worth of economic activity.

Some of the projects that the regional development plan has supported include Sundrop Farms. A \$6 million Regional Development Fund grant was provided to Sundrop Farms to help build its high-tech glasshouse in Port Augusta. This grant assisted Sundrop to secure additional project financing that was required. The project is expected to generate in excess of \$200 million in gross output for this region through both direct and indirect impacts. The project is also expected to create somewhere in the order of close to 700 jobs through both direct and indirect impacts, of which in excess of 100 are estimated to be employed as ongoing jobs in the area.

Thomas Foods has received support from the Regional Development Fund to help the company develop a new state-of-the-art beef boning facility to assist the company to increase their exports. An amount of \$2.5 million was supplied from the Regional Development Fund, and the company had an upgrade of in excess of \$25 million to its Murray Bridge abattoir. It is expected to lift the company's beef processing capacity by a quarter and increase gross output of the Murray Mallee region by over \$166 million and create in excess of 400 jobs directly and indirectly, with an estimated 200 ongoing jobs at the facility.

Bowmans Intermodal is another example of a grant from this line under minister Brock's area: an \$840,000 grant has assisted Bowmans with an expansion project to duplicate a rail line. The project will see Bowmans doubling from 25,000 20-foot equivalent units, shipping containers, to over 50,000 per year. The grant from the fund has meant that Bowmans Intermodal could increase the scale of their planned investment, also bringing forward the decision to invest in the project. I am advised that the expansion will create almost 70 direct and indirect jobs.

Another example from this fund is Whitty Engineering: it has helped fund in excess of a \$2 million new facility in Mount Gambier.

Mr WINGARD: You made a lengthy statement at the start saying that last time all the questions were outside of this portfolio, but you have not even touched on one of your portfolio areas.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will get there.

Mr WINGARD: No, but when?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will get there.

The CHAIR: No, hang on, minister. Member for Mitchell, you agreed. The preamble to this answer was that it would be lengthy and that it would cover a whole range of areas—you agreed to that. We will listen to the minister's answer and he will get to it. You agreed.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am assisting the committee, as 70 per cent of the questions last time were outside my portfolio area. This may save us time and we might even finish early by putting all this on the record now.

The expansion includes fit-for-purpose sheds for Whitty Engineering, capable of taking up to 10 tonnes. In the tourism area there have been major boosts. We have seen the tourism sector getting a boost through a further \$14.5 million injection into events and convention bid funds. The bid funds have been a key driver behind South Australia's record-breaking tourism figures. This year, the international visitor economy rose to \$1.1 billion.

The bid funds, which have put South Australia on the map as a world-renowned host of major events and conventions, are forecast to inject almost \$500 million into the local economy and create about 4,500 jobs. The \$14.5 million investment includes \$8.5 million over three years for businesses, an incentive for events and conventions, and \$6 million over three years to support the staging of new major events in South Australia. This builds on previous support for the bids fund's initiative, totalling \$38 million from 2014-15.

In other areas of government, the NDIS is likely to be a major increased employer. As a result of the NDIS we are likely to see a significant increase in employment. We are supporting South Australians to build the skills they need to gain jobs in this growing sector and industries. The rollout of the NDIS scheme in South Australia is projected to almost double the number of full-time equivalent employees in this area, and is estimated at somewhere between 10,250 and 12,550 over three years, creating approximately 6,000 new jobs. The government has committed almost \$12 million over this period for tailored skills training and employment programs and workforce development projects and services.

The record investment of \$1.1 billion in Health in the most recent state budget is creating jobs. It includes more than \$250 million to redevelop The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, over \$50 million to expand the emergency department of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and a further \$24 million over two years to be invested into the total upgrade of the Women's and Children's Hospital. These investments in Health are estimated to support around 3,000 direct and indirect positions across multiple sites over the life of the project.

The state government will also commit to contribute \$44 million towards a new state-of-the-art medical research hub to house the Southern Hemisphere's first proton therapy research centre. The total project for SAHMRI 2 is expected to create 250 jobs in construction and somewhere in the order of 340 ongoing jobs. In addition to these infrastructure builds, we have established Health Industries South Australia to build on the achievement of the health and biomedical precinct and promote South Australia as a destination for health industry investment.

In the 2016-17 major budget review, the government committed a further \$6 million over two years for the establishment of the Health Industries Fund. To date, Health Industries has helped to track investment from eight companies across medical devices, clinical research, digital health care and pharmaceuticals. These companies combined are expected to deliver more than \$190 million in total investment. Health Industries South Australia has already helped create a total of 150 direct jobs, and that is estimated to grow to more than 230 by the end of 2018-19.

In the defence area, as South Australians know, the state government fought very hard, with the community, to make sure that the next generations of submarines will be built in South Australia. With the Premier and minister Hamilton-Smith's strong advocacy, the submarines are being built here, rather than in Japan, which seemed to be the preference of the federal Liberal government at the time. There are conservative job estimates of an additional in excess of 3,000 skilled workers over the next 10 years, with rapid growth expected from 2020, peaking at an estimated over 5,000 jobs in 2027.

A high proportion of experienced workers will be required in jobs in electrical and mechanical engineering, metal fabrication trades, electronics, information communications technology, software engineering, aviation project management, business support and logistics. In areas that I am directly responsible for as well, we are seeing significant investment in South Australia in the innovation area. We are building on previous successes. Over the last 15 years, BioSA, now TechInSA, has supported the creation of more than 80 companies, with jobs in the bioscience industry estimated to double to more than 1,700.

We have also introduced the \$10 million Early Commercialisation Fund. Currently, I am advised that grants have already been allocated to 26 companies from the Early Commercialisation Fund, creating an estimated 76 jobs and over \$4 million in revenue. It is estimated that, over the first two years of the fund, approximately 250 jobs will be created. Some of the companies from that fund have included Inovor Technologies, which is setting up a satellite manufacturing facility in Adelaide that will use local electronics and precision machining partners to produce small microsatellites for local and international markets.

They also include companies like Jackson Care Technologies, which is developing smart Internet of Things technology to support independent disability and aged-care living, and Afalitic, which is a software company helping manufacturing companies improve efficiency in their production processes to generate greater returns. Based on artificial intelligence software, the grant will enable the company to undertake further development of their algorithms that optimise the utilisation of consumables and supplies.

Vinnovate is a local company developing Vino Cap, a functional wine bottle closure that allows on-demand enhancement of products. Myorta has developed a low-powered low-cost satellite communication platform for industries with remote operations, such as agriculture, mining, transport and logistics.

I am also pleased that Blue Sky has been recently announced as the fund manager for the South Australian Venture Capital Fund, a \$50 million state government-backed venture capital fund that will see us invest in exciting businesses, and a number of those are expected to be spun out of the early stage commercialisation fund.

We also have, as part of the Northern Economic Plan, the Small Business Development Fund, which is a \$10 million development fund that has been developed by the state government in partnership with councils in northern Adelaide, along with industries and businesses. The fund is providing support over three years through two competitive grant programs, a start-up business program with grants of up to \$20,000 on a one-for-one matching basis, and a business expansion program with grants between \$10,000 and \$100,000 on a one-for-one matching basis.

Applications are on a continuing, rolling basis, and both programs are assessed every seven to eight weeks. I am advised that, at the end of June 2017, 53 start-up and 58 business expansion grants, for a total of almost \$5 million plus GST, had been approved. Based on the grants awarded to date it is anticipated that 368 new FTE jobs will be created within 12 months. Actual job creation is reported 12 months after the conclusion of each round.

In the energy area, as many are aware, the state government is investing heavily in energy initiatives that will create new jobs for South Australians. Initial estimates predict 530 full-time equivalent jobs will be created through new construction and 100 full-time equivalent jobs through increased gas exploration.

In terms of infrastructure projects, this year's budget has record investment in infrastructure projects. The government's capital program will support an estimated 5,700 jobs on average per year over the next four years. Key projects in the infrastructure spend include \$1.9 billion for roads, including the north-south road corridor, in partnership with the commonwealth; \$875 million for major public transport projects, such as rail projects; \$425.4 million to redevelop hospitals; and \$409 million for early childhood education projects. That builds on other areas like tax reform from the 2015-16 state budget, which is locking in a discounted payroll tax rate of 2.5 per cent for small businesses with payroll tax between \$600,000 and \$1 million, and extending the payroll tax discount to businesses with payroll between \$1 million and \$1.5 million, estimated to benefit an additional 1,300 businesses in this bracket.

The question had been asked about the Future Jobs Fund, so seeing that it had been foreshadowed, I will answer the speaker a little bit about the Future Jobs Fund that the government has introduced.

Mr WINGARD: Sorry, I did not ask about the Future Jobs Fund in my question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: You talked about it earlier. You—

Mr WINGARD: I did not ask about it in my question. Just answer the question, minister.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! While we talk over each other, Hansard cannot record anything.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, you are welcome that I am now—

The CHAIR: Minister! We have been very generous with our time in that last answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will talk about the Future Jobs—

The CHAIR: Hang on. The minister will continue his answer. When we speak over each other, Hansard cannot transcribe what we are saying, so it is basically dead air, and it is your time, the member for Mitchell.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to leave the answer there and speak about the Future Jobs Fund in a moment, because it is obviously a very important initiative.

Mr WINGARD: What I was trying—

The CHAIR: Hang on.

Mr WINGARD: Sorry, is another question—

The CHAIR: You can ask a question, not have a speech.

Mr WINGARD: That is what I am getting to. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 55. The total budget allocated for your department is \$645 million, down on the estimated result of last year, so there has been a cut in spending there. I just want to clarify, with a yes or no answer if you would, whether the Manufacturing Works programs, the Our Jobs Plan and the Northern Economic Plan fit under that budget?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The answer is mostly, yes, but of course with the Northern Economic Plan there are many, many parts of that plan that are in other areas, because it has a whole lot of contributing—

Mr WINGARD: They cross over into other—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Indeed.

Mr WINGARD: I understand that. That is why in this scope of questions some of them will cross over, because it is not clear cut which ones cross in and cross out. If some of them, in the past, have breached into other areas, I apologise, because there is that crossover and I take your point.

Can you list how much is allocated to each program that you are responsible for that fits under Manufacturing Works, Our Jobs Plan and the Northern Economic Plan, how much is expended, how many of those programs are finished and how many are ongoing? I do not expect you to do all of them. I am happy for you to take them on notice. That is what my first question was and I am asking it again through this budget line now. If you are happy to take that on notice, I might ask a couple of specific questions to get a few answers now.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that question on notice. There are many funding areas particularly through the Northern Economic Plan, some of which I am responsible for and some, which I have mentioned before, I am not. Through Manufacturing Works, whether it is innovation vouchers or business transformation vouchers, there are a number of funding areas that I am happy to take on notice to help the member with the exact details of what stage they are up to and the funding over the next year for those individual programs for which I am responsible.

Mr WINGARD: How much has been allocated to each, how much has been expended and which ones are finished? With the greatest respect, I met with the CEO of DSD, and I appreciate the briefing, and it was outlined to me that it is not very clear where all these programs fit and where they all go. Some of them are still up on the website and they are not running anymore, as far as I am aware, and that is the clarification I am seeking.

If we look at the Northern Economic Plan, for one, we have the Advanced Modular Construction Industry Alliance. Can you tell me again where the money for that has been expended, how much has been expended and is that finished?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that that particular part of the Northern Economic Plan had a budget of \$500,000, some of which was brought forward. We do not have the final result of how much was expended from that amount and the amount that was brought forward for this last financial year, but I am happy to take that on notice and bring it back once we have the final results for the last financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Is it ongoing; is it continuing to run?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Like many areas, this was a one-off program as part of the Northern Economic Plan to support that particular area. There were a number of focuses of the Northern Economic Plan. It included transport and logistics, the building sector, food manufacturing and defence, so there were a number of very targeted focus areas. That was the construction area and I am advised it was \$500,000 for that particular part of it, of which some was brought forward, but when the exact results are known from the last financial year I will report back.

Mr WINGARD: Can you give us the breakdown of the \$4 million that was allocated to the Disability Employment Hub? Has all that money been expended and where is that program at, is it ending?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for his question. It is the case that we are increasing and diversifying the disability sector, as I mentioned in an earlier answer, with the introduction of the NDIS, which is expected to almost double the workforce in areas that the NDIS covers. As well as the jobs that I talked about before, estimated between 10,250 and 12,555, there are expected to be other flow-on jobs from there.

The NDIS preparedness and transition is being supported through the workforce development activities of the government's three-year Disability Sector Skills and Employment Development Project, which is being delivered by DSD. Again, the specifics are both in skills and with the Minister for Disabilities, but there is a project through the state government that has committed up to \$12 million over three years for tailored skills training and employment programs, workforce development and projects. This comprises—as I think the member had in his question—

\$4.025 million as part of the Northern Economic Plan, and the remainder of that almost \$12 million is through WorkReady training and employment initiatives.

There are additional resources of \$1.79 million for complementary workforce enterprise building activities being secured from the commonwealth government. The project is being delivered with the strongly applied principle of engagement and working with the disability sector and employers in its design. The project has now established six Disability Workforce Hubs at 12 shopfronts to coordinate workforce development activities across the state.

The northern Adelaide hub is hosted by Northern Futures, which shopfronts the Elizabeth shopping centre and Salisbury. I was very pleased, a number of months ago, to attend the opening of the Elizabeth shopping centre with the chair of this committee. That particular shopfront is also in southern Adelaide, hosted by Career Partners Plus, which shopfronts at Christies Beach and Warradale. The southern Adelaide hub will provide reach into the Fleurieu Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and western Adelaide.

The western Adelaide area, in conjunction with the northern Adelaide hub, is at the Murraylands and Riverland, hosted by Regional Development Murraylands and Riverland, which shopfronts at Murray Bridge and Berri. The Limestone Coast is hosted by RDA Limestone Coast, with a shopfront in Mount Gambier. Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula are hosted by Whyalla and Eyre RDA, which shopfronts in Port Lincoln and Whyalla. The Yorke and Mid North have the RDA hosting shopfronts at Port Pirie, Clare and Kadina.

The CHAIR: Hang on, minister. Do you have a point of order, member for Mitchell?

Mr WINGARD: Yes. Can the minister answer the question, please? How much money—

The CHAIR: Hang on, that is not a point of order. The point of order is directed at me.

Mr WINGARD: The point of order is that the minister has just strayed miles from the question.

The CHAIR: The question was about the Disability Workforce Hubs, yes?

Mr WINGARD: About the hub and the expenditure—

The CHAIR: And the expenditure on the hub across—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am giving you exactly what it is being expended on—the exact answer to the question.

Mr WINGARD: No, you have not got to the hub at all. I am asking about the hub, which is the part that you are responsible for. You have gone on about the NDIS and all the other parts that you are not responsible for, and you have pointed that out and you have not answered the aspects of the finances.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is the hub in northern Adelaide. It is hosted by Northern Futures; it has shopfronts at Elizabeth shopping centre and Salisbury.

Mr WINGARD: No, I have asked about the expenditure of that program: how much has been spent, when has it been spent, across which years, and how much is unspent?

The CHAIR: I am sure the minister is getting to those precise points.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: \$11.9 million over three years, from 2016-17. It comprises just over \$4 million as part of the Northern Economic Plan. The exact amount spent for the hubs in various areas, particularly the ones in the north that I think the honourable member is asking about, is very fine-grained detail, but I am more than happy to get it and come back and answer that. But I think it is important, if I have the information, for the benefit of the committee, to talk about what we are doing. This is an exceptionally important area of possible employment in South Australia, so I have been pleased to be able to tell you just how extensive the government's involvement in this has been.

Mr WINGARD: This is the opportunity for me to ask questions and get the breakdown of finances from the budget on specific budget lines.

The CHAIR: Yes, it is, but the minister is allowed to contextualise. This is not question time; the minister is allowed to contextualise.

Mr WINGARD: Waffle or contextualise?

The CHAIR: No, the minister is allowed to contextualise, within reason, which he has done, and I think he has finished his answer.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. Again, if I can seek clarification that you will go away and obtain for the committee, within the time line that is outlined, a list of all the programs under Manufacturing Works, Northern Economic Plan and Our Jobs Plan, because, as I am asking the questions now, you have not been able to answer the last two programs I have asked you about, specifically. You do not have the information here, and I take that on board, but I want clarification that you are willing to go away and get that information for the committee, within the deadline, by Friday 22 October, to find out how much is allocated to each program under Our Jobs Plan, Northern Economic Plan and Manufacturing Works, which you are responsible for. How much has been expended across which years? How much is unspent? Are the programs finished? Are you willing to do that for the committee, minister?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to go away and bring back answers that give more detail to what I have already outlined.

Mr WINGARD: As I have requested?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: You have requested details about the programs in Manufacturing Works. In Our Jobs Plan you have also requested the detail of the \$4.02 million for the disability hub as part of the Northern Economic Plan. I will get those.

Mr WINGARD: And all the programs that fit under Manufacturing Works in the Northern Economic Plan and Our Jobs Plan, that you are responsible for and the spend of those across the board.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can probably go into some more detail about some of the areas with the Northern Economic Plan that might be helpful. Let me find the information—

Mr WINGARD: What I would like to know about the Northern Economic Plan, if you are wanting a question on that, is how are you going with the 15,000 jobs you promised for the economic plan, and how are those jobs rolling out? Fifteen thousand was your target. How is that target going?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for the question. The Northern Economic Plan was a partnership between councils in the north and the state government. We put in an ambition to create 15,000 additional jobs in northern Adelaide by 2025 to reach 150,000 jobs. An estimated 2,795 jobs are now projected to be created by projects that the Northern Economic Plan has oversight over that are either currently planned or underway. In addition, the NDIS is forecast to create almost 2,000 extra jobs, and it is estimated that the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme would create an additional 3,700 jobs in and around Adelaide's northern suburbs.

The growth sectors that have the most potential to provide jobs in the future of northern Adelaide include construction and urban renewal; health and ageing; agriculture, food and beverage; defence; mining services; tourism; recreation; and culture.

In addition to what I have outlined with the NDIS and the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme, other jobs are underway. The Northern Connector project is estimated to generate more than 400 jobs a year over the next four years.

Some of the longer term initiatives that have oversight under the Northern Economic Plan that will create a significant number of jobs include the Future Submarine, which I have talked about, and the Future Frigate. The Port Adelaide renewal project expects to generate 350 construction jobs per year.

There are significant jobs since we launched the Northern Economic Plan that have already been created. I have to say that I have not encountered such close and sustained working between the local government and state government in what we do as I have with the Northern Economic Plan, and I want to place on record my thanks to those councils in the north that have worked hand

in hand with the state government to make sure that we are doing everything we can across those two levels of government to support jobs in the north after the federal Liberal government decided to withdraw complete and utter support for our auto manufacturing industry, which has placed significant strain on South Australia.

Mr WINGARD: How many of these jobs that you said have been created already, have been created to this point and not anticipated? How many of those are full time?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not know the breakdown of full-time jobs and how many of those, as of today, have been created. As I have said, it is estimated that there are almost 3,000 jobs from projects under the Northern Economic Plan that are either currently planned or are already underway.

Mr WINGARD: So, you are not willing to go away and get us a breakdown of which ones have been created and which ones are still an ambition?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If that can reasonably be done, I will do it.

Mr WINGARD: How do you reasonably calculate how many jobs there are, if you cannot work that out?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It may involve an inordinate amount of time for an officer to go away and look at every single project and determine the details at a point in time, and I suspect that will change over points in time. But if it can be done—I will go away and see if it can be done.

Mr WINGARD: Is that clarifying how many are full-time jobs and how many are just part-time jobs?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If it is possible to do that, which I suspect would take a lot of time and be very difficult, I will see if it can be done. If it can be easily done, I will bring back an answer to that.

Mr WINGARD: Can I just clarify then: as part of tracking the jobs that you are creating, you are not tracking whether they are full-time or part-time jobs.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If it can be easily done, I will bring back an answer to that.

Mr WINGARD: And you are not even calculating whether or not they are being created or not. That is a fairly simple request.

The CHAIR: Hang on, member for Mitchell, the minister has endeavoured to find an answer for you, if he can.

Mr WINGARD: I know, and I am just seeking clarification. He is saying he does not keep track of whether or not these jobs have been created or not. He is claiming a number yet not saying that they have been created. It is very misleading and very confusing.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the estimate for actual jobs that have already been created between December 2015 and March 2017 is an increase of 2,900 jobs already created, which I am advised, with the aspirational target of 15,000 jobs, would place that well ahead of schedule. So, you are welcome.

Mr WINGARD: Can you break that down into which programs created which jobs? If you have those numbers, you obviously know where they have come from.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have the global number, I do not have the individual numbers. Again, if it is easily done, I will look to bring back an answer.

Mr WINGARD: And a breakdown of whether they are full-time or part-time jobs.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If it can be done easily, yes.

Mr WINGARD: If you have an estimate, it has come from somewhere.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If the figures can be easily antagonised to look at what it is, I will do that.

Mr WINGARD: That is cool. Even if it is a little bit of hard work, do not be afraid of a bit of hard work; that would not be a problem at all. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56, Minister's Accommodation, budgeted \$880,000; total cost, \$1.868 million. Can you please explain the extra million dollars spent there on minister's accommodation? Just to repeat, it is Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56, I think it is four or five from the bottom.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice for this line, and just so we are making sure that we are on the exact same page, that is where in 2016-17 the estimated result is listed at \$880,000 of a total project cost of \$1.868 million. My advice is that the reason for the difference between those two amounts is what you do not see in there is the 2015-16 budget year where much of that was expended. So, the difference between those two, I am advised, is primarily made up of the budget year previous to that that you do not see on that page being expended. It is not that there was a massive increase in doing that; it is that there was money expended in the financial year that you do not see on that page.

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate that. If I could see those figures, that would be great; if you could forward them to me and line them up. I appreciate where you are coming from. Just back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56. I mentioned before the total expenditure for DSD is \$645 million and I appreciate some of those things do not fit under your remit, as we have discussed already, but if I can, if we go through industry, innovation and science, that I know fit under yours, I am presuming the grant funding fits under that. Can you give me a year by year grant budget figure for last year, the forecast for this year and then the forecast through forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just so I understand what we are being asked to look for, that is from the areas of innovation, the areas of science—

Mr WINGARD: Yes, and industry.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and industry, what are the components that comprise grants—

Mr WINGARD: The grant budget, yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —that comes from DSD for those three areas in this year and—

Mr WINGARD: How much was spent last year just gone, how much is forecast to be spent in this financial year and then the forward estimates years as well.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice. Of course—

Mr WINGARD: If you just have some figures for now, I am happy to get those and you can collate the others afterwards.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have some information, but I am happy to take it on notice for complete information. We do not have all of them, particularly the science area, in terms of the grants. I assume you want grants, not loans—just outright grants?

Mr WINGARD: Grants, yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We will have to also—

Mr WINGARD: Or what fits under the grant budget, specifically.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have grants that are made out of the Early Commercialisation Fund or the Venture Capital Fund that is estimated. We will have to go back and make some estimates on what we might hypothetically put in over the next four years, but I am sure we can—

Mr WINGARD: Again, I am asking, specifically for industry, innovation and science, for the grant budget that is allocated. You would have allocated money last year, you will have money allocated for this year and you would have money budgeted for the forward estimates as well, so if I can get that breakdown, that would be fantastic.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, we have some of those figures, but I will take it on notice—

Mr WINGARD: Feel free to share those with the committee. It is fine; go for it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —to bring back—we have some for the grants and subsidies, so it does not quite fit your question, so I will take that on notice.

Mr WINGARD: If you would like to share the grants and subsidies—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will take it on notice to bring back a complete answer.

Mr WINGARD: —I am more than happy to hear the grants and subsidies figure, so please share it with the committee.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is straight out of the budget papers. The grants and subsidies in industry and innovation—this does not include science—for 2015-16 actual were \$14.3 million; for the 2016-17 budget, it is \$26.939 million. They are straight from the budget papers. That does not include the science area, so I will take it on notice and bring back a more complete answer.

Mr WINGARD: Are there figures there for 2017-18 as well?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For 2017-18, it is estimated at \$15 million, but as I said, I will take on notice—

Mr WINGARD: What was the decrease then between last year and this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The figure straight from that area is \$15 million for the 2017-18 budget, but I am advised that it appears that that does not include things like the \$50 million Venture Capital Fund, so some exceptionally significant investment that has been—

Mr WINGARD: Can I just clarify, in industry and innovation, there has been a cut from \$23 million in cuts and grants and subsidies to \$14.4 million from last year to this year, estimated result—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is why I will bring back an answer. If you included the \$50 million Venture Capital Fund—

Mr WINGARD: No, I do not want to include that. I just want to look at industry and innovation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is why I am going to bring back an answer because, no, I do not think that is a fair reading that for—

Mr WINGARD: The budget papers—

The CHAIR: Order, member for Mitchell!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —industry, innovation and science there has been an overall drop because it does not include everything we are doing in different areas. And just so that I can get this on the record, what that does not include is other areas of government that have had massive increases, like our \$200 million Future Jobs Fund.

I think it would be completely and utterly misleading to look at a figure in here and conclude that there has been a drop in grants that the government is making for industry in South Australia. The most significant thing we are doing is our \$200 million Future Jobs Fund which, it appears, the Liberal opposition here hates and is against. They would much prefer to give tax cuts to banks than a \$200 million Future Jobs Fund, so—

The CHAIR: Order, minister! Minister—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —I will bring back a complete answer, a much more complete—

The CHAIR: Minister!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! This is directed really at both of you. I must insist right from the start. This is informal. It is good to have a good flow of conversation, but if you speak over each other, no-one can hear what is going on and Hansard cannot record it.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4—

The CHAIR: And you are the main offender, member for Mitchell, honestly. I am trying to help you. You have 10 minutes.

Mr WINGARD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 58. If we have a look at grants and subsidies there, minister, can you confirm that the 2016-17 estimated result is \$23,841,000? That was the commitment for grants and subsidies in 2016-17, as the estimated result, \$23.841 million. Then for 2017-18, the budget is \$14.482 million. Can you confirm that, please? Yes or no is fine.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can confirm that when you look at what support we are giving to industry across government, when you look at the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund there will be a massive increase in support for industry in South Australia when you include everything that the government is doing. It would be ridiculous to conclude, from looking at that, that there is a decrease in support for industry. There is a massive increase in support for industry and job creation programs in this state, and the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund is the largest component of that. I will find out the exact amount but it will be, in the next financial year, in the order of tens of millions of dollars extra support for industry. So, no, there has not been a cut in support for industry; there will be a massive increase in support for industry.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 3, at page 4—since we are on to the Future Jobs Fund—the specific future jobs measures announced in the 2017-18 budget: at sub-point 3 it says that some of the measures identified in those points there, including the \$30 million loan component, is \$81.5 million. Is that the total value of what is described as the specific future fund measures? If you look at those four there and add them up it comes to only \$81.5 million.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for his question. It might be helpful to give an outline of the Future Jobs Fund for the sake of completeness. As we discussed a moment ago, the 2017-18 budget included \$200 million—that is \$200 million—to help drive job creation. We are backing those sectors that are growing and providing incentives for businesses to grow and invest. This is a massive investment in industry in South Australia, and that does not include the support that this government has provided for things like the steelworks in Whyalla. It is a massive support that we have given for industry right across South Australia.

The member asked about components of the Future Jobs Fund, so I am happy to talk about them. There is \$50 million in grants and \$70 million in low-interest loans specifically for job creation.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Member for Newland.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: I am happy to let the banter continue if you want to run down the clock, member for Mitchell.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The members interject about being a minister and ministerial experience. The Liberal Party has Rob Lucas as the sole person who has experience. When you hold up Rod Lucas as a shining example of what is good about you, you know you are in a lot of trouble.

There is \$50 million in grants and \$70 million in low-interest loans to businesses to support job creation. Now, there are some industry funds for you, Mr Chairman. There is \$50 million in grants and \$70 million in low-interest loans. They will target key sectors like shipbuilding and defence, renewable energy and mining, tourism, food and wine, health and biomedical research and IT and advanced manufacturing. Applications to the Department of Treasury and Finance, which is responsible for these budget lines—and I do not know if the member was involved in the Treasurer's estimates and had an opportunity to ask questions in his portfolio areas, but it is in the Treasurer's budget lines.

Applications for grants and loans close on 29 September 2017, and there is an additional \$60 million being provided to Investment Attraction South Australia. We have heard today about the great work that Investment Attraction is doing under the stewardship of minister Hamilton-Smith. There is over \$20 million in other measures to support local industries to grow. It is \$14.5 million over

four years to continue to secure major events and there is an extra \$5 million for the automotive diversification program, to help auto suppliers to diversify, and there is \$2 million to extend the I Choose SA campaign.

This \$200 million worth of measures is in addition to the \$109 million Job Accelerator Grant fund in 2016-17. We remember the Job Accelerator Grant fund because I think there was a leaked internal policy document from the Liberal Party suggesting that the Liberal Party should have a \$15 million or \$20 million jobs accelerator fund—\$15 million or \$20 million, Mr President, the Liberal Party leaking on itself. So this, in orders of magnitude, is more than a—

The CHAIR: Order! The minister will not refer to me as 'Mr President'.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr Chairman, I do apologise: I am used, when I see all this red around me, to referring to the person in the chair in that way.

The CHAIR: Perhaps the question has been answered; we might move on to another question with the five minutes remaining to us.

Mr WINGARD: Given that budget line again, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 55. On page 58 we talked about the total expenditure of grants, and on page 55 we looked at the entire expense of the Department of State Development. Under your stewardship as the minister in this space, do you think that, after 31 months of South Australia having the highest unemployment rate in the nation and sitting at the bottom of the table, the spending of those funds, given the reduction in grants for industry, will actually improve our unemployment figure in South Australia?

The CHAIR: That question is so broad that I can let the minister extrapolate.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for his question. In talking about unemployment, we saw the Hon. Rob Lucas say that we would, as we came towards the closure of Holden, have double digit unemployment in South Australia. That was the claim, that is what the Liberals predicted and, quite frankly, that is what the Liberals were hoping on us. They predict doom and misery for this state, and they rub their hands with glee if it happens. That is what they want, after their mates in Canberra closed down the auto industry.

They were hoping and cheering on double digit unemployment in this state. It is the case that we are facing a series of events, many of them out of our control, like the deliberate closure by the Liberal Party in Canberra of the auto industry—outside our control—which has contributed to exceptionally challenging areas.

We have seen other jurisdictions right around the globe, which have had reliance on manufacturing, facing such challenges. The examples are: in the US, 10.9 per cent unemployment in Indiana; 11.9 in Alabama; 11 per cent in Ohio; Kentucky, 10.9; Mississippi, 10.8; South Carolina, 11.7; Tennessee, North Carolina, Oregon, Illinois, which have been heavily reliant as a major part of their economy on auto, go over double digit figures, like the Hon. Rob Lucas predicted would happen in South Australia. That has not happened in South Australia.

With the headline unemployment rate last month of 6.6 per cent, we would have 30,000 more people unemployed in this state if we had got what the Liberal Party was wishing upon us. If it had hit double digit figures, there would be 30,000 more people unemployed in this state.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In addition to that, if you look at the long-term average in South Australia, we have a small economy. For the last 40 years South Australia's unemployment rate has been, on average, 0.8 per cent higher than the national average. That has been the case for 40 years. For a couple of generations under both Liberal and Labor governments, given the size of our economy and where we are situated in Australia, we have had 0.8 per cent, on average, unemployment above the national average.

The national average last month was sitting at 5.6 and us at 1 per cent over that. We are almost right on what we have been in comparison with the national average for over 40 years, which, given what we are facing, and the predictions of double digit unemployment, means there is a lot of

work still to do. That is why we have things like the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund, because we recognise that we want a lot more to do and we want the unemployment rate to be lower. That is what this government wants and what these programs are aimed at doing.

But, other jurisdictions around the world have faced similar problems and have fared a lot worse than South Australia. We want the unemployment rate to be lower, that is why we are putting those programs in place. I think it is instructive to look at what members of the Liberal Party predicted and wished upon us.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payment adjourned until later today.

Mr WINGARD: Are we finished for time; do we still have two minutes left or not?

The CHAIR: No, 30 seconds, according to the world atomic clock. The morning break is at 10, so the committee will suspend until a quarter past 10.

Mr WINGARD: In any event, I do not think we were going to get any more answers; it was clearly evident that the minister was dodging all the answers today, but we will try again after 10.15.

Sitting suspended from 10:00 to 10:17.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Duffy, Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Ms A. Reid, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Mr A. Reid, Executive Director, Department of State Development.

Mr R. Janssan, Executive Director, Strategy and Business Services, Department of State Development.

Ms G. Elston, Director, Policy and Economic Transformation, Department of State Development.

Ms P. Chau, Director, Performance and Governance, Department of State Development.

Mr P. Goiak, Director, Industry Development, Department of State Development.

Mr A. Christie, Ministerial Adviser.

The CHAIR: I welcome the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. We will just check the timetable before we go on. The agreed timetable is 10.15 to 11.45, Manufacturing and Innovation, and then 11.45 to 12.15, Automotive Transformation. Is that still the agreed timetable, member for Mitchell?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The CHAIR: Excellent. We are continuing with the Department of State Development, and administered items for that department. I now call the minister to introduce any new advisers he has with him.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have just had a couple of folk change round. Again, Mark Duffy is to my left, and now on my further left is Alex Reid, Deputy Chief Executive. On my right is Adam Reid, Executive Director of Industry, Innovation, Science and Small Business in the Department of State Development. The changes behind me include Georgette Elston from the Department of State Development, Paul Goiak and Andrew Christie. Rick Janssan stays there.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Do you have an opening statement?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, not really.

The CHAIR: The member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: I am sure we will get some waffle. I refer to Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 58. We see total expenses for budget 2017-18 is \$33,797,000, down from an estimated figure of \$52,947,000, quite a large reduction in industry and innovation. My question to the minister is: of that \$33 million, the reduced figure, how much will be allocated to the Manufacturing Works Program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that, of that amount, there is \$1.4 million which comprises Manufacturing Works, which as the member would be aware was launched in October 2012 as a 10-year strategy to accelerate transition towards higher value manufacturing activities. Importantly, again as we talked about before the break, there is now a \$200 million Future Jobs Fund, which is providing grants and loans in many areas that include manufacturers.

In addition to that, there are many, many other areas that we talked about before the break in terms of the Early Commercialisation and the Venture Capital funds, that are also supporting new ideas and that have and certainly will include manufacturing processes in South Australia. In addition to that, there is the work that has been done and continues to be done with additional funding for automotive supplier diversification.

Mr WINGARD: Can the minister give us a figure on how much has been spent on Manufacturing Works to date, and then how much is forecast to be spent on Manufacturing Works—just to repeat the figure for next financial year and the forward estimates years beyond that—given that it is a 10-year program that was put in place?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In 2012, as I said, when Manufacturing Works was launched, there was a budget of \$11.1 million. In 2014, there was an additional amount of funding: \$8.65 million was provided on top of the original allocation to Manufacturing Works. Manufacturing Works has a number of components, including business transformation vouchers, industry roadmaps, innovation vouchers, business model innovation programs, manufacturing technology accelerated programs, advancement manufacturing to do with photonics. As I have said before, for the financial year in the 2017-18 budget it is \$1.4 million allocated to Manufacturing Works.

Of course, as I answered in the previous question, there are a whole range of initiatives, from the \$10 million early stage commercialisation fund, the \$50 million Venture Capital Fund, the extra \$5 million for auto supplier diversification and, of course, on top of all of that is the very, very big one, the \$200 million from the Future Jobs Fund, which will support industry in South Australia. One of the components of the Future Jobs Fund talks about advanced manufacturing, so in addition to that initial \$11.1 million and the additional \$8.65 million we are talking many, many millions more to support manufacturing in south Australia.

Mr WINGARD: Can I confirm Manufacturing Works will have no more funds allocated to it beyond the \$1.4 million finishing off—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Like a lot of budget programs, that was the allocation. There is \$1.4 million in—

Mr WINGARD: So, it will be wound up?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —this next year, and that is, in the current budget cycle, all that has been allocated. Of course, well over on top of that is the \$60 million between the early stage commercialisation and the VC fund, as well as the \$200 million from the Future Jobs Fund, including the \$5 million extra for auto supplier diversification.

Mr WINGARD: So, \$20 million was spent on Manufacturing Works in the first four years; there are six years remaining in the program, and you do not have any money allocated to that. So, it would have probably been more like \$30 million that was expected to be spent on that to keep the roll-out of that program going, and that has been axed now; is that correct?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, that is not at all true that it has been axed.

Mr WINGARD: So, there is no more money.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think that is a fundamental misunderstanding of how budgeting and budget cycles work, to suggest that because there is a program that has allocations during years, that once a program's years are allocated, that is being axed. That is what it is budgeted for. It is not

like there was a program that was expected to be ongoing forever in exactly the same way and all of a sudden it stopped. This is what the budget papers have said is to be allocated going forward, since the program was initiated. It was deliberately timed and deliberately time-limited. They were not intended to be programs in perpetuity. It was recognising that we are going through a very significant period of transition in South Australia.

The Manufacturing Works strategy has now entered the five to 10-year stage where support for innovative manufacturing firms is becoming very targeted. Particularly through the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program there is extra money provided to that, but there are other areas where we have significantly increased, and as a result of some of the areas, Manufacturing Works has told us of areas that have been going well that we are targeting for: the advanced manufacturing and other high-tech initiatives and growth through the early stage commercialisation fund, the Venture Capital Fund and now, of course, the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund is a massive increase in support for manufacturing in this state.

Mr WINGARD: Just to clarify, given this was a 10-year project, it has run for four, you have \$1.4 million left in residual funds to pay out on Manufacturing Works and no more money allocated for this Manufacturing Works Program, can we presume that this has been closed down in lieu of something else?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The \$200 million Future Jobs Fund.

Mr WINGARD: But Manufacturing Works is closing down, can you confirm that, please?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The budget allocation for Manufacturing Works, as it has been the year before and the year before that, was quite deliberately for a time-limited time—

Mr WINGARD: For 10 years?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —intensively going—

Mr WINGARD: For 10 years; it is a 10-year program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is a 10-year strategy, yes. The funding for specific—

Mr WINGARD: Was only for four.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The funding for specific programs, as has been outlined in last year's budget and the year before that, and in 2014 with the significant extra investment in it, was deliberately timed, as part of the strategy, to provide funding with that transition. As I have said, we are seeing a very significant increase in the amount of funds available to manufacturers and high-tech companies in South Australia through a whole range of initiatives: the \$60 million, that is in my portfolio areas, but very significantly the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund, and that is on top of the Jobs Accelerator Fund: the \$109 million that manufacturers right throughout South Australia can use. Yes, we have seen a massive increase in the support that is available for manufacturers and that is in this year's budget.

Mr WINGARD: So, clearly we can see where this money has come from now, given that this 10-year project is going to finish early—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, no, no. The strategy—

Mr WINGARD: No, I am just about to ask the question—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The strategy continues. Funding for very specific programs is now—

Mr WINGARD: It is a 10-year project—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —much, much greater—

Mr WINGARD: It is a 10-year strategy—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —than it has been in the past.

Mr WINGARD: —and you have just shortened it to four.

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr WINGARD: If I could ask my question, please.

The CHAIR: You can have a question, but you cannot make a statement and then not expect the minister to respond so—

Mr WINGARD: If I could ask my question, please, Chair, that would be fantastic.

The CHAIR: —ask a question.

Mr WINGARD: Given that you have stopped the Manufacturing Works strategy, have you given up on the Manufacturing Works strategy?

The CHAIR: That is a very broad question. I will expect the minister to answer it fulsomely.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to go for the next hour going round and round in circles on this. I have nowhere else to be. The strategy was a 10-year strategy, the funding was profiled as it was in the last budget for those first five years, the strategy continues and the funding that is available now for manufacturers is much greater than it has been in the past.

Mr WINGARD: In that budget line figure on page 58 that we talked about before, the \$52 million that was spent last year, we know the Frost and Sullivan report was done into Manufacturing Works as the first review of that and then you had a new review done. How much of that \$52 million was spent on the second review of the Manufacturing Works Program that was only four years old?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Regarding one of your questions, I think EconSearch is the company that is conducting the current review. Your question is: how much, specifically, did that second EconSearch review cost? The exact amount of that cost would be reasonably easy to find out. We do not have it at our fingertips, but are happy to take it on notice and come back with the cost of that EconSearch review, which I understand is in its final stages now.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you very much. I refer again to page 58, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Program 1: Industry and Innovation. I am just trying to find my way through this. It is now titled Industry and Innovation. In last year's budget paper it was titled Manufacturing and Innovation. Have you given up on manufacturing? It has now gone out of the title of one of your sub-programs.

The CHAIR: To ask the minister if he has given up on manufacturing really opens it up, member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: I am happy with that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We certainly have not given up on manufacturing. As I have stated, there are now more funds than ever before available to manufacturers to help them in this state. Let us have a look at why we are where we are now, in terms of South Australia. For many, many decades, manufacturing in South Australia, particularly automotive manufacturing, was a bipartisan enterprise. For over half a century we had made cars in South Australia and we had been very, very good at it. We are currently one of only 13 countries around the world that can make a car from sketchpad to showroom—from the design of the car, all the way through to rolling off the production line. It is an exceptionally advanced process that, as I said, only 13 countries around the world are able to do.

Thanks to the federal Liberal Party, that is coming to an end in South Australia. So, I am not going to have a loaded question asked about whether we support manufacturing. There is one party in Australia that supports manufacturing and there is one party that does not support manufacturing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There is one party that does not support manufacturing. Anyone whom I have talked to who was in the room before the 2013 election has agreed: it was the Liberal Party that went to that election with no commitment to manufacturing. If the Labor Party had won that federal election it would have kept the support for manufacturing and we would not be where we are now. We are here because of a Liberal Party ideology that does not want to support industry.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That is untrue; that is just rubbish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr Chair, look at some of the policy differences at a state level. Do I support manufacturing? Let us have a look at the support—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, no, hang on, minister. Your question, member for Mitchell, was: has the minister given up on manufacturing?

Mr WINGARD: It is nothing that the federal government has—

The CHAIR: Well, he is contextualising. That is a pretty broad question. I will listen to his answer carefully, but he is contextualising.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Look at some of the policies of the Liberal Party at a state level, who want to introduce a state-based productivity commission. We have seen what the federal Productivity Commission recommended: they recommended the complete withdrawal of subsidies for the auto industry, which was a policy then adopted by the federal Liberal Party—a Liberal Party policy. When Joe Hockey, three and half years ago, stood up in parliament and dared Holden to leave the country, that is exactly what they did the very next day. So, do we support manufacturing? Yes, we do. What we do not support is chasing important industries out of this state.

It has been left to this state Labor government to pick up the pieces left by the Liberals' mates in Canberra, who are the ones who do not support manufacturing. In contrast, we have made a massive investment into the funds available to manufacturers. We will continue to support manufacturers and continue to support the workers who work in that industry.

Mr WINGARD: Again, I note that the minister has shut down the Manufacturing Works Program. With that, I would like to have a look at Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 58 again: the decrease in the \$52 million spent last year for industry and innovation. It is a notable decrease from \$52 million down to \$33 million. It is a sizeable decrease in the investment in this program, and it must be noted. I want to know: with that \$52 million spent in 2016-17, as opposed to the measly \$33 million that the minister is talking about for 2017-18, in which one of those years was the Premier's innovation strategy put together, and how much did it cost to put together the innovation strategy? Or has it not been delivered yet, as was promised in August 2016?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am very pleased to talk about the innovation strategy. We had a very good look at where this state was going and what sort of jobs would be in the future. We recognised that high-tech industries were going to be exceptionally important for South Australia. As a response to that—and I am happy to bring back the figures; I do not have them immediately to hand—we engaged Alistair McCreadie from RedFire Consulting to do a substantial review of what was needed in South Australia.

As a result of that review, we made the single biggest investment we have seen in the history of this state in the innovation space—the single biggest investment. Not this year's but last year's budget saw almost \$80 million of new funding in the innovation area. It included \$50 million for a state-backed venture capital fund. Only in recent weeks, we announced Blue Sky as the managers of that venture capital fund. That fund will invest in companies that have the ability to be very high-growing, world-class companies in South Australia.

The terms of the investment will be that any investment from the \$50 million of state government funds in the VC fund will need to be matched by private sector equity. That means we will be exposing private sector VC equity funds to South Australia, but it also means we will be doubling that investment as other fund managers bring in extra investment through that private sector equity. That is \$50 million in last year's budget to support innovation as a result of looking at what this state needs and our support for innovation.

It also included \$10 million for the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund. That fund has been set up to provide very early stage companies the opportunity to receive grant funding with co-investment from the company. We opened that up in November or December last year. Upon its opening, I am advised there were around 200 expressions of interest. As soon as it opened, it showed great demand for this early stage funding for some extraordinary ideas from South Australia. I am

advised there were almost 300 expressions of interest for that South Australian early stage commercialisation fund, and there are almost 30 projects that have—

Mr WINGARD: Point of order: the question was specifically about—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Do we support innovation? Yes, I am telling you—

Mr WINGARD: That was not the question. You do not even listen anymore. Listen to the question. How much of that money was allocated to coming up with the innovation strategy? You went on to the RedFire report, which actually points out there should be an innovation strategy.

The CHAIR: Member for Mitchell, that was your question, but it was contextualised by some commentary about the changing of the budget, which the minister is addressing, from year to year, from 2015-16 to 2017-18.

Mr WINGARD: And I asked which year was it in? Was it in that year or was it in that year?

The CHAIR: You did not just ask that. You contextualised it. You made commentary about the changing numbers. I would ask the minister to come to the party.

Mr WINGARD: The innovation strategy, when are you actually putting it out?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The cost for that RedFire report, I do not—

Mr WINGARD: No, not the RedFire report, the actual innovation strategy. When are you putting out the Premier's innovation strategy, as was promised in August 2016?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have put out an innovation strategy. We have done it in a number of different forms.

Mr WINGARD: Is there an innovation strategy, as outlined in the RedFire report?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Absolutely; we have put out our innovation strategy. After this, I will supply material to the honourable member to educate him about what the government has been doing. I am very happy to do that.

Mr WINGARD: There is request for, and the Premier has said he will put out, an innovation strategy. There is no one innovation strategy.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, we have done that. I cannot remember the exact date we did that, but we put out our innovation strategy. The innovation strategy and the innovation statement we released included many of the things I have talked about, and I am happy to talk about—

Mr WINGARD: So, was it an innovation statement or an innovation strategy? Which one was it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The statement informs the strategy that the government is working on. We put out an innovation statement that contained our strategy. I am happy to supply the member with that later on. I think it stands in stark contrast to the policy vacuum—

Mr WINGARD: So, it was an innovation statement and not a strategy. I am just going through the RedFire report and what they ask for.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —we see from the Liberals in terms of, really, anything.

The CHAIR: Can I remind you, particularly the member for Mitchell, not to talk over the minister. As much as you might disagree, you can raise a point of order, but talking over each other is just counterproductive and wastes everybody's time. Next question.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. I will wait for that innovation strategy.

The CHAIR: You might want to ask a question. You can wait for whatever you like, but you might want to ask a question.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you very much. I will do that. Just a clarification on one of the points the minister was just talking about, regarding the Venture Capital Fund, the Early Commercialisation Fund and the Rapid Commercialisation Initiative. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 64, the 2016-17

estimated result and the 2015-16 actual result. Did the \$2.5 million to establish the Early Commercialisation Fund include the \$600,000 to establish the Rapid Commercialisation Initiative?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, they are two different things.

Mr WINGARD: So, \$600,000 on top of the \$2.5 million?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes.

Mr WINGARD: How many grants have been allocated from the \$50 million Venture Capital Fund that you talked about?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I explained before, and I was hoping the member might have been listening to the answer, the fund manager was appointed in the last few weeks, so there has not been a grant from the Venture Capital Fund. It would be a peculiar thing to start making grants before you appointed a fund manager. That is certainly not how we choose to run government, to make grants from a fund before you have someone to manage the fund. It is not often the way it is done. What I said before probably answered that question, I expect.

Mr WINGARD: Can I clarify that no money has been spent from the Venture Capital Fund yet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No grants or investments have been made from the Venture Capital Fund—

Mr WINGARD: So, zero, thank you.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —which would be expected if you just—

Mr WINGARD: Zero is fine.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —appointed a fund manager. I am not sure what the suggestion is that you would start putting grants out before you put a fund manager in place.

Mr WINGARD: I know how long it took you—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I am happy to sit down with the member afterwards—

Mr WINGARD: —to appoint the fund manager.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and explain how venture capital works and the necessity for the running of it. I understand he has not been here a long time and very few of them have ministerial experience, but to suggest that you would start making grants from a fund before you have a fund manager is an extraordinarily silly proposition.

Mr WINGARD: Is there a link between the Venture Capital Fund and—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I should not have used the member's terminology. The nature of venture capital is that they are not grants, they are investments in companies for which you take an equity stake. When you talk about venture capital, almost by its definition, one does not talk about grants, one talks about investments.

Mr WINGARD: A rookie mistake from the minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: You are welcome.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: He is the minister. I am asking the questions and if he cannot get it right, it is not my fault. The Early Commercialisation Fund stages 1, 2 and 3 is a lead-in to the Venture Capital Fund. How many are at stage 3 ready to go for the Venture Capital Fund? Will they be given grants?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is a very good question and I am happy to talk about the early stage commercialisation fund and to contextualise where we are with it now, which will provide a good context about where we will be going with the third stage and the lead-in, as he said, to the Venture Capital Fund. Funds provide grants and assistance to innovative high-growth ventures with national and global potential. Up to a maximum of \$500,000 is available to each project, with

matching funding required. It is a competitive program administered by TechInSA, with support from DSD.

As at 30 June 2017, I am advised that TechInSA has received 259 expressions of interest, which I understand is more now as we move past 30 June, for funding through the South Australian early stage commercialisation fund. I am advised that matching funding has been provided to applicants in the order of \$2.1 million, and that there have been 27 grants to 26 companies made already.

The reason you might see more grants than companies is that it is a deliberately staggered fund, where an initial grant of up to \$50,000 can be applied for for very, very early stage; then upon meeting agreed KPIs, there is the possibility of stage 2, \$150,000; and then at the final stage of the Early Commercialisation Fund, \$300,000. As I have said, it is possible that companies can receive the total of a full half a million dollars from the early stage commercialisation fund. It is anticipated that in due course the Venture Capital Fund may look to invest in some of the companies that have come through the early stage commercialisation fund.

That is not to say either that all companies will progress at stage 1, the \$50,000. There may well be companies who access at stage 2 or even stage 3. I am advised that 21 companies began accessing funds at the phase 1 program since this launched at the end of last year. Six companies have begun accessing funds out of phase 2 and there are five companies that, have agreement from the selection panel at TechInSA to access funds from phase 3 when they reach those certain milestones.

As you would expect, with a fund that has now been running for six months, we will see companies progress, and I am sure we will see companies that enter at stage 1 and get through the three stages. With the fund managers from the commercialisation fund having a good visibility of those companies that are coming through South Australia, you would naturally expect that there would be some investments in due course from the Venture Capital Fund to companies that have either come from stage 1 right through the three stages or indeed, for the Early Commercialisation Fund, have come in at stage 2 or 3.

Mr WINGARD: I confirm that no-one is at stage 3, from your answer. Thank you for that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, there are five companies that have been approved—

Mr WINGARD: I am just confirming—there are none.

The CHAIR: Let the minister answer the question. You asked a question. Let the minister answer it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There are five companies that have already been approved for stage 3 once they meet milestones.

Mr WINGARD: So, none—okay.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There have been five companies that have been approved for stage 3.

Mr WINGARD: Why was there a delay—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We can keep going back and forth and see who has the last word. I am happy to do that.

Mr WINGARD: —in the appointment of the Venture Capital Fund manager?

The CHAIR: Order! Member for Mitchell, you will not speak over the minister. The minister has a right to answer a question.

Mr WINGARD: My following questions are: why was there a delay in the appointment of the Venture Capital Fund manager? What were the costs associated with the implementation of the Venture Capital Fund manager and were these costs budgeted for?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: To be clear, the question is: how much money was used in the processes to advertise, recruit and appoint the Venture Capital Fund manager?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice. I do not have an exact amount.

Mr WINGARD: The other question was: why was there a delay?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can actually give an answer. I am advised that there was a budget of \$434,000 for the tender process including evaluation, panel expenses, obtaining advice from specialist consultants to inform the tender and evaluation process and negotiation of the investment managers. Of the \$434,000 that was budgeted, I am advised that approximately \$300,000 has been spent on that process. In terms of why we have three weeks ago appointed the fund manager, the reason these things take more than a few weeks is that we want to get it right.

There was extensive interest, both domestically and from overseas, from venture capital firms and fund managers and individuals once we put out the tender documents. We went through an exhaustive process, with an evaluation panel shortlisting, having specialist consultants do due diligence and undertaking complex negotiations to make sure that we are getting the best possible deal for South Australia in how this fund is managed. I am exceptionally pleased that we have gone through extensive processes and we have had the best possible people who might be interested from right around the world put in tenders for the management of the Venture Capital Fund and we have appointed venture capital managers.

Mr WINGARD: How many applications were received and how many applicants were from South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am informed that 12 expressions were received for the management of the Venture Capital Fund. Blue Sky, which came out the other side of the tender and evaluation process as the preferred fund manager, already has an office in Adelaide that they are expanding as a result of winning this tender.

Mr WINGARD: How many were from South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am informed that there were four that had a South Australian presence—four out of the 12 had a South Australian presence. As I said, Blue Sky already has a South Australian presence which will be expanded as a result of the awarding of this tender.

Mr WINGARD: How many people were Blue Sky employing in South Australia before they lodged this tender?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can take that on notice and find the figure. I do not have with me the exact number that were employed before this tender. I know that number exists and I think there is also an estimate of how many we employed here as a result of this tender. I am happy to take the question on notice and find those answers.

Mr WINGARD: Just confirming: are you saying they had an office here before it went to tender for Blue Sky?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, they had a presence here. I said I would take the question on notice but I am happy to provide an answer right now. I am advised that it was in the order of 10 staff that Blue Sky had already employed in Adelaide and that will increase as a result of this tender.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. If I can turn your attention to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 59, program description-objective, Sub-program 1.1: Industry Development. Given that this is a new sub-program, where has this money come from?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that this is not new money; this is just a difference in the headings in this year's budget papers. What you are now talking about consists of three sub-programs of industry development, automotive transformation and innovation and commercialisation, described there as industry development. This is not money that is new or has been cut, this is a different way to describe things that are made up of separate sub-programs.

Mr WINGARD: This sub-program was not reported in last year's budget but it was in this year's budget. What was the reason for it, just to explain why that was peeled out?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the way it is described is that the words that are used in the heading of the budget papers have changed to improve reporting and alignment with internal structures of DSD. So, the programs that lay under them have not changed because of the change of heading; these are the new words at the top to describe what the DSD does in better alignment with structures within DSD.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 58, Program Summary. This year's budget shows that the 2016-17 budget FTEs for the same program was 64. Can you explain why in budgeted FTEs in last year's budget paper, the same program for 2016-17 on page 60, was 53? Why is there a discrepancy here in FTEs? The estimated result for FTEs in 2016-17 as shown in this year's budget is 88, so there is an increase of 24 on that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just to get the question clear: in the last part of it you said the estimated result for 2016-17 is 88, and that is down the bottom of page 58?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: And your question is: why is that up from the budgeted 64?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What was the 58 figure?

Mr WINGARD: The 53 figure was from what it was budgeted for in last year's budget papers. It was 53 in last year's budget papers and then that changed to 64 in this year's budget papers, so there is a discrepancy between the two years, but fundamentally it has gone to 88, which is 24.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the figure in the 50s to 64 was a realignment of science programs within DSD to come into this section. I am advised that the increase you see (the 64 to the figure in the 80s) is an increase due to a 10 FTE increase to support industry sectors, including development strategies for healthy ageing, disability and defence. A lot of those sit within DSD but are not within my direct portfolio, they are obviously with Defence or Disabilities. There are three FTEs for an increase in corporate support and then recognising unassigned staff during that year.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. And then the reduction in budgeted numbers from 88 to 78, from where will those reductions come?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that as part of the allocation I talked about, part of the increase was a recognition of unassigned staff. That is anticipated to reduce those eight, and the other two for contract positions ending.

Mr WINGARD: Can you explain 'unassigned staff'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that these are staff who had once-off budget allocations that have come to an end.

Mr WINGARD: So, contract staff, is what you are saying?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Not necessarily. These are staff who have not been budgeted for but have been needed for specific roles that have come to an end in that year, I am advised.

Mr WINGARD: And they will be terminated once their roles have finished, or what happens there?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that a number of those, it is anticipated, will be placed in funded positions, but possibly not within the particular area described at page 58 of the budget.

Mr WINGARD: So, to be reallocated amongst—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, DSD or elsewhere, some of those may well be.

Mr WINGARD: Sub-program 1.3: Innovation and Commercialisation, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 64, refers to the Rapid Commercialisation Initiative. How many commercialisation experts have been appointed as part of the Rapid Commercialisation Initiative?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the Rapid Commercialisation Initiative is run by a company called Availia, who draw on a wide range of expertise from other areas. I do not have figures in terms of the number of other experts they have drawn upon, but I am happy to see whether it can be found and bring back an answer to the range of expertise that I am advised are used in that particular program.

Mr WINGARD: You may want to take this on notice as well, potentially: what is the process for appointing these experts and how much have they been paid?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on board. It is, again, a process of good government to make sure expertise from a wide range of areas is being used, but I am happy to find out the amount of outside expertise that company is using in administering that program.

Mr WINGARD: If I can add these questions also—if you want to answer any please feel free or take them on notice: have they signed four-year contracts; how many research organisations/universities have been engaged; and, how many start-up companies have been created?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have a bit of information, and if there is anything I do not answer as part of that, I am happy to take it on notice and go away. I am advised that, as part of that initiative, the three universities have been engaged with the Defence Science and Technology Group, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, the South Australian Research and Development Institute, TechInSA, and other representative bodies like the Grains Research and Development Corporation. I am advised that, to date, this initiative has led to the establishment of five start-up companies, which is ahead of the first year target of three start-up companies.

Mr WINGARD: Looking at the performance indicators, and given that last response, on page 65 of that same budget paper, under TechInSA—Industry Development, 'No. of new companies created', the estimated result is 17. What do you have to do to have technically started up a company? Do you just have to register an ABN? What do you need to do to start up a company?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take on notice what, in this particular context, is described as a start-up company. I do not have that information with me, but I am happy to take it away and bring back an answer as to what is the exact definition used in relation to that part of the budget paper on page 65.

Mr WINGARD: If you could also follow it up with the second part, which is 'No. of projects assisted', relative to how many jobs are then created from that, that would be greatly appreciated.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For the record, I am happy to take that question on notice as well and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. Likewise, under Activity indicators, the estimated result for 'Support entrepreneurship activity in South Australia, No. of companies assisted under the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund', you have 26 and projecting 50. The figure before was \$2.1 million, which was what was spent on the Early Commercialisation Fund to date of the \$2.5 million, I think, that is allocated. How many full-time jobs were created out of the spend of that \$2.1 million?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I think I might have an answer off the top of my head. No, I will not do that. I was going to say 70 something, but that is an exceptionally dangerous thing, so I will not say off the top of my head. I will have staff and departmental folk frowning if I do that. I do not have that in front of me, the number of jobs expected from out of those 26 companies that have received grants so far, but there is a number that exists in terms of what jobs the companies project from those activities.

Off the top of my head, I thought it was possibly 70 something jobs, but I am happy to go away and find out what are the figures reported from companies. This is a difficult thing to do. The whole point of this is that it is very early stage, but there is a figure about what companies themselves are predicting, and I am happy to go away and find out that answer. I will also be interested to see how wide of the mark I am with my 70 something.

Mr WINGARD: So, you do not know the number?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have just checked. We do not have that with us now. I know that there is that self-reported number from companies that have availed themselves of these, and I am happy to go away and find that.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. If we look at activity indicators on the bottom of page 65, Support entrepreneurship activity in South Australia. As I mentioned, the estimated result is 26 for this year; the projection is 50. From my recollection, the allocation of funds was \$2.5 million over the two years—\$2.5 million last year and \$2.5 million this year—so you are investing the same amount of money into the program, yet you are expecting the projection to go up to double?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: One of the reasons for that estimated result is, as I described earlier, that this only opened in either November or December last year for expressions of interest, so that estimated result for 2016-17 is half a financial year as a result, which largely describes why we are expecting more in the next year.

Mr WINGARD: I take that point on board. Thank you for that answer, but given that, you have budgeted the same amount of money for both years. You have spent \$2.1 million in half a year is what you are saying and the budget for the full year is \$2.5 million, so you have fundamentally overspent in the first year.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The other major contributing factor is that the old BioSA, now TechInSA, had their own grants program, which has been added to the early stage commercialisation, so although the early stage commercialisation fund had a \$10 million budget over four years, when that is combined with what TechInSA already had in their grants program, it is not quite double but it is almost double the amount that is available for these early stage commercialisation grants. So, in effect, the \$10 million for the early stage commercialisation fund has been added to by some of the work that the old BioSA, now TechInSA, is already doing as well.

Mr WINGARD: I understand. So, the early commercialisation grant was \$2.5 million a year over four years, and you are saying some extra funds were added in. Could you give me a breakdown of what the budget line is then, year on year, for those?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In addition to the \$2.5 million a year that a year ago the budget put in for the early stage commercialisation fund, it is approximately \$2 million a year of grant funding from TechInSA that is added to that to make it a bit over \$4 million a year now that will be available for that program.

Mr WINGARD: Again, just for clarification: so 2016-17, was there the over \$4 million available?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, but on a pro rata basis for those six months, is my advice. My advice is that that is why there is the \$2.1 million, because it was for half a year. When you combine the \$10 million of new funding, which gives you \$2.5 million a year, with the existing TechInSA grants program of about \$2 million a year, it provides you with approximately \$4.5 million a year, which is why I am advised that half-a-year result is that approximately \$2.1 million.

Mr WINGARD: Right. So, the money is still all there, rolling forward; it is just that we have calculated this over half a year from when it first started. It started at a half-year mark.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, that half a year is expended as approximately half of that funding—

Mr WINGARD: And given that there is a conglomerate of funds here, does that program have a new name? Is it going to have a new name? I mean, it is the early commercialisation—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, the old grants program from TechInSA has been rolled into the early stage commercialisation fund.

Mr WINGARD: Was that old program budgeted across the full four years of the new one?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that that is the case, yes.

Mr WINGARD: So, they will run concurrently?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, so instead of \$2.5 million a year that will be in the order of \$4 million a year.

Mr WINGARD: So, the growth in that fund has come from an old fund supplementing it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: An existing program has supplemented that fund—

Mr WINGARD: For sure.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —to give it increased scale and increased effectiveness in South Australia.

Mr WINGARD: You mentioned the relaunch of TechInSA. How much money was spent on doing that—changing the name from BioSA, I think is what it was called before it went bad?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is, and this is not an exact accounting term, a very small amount of money, but the exact smallness of the amount I am happy to take on notice and bring back an answer to that.

Mr WINGARD: How much was spent on the NanoConnect program, when will that program expire and what is the funding across forward estimates for that one, please?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The budgeted funding for NanoConnect was in the 2014-15 financial year; there was an element of the \$250,000. I do not have the exact amount that was carried over from that year into the next financial year but I am happy to find it, but projects under that program are still running—the university using internal resources. That is often the way with a number of these industry and university collaborations. Government funds or industry clusters, for that matter, are deliberately designed to be seed funding from government, and if it is a successful program either industry or the university taking over that program, taking over funding. Certainly, I am advised, with the NanoConnect funding, which money has already been expended by government, that the projects are now being funded by the university.

Mr WINGARD: Do you have a number for how many jobs were created by the seven companies that received assistance through that program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have figures with me now, but if there are figures available I am happy to go away and see if they can be provided.

Mr WINGARD: How much money was spent on the Medical Devices Partnering Program, when does this program end and how much has been allocated in the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Medical Devices Partnering Program was initially funded through Manufacturing Works. It now sits within government with the health minister, but I do have some information I can provide on the Medical Device Partnering Program. It is led by Flinders University and had a total budget of \$1 million over four years from 1 July 2013. As I have said, many of these programs are seed funding when it comes to programs that we fund with university or with industry groups, so that initial seed funding was budgeted to end 30 June 2017. The government has extended that program by a further \$200,000 until 30 June 2018, I am advised.

Mr WINGARD: The allocation of funds for the Advanced Manufacturing Council, I am led to believe, was \$6.7 million through 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16. Has that program finished or is there more money for that program in this year's budget?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Advanced Manufacturing Council, as part of the review of boards and committees a year or two ago, was wound up and the functions that the Advanced Manufacturing Council used to perform are now conducted by the EDB and the forward funds that were for the Advanced Manufacturing Council were transferred to the EDB to do that work.

Mr WINGARD: Can I confirm that that is an ongoing cost or—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There is no further budget for it and it is now one of the things that the EDB does as part of its work.

Mr WINGARD: So, it is finished from your budget, that council has gone?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is right.

Mr WINGARD: I think \$80,000 was given to the building Design Confidence in 2012-13, 2013-14. Confirming that there was no money for that in last year's budget or going forward for this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What budget line from the budget are you talking about?

Mr WINGARD: Just in general revenue.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Which particular budget line are you referring to—

Mr WINGARD: Page 58.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —to help us look for it in our budget papers.

Mr WINGARD: It is one of the sub-programs of Industry and Innovation. Under the general revenue there was \$52,900,000 spent last year and \$33 million budgeted for next year. I want to know whether any of that allocation is for this program.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the programs will be run by the Building Design Competence Pilot program for the 2017-18 budget year. It is now known that the programs are run under the SME Innovation Capacity Program, which has a budget of \$70,000 in the 2017-18 financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Just for clarification, has that now moved to the small business minister?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, it still sits with my area, the DSD, but the services that were provided under that program are now provided, as I said, under the SME Innovation Capacity Program, which this year has a budget of \$70,000, I am advised.

Mr WINGARD: Was there money for that last year as well?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there was a smaller budget allocation in the last year to provide the same capacity to industry.

Mr WINGARD: Under that \$52 million last year and \$33 million this year, the Business Model Innovation program has funding for 2012-13 and 2013-14, but was there any funding last year and this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That follows on very well from your last question. I am advised that the SME Innovation Capacity Program also captures the service that will be provided by that.

Mr WINGARD: Can I ask the reverse question: are there any others that go into that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised they are the two main programs that are provided by the SME Innovation Capacity Program.

Mr WINGARD: The Future Industries Institute had \$1.4 million in 2014-15, \$1.5 million in 2016-17, \$3 million for 2017-18 and \$3 million, again, for 2018-19. I am confirming that that is within the scope of the industry and innovation budget and whether any more has been committed through forward estimates.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is in the scope of my areas within DSD. While people are looking to confirm exact figures, I can advise that it was, I think, a bit over \$7 million that was a part of the record almost \$80 million investment in the last budget for innovation. Seven and a half million dollars was allocated to the Future Industries Institute, which brought together a number of different schools doing innovative research at the University of South Australia, and also the application and commercialisation of that research. I visited the Future Industries Institute a number of times and had a look at some of the exceptionally interesting work they are doing.

I think the Prime Minister's science award for innovation last year went to one of the researchers there—I cannot remember the researcher's name—doing research in terms of materials for codings. Some of the work the member would be aware of is that being done in collaboration with companies like SMR in new coatings for mirrors that have been exported to put on trucks for Ford all around the world. It is quite a remarkable program that has been set up to bring those researchers and those in industry much closer.

If you visit the Future Industries Institute at Mawson Lakes, you will see people walking around wearing shirts from companies. It brings scientists and researchers from industry into the university setting, but also brings university researchers into the industry setting. This transition into high-tech and advanced manufacturing industries is something the government was very keen to support.

What I have been told is that it is allowing companies to do that very detailed, fine-grained, small-scale research that they do not have the capacity to do, working with the university. It is also allowing university researchers to do things with companies at a scale that they cannot do at universities. That is a \$7½ million investment by the government in conjunction with the University of South Australia from last year's budget.

Mr WINGARD: Just confirming, that \$7½ million will finish at the end of 2018-19?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is correct. That is a \$7½ million investment over those years to finish that financial year. As I have said, it is something that not just our government but governments regularly do in terms of program funding to help an initiative, a cluster or a program set up, with help with seed funding or to help with initial funding to kickstart it, to accelerate it at a much greater rate than it otherwise would. That is why, over those years ending in 2018-19, a budget has been provided to help the University of South Australia realise its potential through the Future Industries Institute with commercialisation.

Mr WINGARD: Has any money been already allocated for this financial year and/or any in the forward estimates for 2018-19?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For the Future Industries Institute?

Mr WINGARD: As in, to any specific people, or is that just decided through the universities, you do not have a hand in that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that, under the contract we have with the university for our funding for the Future Industries Institute, that money that has been allocated has been paid to the university and been spent.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic; thank you for that. The ICT Roadmap for Minerals and Energy Resources Project is another manufacturing project here. Can you just explain again whether any money for that was spent last year or forecast to be spent next year in that \$52 million, \$33 million budget spend for this program, given, I presume, industry development fits under the whole—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Can you just—

Mr WINGARD: Sorry; it is the ICT Roadmap for Minerals and Energy Resources Project. It is administered by the Department of State Development under Manufacturing.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that is a component of the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence, whose total budget for the 2016-17 financial year was \$1.9 million; that one being a sub-program of that. I do not have the exact information, but I am happy to take that on notice. The question is: has that money written against the program been spent in that way?

Mr WINGARD: How it has been spent and whether it is a finished program.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As a sub-program of that program, I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: Manufacturing services series is another one. Again, if I look back to 2012-13, 2013-14, there was, I think, 50,000 over those two years.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Is there a specific reference in the budget papers to help us get to that? Some of these are sub-programs of sub-programs of specific programs.

Mr WINGARD: Yes, I am just wanting to know where they fit. The only information I have here is Industry and Innovation on page 58. I know that there is \$52,900,000 spent last year and only \$33,700,000 in the budget going forward, so I want to know if there is any more money allocated to that one out of that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that particular one on notice in terms of that program. Again, just so that I get it correct: has the money that we looked at spending under that particular sub-program been spent, and—

Mr WINGARD: Was any spent last year? Any forecast for next year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —was any spent last year, and next year, and when is it scheduled to end?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, thank you. If you want to take on notice the manufacturing strategy website, the PACE manufacturing IT simulation and the PACE manufacturing program as well, they are similar ones. If you have answers, I am happy to receive them, if that is easier.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can take that on notice and provide a complete answer.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, I appreciate that. Back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 65, targets for 2017-18. The target for 'Applied research engagement programs, number of participating companies' in 2016-17 was 10 and the estimated result was 21; the target for 2017-18 is four. Why the drastic reduction given that the estimated result was 21?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I am happy to take parts of this on notice to bring back an exact reply, but I am advised that there are a number of those industry engagement programs that, as I talked about, were designed as money to start these programs that the government has provided, some of which will be continued by industry or universities, which obviously then will not appear in our budget paper because we are no longer funding them, but in terms of which programs are encompassed by that line, I am happy to bring back a reply. I am advised, though, that since the budget papers were written, it is estimated that that will be significantly more than four. That is what we thought it would be at the time with government funding, and I am advised that it is now in the order of more like 17 from what government money there is, but I am happy to bring back a more complete reply to that.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 59. In the financial commentary it says, 'reduced expenditure in 2017-18 in line with the forward strategy for the industry development component of Our Jobs Plan'.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is the first dot point under the—

Mr WINGARD: Yes, sorry. The first dot point, financial commentary, page 59, just below halfway down the page, 'reduced expenditure in 2017-2018 in line with the forward strategy for the industry development component of Our Jobs Plan (\$5.8 million)'. We had a little discussion around this before, and I will revisit it somewhat, as far as Our Jobs Plan is concerned, and when that one actually finishes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: When what finishes?

Mr WINGARD: When Our Jobs Plan finishes. Is there an end date to Our Jobs Plan?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: When Our Jobs Plan was launched, the funding was provided up until the end of the 2017-18 financial year, and a very small amount in 2018-19 in that budget line. But as I have said, like any good government, the government looks at how they fund various programs and the almost \$80 million in innovation funding in the last budget, as well as the \$200 million for Future Jobs funding in this budget is a very significant increase in making sure that industry and jobs, and particularly those high-tech industries are very well supported where they can be by the state government.

Mr WINGARD: Just confirming the next financial year is year four of Our Jobs Plan, which was planned to run for four years. How much is budgeted for Our Jobs Plan in total in the fourth and final year, which is the upcoming financial year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The funding component in that current year in the estimated budget 2017-18 is what is being asked? I am advised that it is \$8.56 million.

Mr WINGARD: Can you give us a breakdown of what that was last year and for all the years of the Our Jobs Plan?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can. For 2013-14, it was 5.1; 2014-15, 7.8; and 2015-16, 14.8. It was forecast in 2016-17 at 18. The forecast budget for 2017-18, as we have said, is 8.56, and of course for 2017-18, there is a massive amount to support industry—that some \$200 million for our Future Jobs Fund and that huge increase in investment in innovation of \$80 million last year as well.

Mr WINGARD: Just to clarify, \$18 million was forecast for 2016-17 or \$18 million was spent?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised too that the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program is included in the Our Jobs Plan figures. What the figure I have just given you does not include, I am advised, is the extra \$5 million as part of the \$200 million future jobs program that has been allocated that would otherwise be included in that figure, as well.

Mr WINGARD: I understand, and I just want to clarify that under the Our Jobs Plan —

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Our Jobs Plan in the past has had the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program included in it. This most recent budget had a \$5 million boost to the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, so I am advised that when we talk about \$8.56 million, that is not including the auto supplier that has been included in the past.

Mr WINGARD: That separate program—I hear what you are saying. It is because that program finished and this is just a top-up; is that right?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program is a bit over \$11 million. The amount in there has either been expended or there are applications under consideration that will take us to that amount, so an extra \$5 million has been provided for that program for auto suppliers in diversifying. In the past, that figure had been included in the Our Jobs Plan. My advice is that that \$8½ million does not yet include, as it has in the past, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program. If we are properly comparing it, you would need to add that to that figure.

Mr WINGARD: We will elaborate on the auto diversification program in 15 minutes' time because that is a separate program under a separate scheme. I am just referring to the Our Jobs Plan now and confirming that it was \$5.1 million in 2013-14; \$7.8 million in 2014-15; \$14.8 million in 2015-16; \$18 million in 2016-17; and \$5.6 million in 2017-18; and no more funds—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No—2017-18 was \$8.56 million.

Mr WINGARD: And no more funds have been allocated to it in 2018-19. It finishes—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, the programs are put in place—

Mr WINGARD: I understand. I am just—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —for a time. There may be a misunderstanding. The auto programs are included as part of the Our Jobs Plan. They are included in there. You would naturally expect that industry support for the supply chain, as well as support for workers in those industries, is going to hit a very significant peak as we come up to the closure of Holden at the end of October of this year. The profiling that you see of these figures is not just plucked out of a hat. It is very deliberate in terms of supporting manufacturing in this state with the closure of Holden. It is very deliberately profiled to make sure it fits in with providing the maximum possible—that it is as efficient as it can be in supporting manufacturing in the state with the closure of Holden.

Mr WINGARD: I very much understand, but I just want to round out those figures. Were the figures I repeated to you correct?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Well, I cannot remember what you just said, but if they reflect what I told you, if you have said what I said, then you are accurate.

Mr WINGARD: Good, I will check *Hansard* and make sure. I will not go into the automotive supplier diversification programs. We will save those for 10 minutes' time or so. Again on those lines, there was a budget line and a program under Industry and Innovation for expansion of manufacturing works which we have discussed a little bit earlier in 2015-16 and 2016-17. I just want to confirm that that expansion was just for those two years and no further funds are allocated.

I think it was talked about as a \$2.7 million program for expanding Manufacturing Works. To my recollection, I have half a million dollars that was spent in 2015-16 and half a million dollars that was spent in 2016-17, which leaves us \$1.7 million short in the expansion of Manufacturing Works initiatives. Was more money than that spent in 2016-17, and has more money been allocated into 2017-18? Can you update me on the expansion of Manufacturing Works and issues and where that fits under the Industry Innovation Program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised, for that particular line for expanding existing Manufacturing Works programs, that the budget for 2016-17 is \$0.74 million and the budget for 2017-18 is \$0.5 million.

Mr WINGARD: Does that roll any further forward in the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, that is the budget for those two years.

Mr WINGARD: That means the project that was promoted as a \$2.7 million project only adds up to \$1.74 million—we are a million short.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice and bring back the actuals from previous years to—

Mr WINGARD: If you have the answer I am happy to—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can provide an answer now. For the expanding of existing Manufacturing Works initiatives the actual for the 2013-14 financial year was \$0.7 million, the actual for 2014-15 was \$0.5 million and the actual for 2015-16 was \$0.27 million. As I said, the budget for 2016-17 is \$0.74 million and the budget for 2017-18 is \$0.5 million, adding up to the \$2.7 million.

Mr WINGARD: So, that will be finished at as at the end of next year again.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, that is one of those programs—

Mr WINGARD: So, that is another finished project.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —like many we are doing and, of course, being replaced massively by the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund, the record \$80 million investment in innovation in South Australia and the \$109 million Jobs Accelerator Fund. So, when you add all of those up that is some hundreds of millions of dollars extra support for that. I can probably, if you like, take it on notice and bring back the hundreds of millions of dollars of extra support we are doing for industry in this state. It is fascinating.

Mr WINGARD: From the savings from cutting these projects, I understand. Industry roadmaps is another one—developing industry roadmaps, \$1.45 million. There was a million spent in 2013-14 and \$0.45 million spent in 2014-15. I am presuming that one is exhausted as well.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, and as the name suggests, developing industry roadmaps: one develops a roadmap and that is what they do. It would probably be a strange thing to have an ongoing recurrent budget for developing a particular industry roadmap.

Mr WINGARD: Or revisiting Manufacturing Works three times over.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, that sort of—

Mr WINGARD: How many times can you review it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Definitionally, doing a roadmap is probably a time-limited thing to do.

Mr WINGARD: Yes, it is a matter of how many times you want to revisit Manufacturing Works, too, but that is another story. The new Jobs Accelerator Fund was a \$20 million fund—maybe you can take this on notice—along with other new programs that reskill and re-employ workers, at \$7.9 million, and supporting local entrepreneurs through start-up initiatives is \$2.68 million. That was promoted in a previous budget and I presume that encompasses all the sub-programs that we have been rattling through.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The budget does encompass a lot of those sub-programs that we have been talking about, and I will bring back answers to some of the specific ones that you have asked about.

Mr WINGARD: Yes, that is great. If we can get them all back from the ones that fit under your banner, that would be wonderful. We do have a couple of minutes left so I would love to go to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 59, the financial commentary about the electric bus prototype. How much is left to be spent on the electric bus prototype trial and the advanced modular system alliance initiatives within the industry and innovation budget papers?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They are two separate things. The bus manufacturing?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, the actual bus prototype trial.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That was an initiative, \$2 million, and that was part of the Northern Economic Plan. That, I am advised, has all been spent. I can give a bit of detail about that program. We are very proud of how that has worked. It was a joint venture between two auto supply chain companies, ZF and Precision Components, and that money went towards creating full prototypes: two electric buses and two low-emission diesel buses, I think, compliant with Euro 6 standards for low-emission diesel buses.

As a result of that particular \$2 million state government grant, I was informed on, I think, Boxing Day or just before Christmas that this new joint venture had won a contract to supply something like 50 buses interstate to be manufactured in Adelaide, creating something like 30 full-time jobs. I know that joint venture is doing a lot of work identifying their potential supply chain in Adelaide. It is one of the real success stories, where the government helped create those prototypes and, from those prototypes, they have increased jobs quite significantly.

We know that electric buses is an area that many other cities around the world, particularly congested cities in Asia, are looking at moving to, and already this has been bought by interstate. The traditional model for buses in Australia has been to buy the chassis, typically MAN or Scania chassis, and put the coach on top of that, which is how it has been done a lot in Australia. This is creating the whole bus here, and in doing that they have made the buses a lot lighter, which has made them significantly more fuel efficient. I think this project points to where there is targeted support by the government to help start things where that funding can go a long way to helping create a potential industry and more jobs.

Mr WINGARD: And the advanced modular systems, how much was put towards that one?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think I took the details of that on notice in Employment, where I reckon we touched on that, but I am happy to go back and have a look.

Mr WINGARD: The point being that there was \$2.5 million for both of these projects.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It was \$2 million for the buses and half a million for the modular systems to do with the construction industry. I think we touched on this before the last break. I am happy to go back.

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate that, thank you. Still on page 59, dot point 4, the once-off grant of \$400,000 to support the South Australian Oysters Growing Association. Can you give details of the jobs that were created with that grant?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that, as the name suggests, it was a once-off grant. It was to look at a project that involved the development of an IT-based management system to assist growers to understand the growing conditions, particularly to address an unexplained increase in oyster mortality. I am advised that South Australia constitutes approximately 41 per cent of Australia's oyster production, so it is an important area for South Australia.

A key element of the oyster hub project is a collection of data at the farm scale, including recording amongst growers key oyster farm information to assist with the economic development of that industry. Like many industries, the recording and being able to use data will help that industry in planning for the future, and particularly, as I said, the unexplained increase in oyster mortality. Those sort of meaningful trends can then be identified to support sector-wide development strategies.

In terms of the number of jobs created by a \$400,000 grant to help the industry in general, I am happy to go away and see whether there is a figure about how the industry has grown. I think it might be difficult to say that a \$400,000 grant to help the development of that IT-based management system created this number of jobs directly because of this, but certainly I am happy to look at how the industry has fared.

Small components that help industry, particularly industry wide, naturally contribute to either growing or sustaining jobs in those industries, but to allocate a precise figure against a project that is designed to be industry wide I think would be difficult, but if it can be done I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr WINGARD: Likewise, under the next dot point, Expenditure associated with Upper Spencer Gulf support 2016-17.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I am happy to take that on notice and bring back some more answers to those.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: I hope the member for Mitchell is as keen as I am to hear about automotive transformation.

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The CHAIR: Are you happy to do that now?

Mr WINGARD: No worries at all.

The CHAIR: Excellent. If you want to change your advisers, minister, that would be great, thank you.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Duffy, Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Mr A. Reid, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Ms G. Elston, Director, Policy and Economic Transformation, Department of State Development.

Ms P. Chau, Director, Performance and Governance, Department of State Development.

Mr P. Goiak, Director, Industry Development, Department of State Development.

Mr J. Phillips, Manager, Science Industry Innovation Policy, Department of State Development.

Ms G. Hewlett, Ministerial Adviser.

The CHAIR: Minister, would you like to introduce your new advisers and/or make an opening statement?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Changing, we have Georgette Elston, who has moved onto the front benches. Behind us, we have Jeremy Phillips and Gillian Hewlett, who are new since two minutes ago.

The CHAIR: Excellent. The member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. If I can go to Budget Paper 3, page 4. We did say before that as far as the future jobs plan is concerned, this element is under your guise, the automotive transformation part of it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, that is correct.

The CHAIR: Which page?

Mr WINGARD: Page 4, paragraph 3.3. I think you made this point before, but I want to clarify that this is just an extension of the automotive transformation program included in previous budgets, as we were discussing before?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I can confirm that. The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program originally had a budget of \$11.65 million; I can advise that from that budget 16 grant applications have been approved. There are a number of grant applications that are still pending, and now those that have been approved and those that are still pending and looking to be recommended would fully expend that \$11.65 million, which is why there has been an extra \$5 million for over the next two years allocated in this budget to extend that program.

I think it is fair to say that, as with the programs in auto, some of the 70-odd tier one and tier two supply chain companies have taken some time to think about a future. There were quite a number of companies; in fact, I think the statistic is that in the order of two years ago, when a lot of companies were spoken to, under a third of companies intended to diversify. The majority of supply chain companies, when the government's automotive transformation team originally talked to companies, were intending that once Holden closed that would be the end of what they did.

Now, as we have got closer, we have seen pretty significant take-up of companies that are lifting their head above the horizon and are looking to and have already started to diversify. As you would know, Mr Chair, with your long involvement in the auto industry in the northern suburbs, many of these companies for many years had been either wholly or almost wholly reliant on the auto sector, not just Holden but Toyota and Ford interstate for what they did. For many companies, particularly smaller companies and also some of the very large multinational companies, there had not been much consideration given.

I have been exceptionally impressed, as I have met with a lot of supply chain companies, at the response and the feedback I have had about the work that the auto transformation team has done in terms of assisting companies to think about what else it is they might be doing and in helping case manage putting in applications to diversify. Now the figures are something like almost three-quarters of companies are looking to diversify.

Certainly, some of those will downsize, but it is a significant turnaround from just a couple of years ago, when less than a third of companies were intending to diversify. Something in the order of three-quarters of companies now have started that process of diversification, which is why there is that additional \$5 million provided in this budget to increase the amount of government support we are providing to companies to continue on after the closure of Holden.

Mr WINGARD: How much was expended in the 2016-17 budget on this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program?

Mr WINGARD: Yes. This is obviously finishing off the program.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised there was, in the 2016-17 year, expended approximately \$3.8 million.

Mr WINGARD: Just to confirm, that rounded out that program, and now we have this extension program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No. In addition to the projects that are in the pipeline but have not been officially funded yet, that would round out the program.

Mr WINGARD: Sorry, can you just explain that again?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There is the carryover of \$1 million for the 2017-18 year plus \$3 million budgeted in the 2017-18 year, all of which is forecast to be expended from the applications that are being assessed at the moment.

Mr WINGARD: So, we have \$3 million for 2017-18 and \$2 million for 2018-19 sitting there; is that right?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Plus the \$1 million carried over from 2016-17 to 2017-18.

Mr WINGARD: That \$1 million carried over—sorry, I misheard that—did you say that had been expended, that has been allocated, or—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It has not been—I guess the best way to describe it is it has been committed to projects.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. That clarifies that. Was the automotive transformation program funded for 2017-18 in the 2016-17 budget or Mid-Year Budget Review?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That we are talking about now?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think your question is: that \$5 million extra for that program, was that part of the recent budget handed down or was that provided in December as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review?

Mr WINGARD: That is correct, thank you.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That was from the recent budget handed down.

Mr WINGARD: I mentioned this before, and I am seeking clarification, the sum of the measures identified in Budget Paper 3 that I am referring to, including the \$30 million loan component, is \$81.5 million. Is that the total of what is described as the specific futures fund measures?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In terms of the Future Jobs Fund and exactly how things are described, I am happy to take those on notice that sit outside my portfolio area, like the grants and the loans that are administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance, and I am happy to bring back a reply. Do you want to expand on exactly what your question is so I do not misunderstand what I am needing to bring back?

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, if I can, and I appreciate you taking this on notice. Where it says, 'Specific Future Jobs Fund measures announced in the 2017-18 Budget include:' and there are four dot points there, if you add them up together I think the figure is \$81.5 million, which leaves us a little bit short. I want to know where the extra \$120 million comes from to round out the \$200 million.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can answer that. That is made up of grants and loans. The extra \$120 million is \$50 million in grants and \$70 million in loans to companies.

Mr WINGARD: Where do those \$50 million in grants come from?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What do you mean, 'come from'? It is administered by Treasury and Finance. There is an application process that closes at the end of September and this is a new budget allocation. This money is not coming from other programs, this is a new budget allocation of \$50 million in grants and \$70 million in loans.

Mr WINGARD: Is that \$50 million incorporated in those four dot points that are outlined there?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised no. That is in addition to what is there. When you look at the \$80 million plus the \$70 million plus the \$50 million that gets you to \$200 million.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. The allocation for the Jobs Accelerator Fund is not part of that \$200 million future fund then, is it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is the \$109 million Jobs Accelerator Fund that was a budget measure last time. That is in addition to the \$200 million.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 62, the table there that you can see. Can you confirm the total expenditure and net cost of services under the Automotive Transformation sub-program in each year of the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just checking, at the top of page 62, the net cost of that sub-program as it is there, you are looking for what it is in—what are you looking for?

Mr WINGARD: What the cost is over the forward estimates. You can see there we have gone from \$18 million estimated result to \$10 million. What is the cost of the forward estimates of that sub-program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice. That includes a number of areas that are not directly the auto programs, when elements from Our Jobs Plan and corporate overheads come into future years, so I am happy to take that on notice. There is not a figure that can be looked at without having the corporate overheads and services coming from other areas, so I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: If you would, that would be fantastic. Just to add to that, sub-program 1.2: Automotive Transformation, which is entirely in your sphere, does that have money allocated to it beyond 2017-18? Will that sub-program keep running beyond 2017-18?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to get exact numbers, but there are elements of that program that continue beyond those years. For example, the extra \$5 million in this budget for the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program goes over two years, and then there are elements of the Automotive Workers in Transition Program that continue after those, up until the 2019 year. However, I am happy to take that on notice and get those exact figures for you.

Mr WINGARD: Are there any other elements or arms of that that will continue beyond 2018-19?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I will find out what there is and bring back a reply. I do note, though, that common sense dictates that a lot of this money be spent now in the lead-up to Holden closing. That is what these programs are designed for: to minimise the impact of the closure of Holden on the economy and, more importantly, on workers in South Australia. So, we will see a very big spike, quite deliberately, and that is what it is forecasted to do to support automotive workers and the automotive diversification that will tail off after Holden closes. I am happy to look at those areas directly in the Automotive Workers in Transition Program, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program and other parts that go to supporting that work, so that I can bring back a more complete answer regarding the years beyond this current financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Again, if you look at the table on page 62, \$18 million is the estimated spend in 2016-17, yet the year that Holden closes (which will be 2017-18) the spend has gone down to \$10.4 million.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can indicate, too, that that does not include the extra \$5 million we saw in this budget—that is not included in this figure. Also, as I outlined, much of what we have been doing, particularly in the supplier diversification space, has been funds spent. There have been applications coming in that will take us to just under the \$12 million originally allocated, and that is why there is the extra \$5 million. However, for many of these companies, if they have not already started accessing state government funds it is going to be difficult to transition once Holden has already closed, which is exactly why, in the lead-up to that, you see that profile of funds to help those companies as Holden closes.

Yes, you will see a reduction once those funds have been spent on those companies that are able to do that, but, as I said—and I give a lot of credit to the team who has been case managing and working with a lot of these companies—it has been a better response than expected, which is why there is that extra \$5 million over and above what was initially allocated in that budget profile to be spent in the lead-up to Holden's closure.

Mr WINGARD: Just to clarify, because I am sure you are not being intentionally misleading: to say that there is an extra \$5 million to go with the \$10 million that is there for this year, that is not budgeted for all five in one year, you are splitting it over two years, so really it is only an extra—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is three in that first year. So, in the financial year in which we find ourselves now it is an extra \$3 million, and the budget for the financial year after that is an extra \$2 million.

Mr WINGARD: So, just to clarify, even including that, we are \$5 million down on last year's spend.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, I am going to correct that.

Mr WINGARD: On this program; on those numbers.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I understand that this is not something you have experienced on the government side before, but it is not correct to say that we are cutting money from a program for which it was intended there would be more money and that suddenly we have made a big cut. This is how it was intended to be spent when this program was initiated. Quite deliberately, it is profiled in certain years to spend more money because, as a company, steps had to be taken to move into diversification well before Holden closes.

So, to try to characterise it as: there is less money now in the first and second quarters of the 2017-18 financial year—as if the government cares less or is not doing as much—if that is a deliberate characterisation, that is quite misleading and wrong. This is how the money was intended to be spent to get the maximum benefit and effect for these companies.

Mr WINGARD: In that table on page 62, the actual spend for 2015-16 is \$6.96 million. The budgeted spend for that year in the lead-up to Holden's closure was \$16 million for this program. That is an underspend of near enough to \$10 million. What was the reason for that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think we went through in some detail earlier the engagement from companies at the start of this process. As I said, when our automotive transformation team initially went out to talk to those 70-odd tier 1 and tier 2 supply companies, less than a third were intending to diversify at all. It was difficult news and difficult for companies, particularly smaller, family-owned companies that for decades, in some cases, were up to 100 per cent reliant on the auto industry, to look at doing something differently, to diversify into other areas. Areas like food packaging and manufacturing, defence supply chain industries, medical devices, support goods for the mining industries are some of the areas that we have seen companies diversify into.

At the very start, it was a lot of work for the government to work with the companies to look at a diversification strategy. As I said, a couple of years ago, less than a third of companies were planning on diversifying. It is now up to around the three-quarter mark. It was a function of companies and particularly those smaller companies not considering diversification. I have to say that I am very glad that has changed over that time, and companies are now using that money and diversifying.

Another factor of that—the other major component—is the support the government is providing for automotive workers in the automotive supply chain. Again, it is similar to companies; a lot of automotive workers have taken time in registering for these services that are available from the government. We had hoped that there would be a greater registration up front, and that is why we are engaging in significant programs to increase the visibility of the Automotive Workers in Transition Program to make sure as many as possible of the automotive supply chain workers are taking advantage of that program.

A lot of workers who I have talked to in supply chain companies have been doing their jobs for, in some cases, some decades and have not turned their mind to accessing government services or, like the companies themselves, what they might do next. It is reflective of the early stages, people not accessing the schemes, but the significant ramp up now in terms of the access to those schemes, which you can see reflected in the profile of what has been spent in the years since then.

Mr WINGARD: Looking back at those budget papers, that 2015-16 point that I mentioned and even 2014-15 and 2016-17 that are outlined there, and what was budgeted and what was spent across those three years, can you give me a total figure of how much was budgeted but not spent across 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, your question is: at the time of putting together that budget, what we thought was going to be spent in those years against what was spent. So, forecast versus actual for those years.

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply. So, that is for the 2015-16, 2016-17—

Mr WINGARD: It is for 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For those three financial years, I will take that on notice, comparing the budgeted to the actuals. As I have said, when we initially budgeted for these, there were companies and individual workers who had not turned their mind to what they were going to do, which created the necessity for the automotive transformation team to do a lot of work, both with companies and with individuals.

I must say that I have been out a number of times when the automotive transformation team has made presentations to supply chain companies. We are seeing a significant increase in people accessing those services. Of course, people can still access those services and even register for those services once Holden closes, if they have not taken steps to do so already. I know the team and have been to a number of the displays and presentations that they have made. We are now seeing a significant increase in the take-up of people availing themselves of those services. At the few I have been to recently, a large percentage of workers at some of the bigger supply chain companies are turning up in their own time on breaks to come and see the presentations and what services are available.

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate you getting me the official figure on this, but I put it to you that the unspent money across those three years, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, is in excess of \$15 million. I take your point that companies were not ready to go, which is the point you were making there, henceforth you underspent by more than \$15 million, yet if you are saying that they are more ready to go now, are you satisfied that the \$10 million you have allocated, compared to \$19 million last year, is going to be enough to deliver these programs to help the Holden workers who are leaving?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have continually made adjustments to these programs when it has been necessary. The best example was the one we spent a bit of time talking about today for the industry fund, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program. When companies became very engaged, we put an extra \$5 million in the budget toward doing that. We have been continually finetuning the eligibility criteria for the Automotive Workers in Transition Program for various eligibility requirements. We have shifted downwards the percentage of auto exposure that a company has to have for a worker to be eligible to make more workers eligible. We have also changed eligibility criteria in terms of allowing partners and spouses of auto workers to enter the program.

This is done on the best information, and the best modelling that we have about what is needed but if there are changes that need to be made, as we have done in the past, we will make those changes to make sure workers in the auto industry are properly supported. We have had a number of forums where workers and their representatives have not only talked to me but also to the Premier and other ministers. One thing that I am very proud of is the way this Labor government has stood beside auto workers, and if further changes need to be made we will certainly do that, as we have done in the past to make sure that we are doing everything we can possibly can as a government to support auto workers in South Australia.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 5, page 75, Automotive supplier transformation, which we have already discussed—I am just making a reference to the paper; no need to check that. With the previous program, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, the extension of that is called the Automotive Supplier Transformation Program. I am just trying to clarify the names to make sure.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is the same thing. It will be administered by the same people, providing the same services to companies, and there will be a number of those applications that we already have in.

Mr WINGARD: Just a slight tweak in the name. So, we confirm that that program is being extended for 2017-18 with \$3 million to be spent there, and 2018-19. Just to seek clarification again on whether any of that fund has already been committed in 2018-19, have you allocated that to companies and organisations to help them out, and/or 2019?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Not the \$5 million, but I think, as I explained earlier from that original \$11.65 million, we now have applications in that would take us to expending all of those funds. I know

the team which goes out and talks to companies is already working with a number of companies which is why this extra allocation was made because we know that there is some further demand for those. None of that \$5 million has yet been spent but we do know from the work the team is doing with companies at an individual level, that there are projects that we are sure will be submitted to have that money expended.

Mr WINGARD: With the view to that \$3 million being spent in 2017-18, and the \$2 million to be spent in 2018-19?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is how that budget is profiled. As I have said, we have in the past and particularly with the Automotive Workers in Transition Program we are open to making changes as they become necessary. It would be an odd thing if we were that inflexible that we were not prepared to make changes to make sure the programs that we have are as effective as possible. That is how it is described in the budget, but if we do need to tweak things to make the money that we have more effective, we will look to do that.

Mr WINGARD: For the Automotive Workers in Transition Program, \$2 million was the actual spend, I think, in 2015-16. Where is that project at in terms of the \$10 million budgeted for 2017-18, and when does that program end?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the budget for the Automotive Workers in Transition Program for 2017-18 is \$2.25 million to support automotive workers. That is made up of a range of components in terms of career counselling, skills recognition and helping to fund training for workers from the automotive supply chain.

Mr WINGARD: How much was spent on that last year in 2016-17?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that we do not have exact actual figures for 2016-17. It is estimated that around \$700,000 may have been spent last year, but as soon as we have the actual, I am happy to bring that back.

The CHAIR: With that, according to the agreed timetable, I declare the examination of the proposed payments adjourned until later today.

Sitting suspended from 12:16 to 13:15.

Membership:

Mr Caica substituted for Mr Kenyon.

Mr Bell substituted for Mr Tarzia.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Duffy, Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Mr A. Reid, Executive Director, Industry, Innovation, Science and Small Business, Department of State Development.

Mr A. Dunbar, Director, Office of Science, Technology and Research, Department of State Development.

Mr R. Janssan, Executive Director, Strategy and Business Services, Department of State Development.

Ms P. Chau, Director, Performance and Governance, Department of State Development.

Mr J. Thorpe, TechInSA.

Mr A. Christie, Ministerial Adviser.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, minister, in your capacity as Minister for Science and Information Economy. I now invite you to introduce any new advisers you may have and then invite you to make an opening statement, if you wish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The changes from when we were here last, Mr Chair: on my far left, Andrew Dunbar, Director, Office of Science, Technology and Research, Department of State Development, and Joe Thorpe from TechInSA. They are the two changes from when we were here last.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Do you have an opening statement at all?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, not per se.

The CHAIR: The member for Mitchell, you have indicated you would like to read in the omnibus questions at this point.

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The CHAIR: Then we will get straight to business.

Mr WINGARD: The omnibus questions are:

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 in 2016-17 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

2. In financial year 2016-17 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2017-18?

3. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, please provide a breakdown of attraction, retention and performance allowances, as well as non-salary benefits, paid to public servants and contractors in the years 2015-16 and 2016-17.

4. For each agency for which the minister has responsibility:

(a) How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2016-17 and what was their employment expense?

(b) How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21, and what is their estimated employment expense?

(c) The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums, in 2016-17, and budgeted cost for 2017-18.

5. For each agency for which the minister has responsibility:

(a) What was the cost of electricity in 2016-17?

(b) What is the budgeted cost of electricity in 2017-18?

(c) What is the provisioned cost of electricity in 2018-19, 2019-20 and, 2020-21?

6. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 financial years:

(a) Balance of the grant program or fund;

(b) Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund;

(c) Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund;

(d) Carryovers into or from the program or fund; and

(e) Details, including the value and beneficiary, of any commitments already made to be funded from the program or fund.

The CHAIR: Would you like to ask some questions?

Mr WINGARD: I would.

The CHAIR: Do you have an opening statement at all?

Mr WINGARD: No, I do not, thank you. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 69. In the financial commentary it states that the reduced expenditure for the Premier's Research and Industry Fund is \$1.7 million. Can you please outline how much has been spent on the Premier's Research and Industry Fund in recent years? In last year's financial year, how much was budgeted for this year and the ensuing years going forward in the estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that for the 2015-16 financial year the actual spend was \$5.261 million. For 2016-17, the revised budget spend (and I can take on notice the actuals when they come in) was \$6.335 million. For the 2017-18 budget, the budgeted spend is \$4.630 million.

Mr WINGARD: Why the significant cut in funding? Has that money been allocated elsewhere?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice, as I suspected, is that the base budget is around \$4.5 million for PRIF. There are timing issues in terms of exactly when contracts are signed and then when money flows to those research consortia and those institutions to which money goes, but the base budget for PRIF is around \$4.5 million per year. It will go up and down, depending on the exact timing of contracts and the receipt of those moneys according to those agreements made.

Mr WINGARD: Is money committed to this fund beyond 2017-18, or does it end at 2017-18?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that this is an ongoing budget line.

Mr WINGARD: How much is allocated in the forward estimates beyond?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that the budget allocation for the forward estimates for 2019-20 is \$4.925 million and for 2020-21 it is \$4.975.

Mr WINGARD: How much money has been expended by this fund in total since it began?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: This will be a case of adding it all up. I am happy to take it on notice and bring back the addition very quickly.

Mr WINGARD: If you can answer this, great, but if you have to take it on notice that is fine, too: how many people have been recipients of funds under this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There are various elements of the Premier's Research Industry Fund. For 2016-17, I can advise that it is in the order of 44 separate recipients, but in terms of since the program has been in existence, I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: A breakdown would be greatly appreciated. Likewise, with the Future Industries Institute funding that goes on there, can you give us a breakdown of how much was spent there over the last few years, so 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, and into the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think we did look at this in the manufacturing innovation part of it, but if there is stuff not on the *Hansard* record from the earlier estimates committee, I am happy to supplement that.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. Do you know offhand for last year and this year the budget figures?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Broadly speaking, the estimated budget for this current year, 2016-17, is \$1.5 million.

Mr WINGARD: And for next year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: And \$3 million for next year.

Mr WINGARD: Is that an ending program or an ongoing program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is a time limit program. I have think we talked about this in some detail; this is one of those areas where we are putting in funding to help a program get started. This was a total budget of \$7.5 million to help with that Future Industries Institute. I will not go into all the good work it is doing.

Mr WINGARD: Appreciate that. The Gig City program: can I request the breakdown of that since it started and its budgeted expenditure into the forward estimates as well?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that the estimated budget for 2016-17 for the Gig City program was \$2.176 million. The budgeted amount for 2017-18 is \$2.126 million; for 2018-19, \$2.504 million; for 2019-20, \$0.681 million; and for 2020-21, \$0.108 million. That includes the \$4.654 million that was the original budget allocation from just over a year ago, plus the additional budget allocation in this year's budget of \$2.941 million to expand the Gig City program.

Mr WINGARD: The expansion, obviously, rounds out the rest of the numbers going forward in the estimates. Are you confident that that project will be finished in that time line, at that cost?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have no reason to believe that it will not be finished at that cost. Certainly, from the first dozen or so precincts that the infrastructure work has been needed to put the optical fibre cable to connect those precincts up, and the contract that has been let for the ISP to connect those precincts up, have not run over budget or beyond when we would have reasonably expected the time to go, so there is no reason to think that it will not stay on course as it has already.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 70. In the performance indicator table at the bottom of that page, the target for projects completed in 2016-17 is three. The estimated result is zero. Can you outline when those projects were completed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that with the Smart Cities project, Smart Cities roadmap pilot projects were planned for 2016-17. All the projects have not occurred in that financial year, primarily due to the extensive consultation process and the interest in the project. More than 100 individuals and organisations took part in those consultations about the pilot program, which means, rather than last financial year, these projects are intended to be implemented this financial year.

Mr WINGARD: So, the target was three and that was the expectation, but because of the roadmap—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I am advised, people were much more interested than we had originally thought and we had over 100 consultations about what the projects would be, and it has been decided that the projects will be rolled out this year rather than last financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you. Over the page, on page 71, Activity indicators as well, under Adelaide Gig City program, for the number of designated innovation precincts connected to the network, 12 was the estimated result for 2016-17, and only five was the target for 2017-18. Can you explain the reason for the reduction to only five in that year, given that I think your spend was going to be pretty much similar to what it was this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I am advised, the estimated result was 12 for the original budget of just under \$5 million for Gig City. The new target reflects the additional funding that has been provided. The 12 were for the original, just under \$5 million, Gig City project, the five more are because there was new funding in this budget to extend it out.

Mr WINGARD: So 17 is the total, for clarification?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Seventeen is the total now.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. If we are estimating the extra five by the end of 2017-18, we still have 2.5, 600, 100 to spend rolling forward. Will that be connecting other venues or locations so that will grow beyond the 17?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Possibly, if there is money left to do that. As I said, it has not gone over budget in any respect, so if there is still funding to go beyond the 12 that were originally envisaged and the five that the new funding is for, we will do that.

Mr WINGARD: So, it could end up being more than 17?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It could be.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic, thank you for that. The other indicator there is increased South Australian science and research capabilities and capacity through strategic investments by the Premier's Research and Industry Fund. That obviously indicates the drop, or the reduction or cut, in funding for that program from the estimated result this year of 6.3 to the projected result in 2017-18 of 4.6?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is the one we initially went through. The base funding is about \$4½ million; in the out years of the forward estimates it rises to closer to \$5 million. It is not that one year had more than it was cut; each base year has been about \$4½ million, but the timing of when contracts were signed and when the recipient institutions, consortia or recipients get that money affects what financial year it is put into.

Mr WINGARD: So, if we trace it back, fundamentally right at the start there would have been some lean years, so to speak—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes.

Mr WINGARD: The blackspot funding program, again, that is outlined in that activity indicator. There were three estimated for this year—25. What is the total number of blackspot site base stations deployed planned to be?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Do you mean deployed that have some—

Mr WINGARD: How many planned to be deployed, so how many—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, so is it how many the mobile network operators themselves plan to deploy or how many are planned to be deployed with any input or funding from the government?

Mr WINGARD: Input and funding from the government.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is proposed that in 2017-18 there will be 25 new base stations.

Mr WINGARD: In the forward estimates are there more planned going forward, or is 25 what we get for the million dollar spend?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In terms of state government funding, there have been two rounds of the federal government Mobile Black Spot Program. We have not heard of further rounds, as yet, have we? We have not heard of further rounds. In addition to the federal government ones, there were four sites funded by the state government from money that the federal government decided they did not want to use from ours and returned to us.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 68, description/objective. If we look at the FTEs there, what is the explanation for the reduction in FTEs over the past two years from 24 in 2015-16 to 20 budgeted for 2017-18?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, the movement from 2015-16, 24, to this year's budget of 19?

Mr WINGARD: This year's budget of 20, I think it is, in 2017-18.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: This is the 2017-18 budget, 20? I am advised that this is probably the flip side of some of the areas we discussed earlier, that there are three FTEs due to be transferred to Program 1: Industry and Innovation, from the Science, Technology, and Information Economy part.

Mr WINGARD: Are they the ones that you are saying—I thought they were going from there as well?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They are ones that will go from there to another area of DSD.

Mr WINGARD: Right. So, again, they are just going to be redeployed; they are not finishing, they are not done?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is my advice, yes.

Mr WINGARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 70. How much was spent on the research consortia program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the original budget allocation of \$1 million in 2016-17 was spent. For the 2017-18 budget it is budgeted that \$2 million will be spent from the 2017-18 budget.

Mr WINGARD: Is any money allocated for that in forward estimates beyond 2017-18, to 2018-19 and beyond?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, this is a subset of the Premier's Research and Industry Fund (PRIF) that we discussed, and this is ongoing funding.

Mr WINGARD: Ongoing funding. Not for now, but if you could give us a breakdown on what the forward estimates funding is for this program that would be—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the funding accumulates, so there is one consortium funded for the first year of \$1 million, two consortia funded the second year at \$2 million in total, then the next year there would be three consortia funded for a total of \$3 million and it maximises at four consortia funded for \$4 million. Research consortia is effectively a million dollars a year over four years.

Mr WINGARD: So, once you get up to four at \$4 million a year it will keep going at the \$4 million a year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As the funding ends for one consortium another one comes on, so a maximum of four at any given time, yes.

Mr WINGARD: Just for clarification, is that an ongoing program? It does not have an end date?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes. I am getting lots of head nods to tell me it is an ongoing program.

Mr WINGARD: What were the seven Cooperative Research Centres that were supported under this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Andrew Dunbar has won the competition to get this bit of paper to me first. Congratulations. That is one point. I note Adam Reid did not get it to me first, even though he is sitting closer to me. However, the seven are: Data to Decisions CRC, Deep Exploration Technology CRC, the CRC for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, CRC for Low Carbon Living, CRC for High Performance Soils, Food Agility CRC and the iMOVE CRC. The participants in that consortium include Flinders University, University of South Australia, the Royal Automobile Association and Cohda Wireless.

Mr WINGARD: I do not think I asked this before and I am not sure whether you are taking it away, so I am sorry if I am repeating the question and if I am, just say so. What were the nine projects and initiatives under the Premier's Research and Industry Fund that were funded?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will take on notice the fine details of the projects within that and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: What was the cost of the development of the Smart City Roadmap?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If you need more detail I will bring it back, but approximately \$100,000 was the cost of that project, I am being advised.

Mr WINGARD: Do you know how much was paid by the council and how much was paid by the state government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We can get that split and bring it back.

Mr WINGARD: Is there any ongoing commitment or involvement that the department has with this group, Smart Cities? Does the government have any ongoing relationship with the Smart Cities Group?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the project with Cisco and Adelaide city council had just over \$300,000 allocated to it this year, as well as in-kind support of staff, and we will look to see how we continue that, depending on the results after this financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Is that an ongoing commitment, or is that capped and a finished program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What support the government puts in on an ongoing basis for it depends on what comes out of this financial year.

Mr WINGARD: Can I take it that it is finished unless you choose to expand it? Is that a fair way to put it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In effect, that is the way it works. The level of funding depends on what the government decides to do; however, there is an MOU between the state government and city council to continue to look at projects of joint interest to us.

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate that, thank you. Can you elaborate or outline what other grant and subsidy programs fit in under the total expenses for science and technology? Again, there is \$14 million budgeted this year after \$15 million spent last year. Can you outline the grants and subsidies programs that will be allocated under the total expenses for this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, this might be one that I am happy to take on notice in order to separate out the grants that fit into that particular budget line. There are grants that cover a number of areas, but I am happy to take that on notice to get the exact details of the ones from the budget line on page 68. However, I can provide some greater detail about some of the grant programs: Adelaide Gig City, digital economy, Mobile Black Spot, Premier's Research and Industry Fund, STEM skills and entrepreneurship, UniSA's Future Industries, the Gig City expansion, partnership with US Ignite, Defence STEM scholarship and internships, general innovation expenditure, and the digital economy grant program. If I have missed any out I will supplement that with the response I bring back.

Mr WINGARD: Can you outline how much was spent on the digital economy grant program last year and how much will be spent in the coming year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If I am reading the table correctly, an estimated \$335,000 was spent on the digital economy grant program this financial year. I can bring back a response for the future financial years.

Mr WINGARD: Could I ask for the breakdown as well, if you go away and find all those—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, sure. So, for the ones I have mentioned and any that I have missed out, you want this year's estimated figures, last year's actual and next year's funding.

Mr WINGARD: The estimates going forward—that would be great. So, last year, this year, the estimates going forward and also whether they have an end date or whether they are potentially—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think those seed funding programs that have a definitive end date, like PRIF, are budgeted as ongoing. I am happy to find out.

Mr WINGARD: That would be great, thank you. Going back to the Black Spot Program you talked about: to get clarification, there was the million dollars that came into PIRSA through the federal government that was allocated into delivering that project, and there was some commercial input as well. Could you elaborate on that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For the last round of the federal government's Mobile Black Spot Program, the South Australian government had a total contribution of \$2 million, of which \$1 million was Geoff Brock's area of government. Of that \$2 million committed by the state government, only about two-thirds was actually used as part of the program. So, with the funds that were returned, the state government has partnered with telcos to expand that program with four additional blackspots that were funded a couple of months ago.

Mr WINGARD: I refer to page 68, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, one of the science and technology dot points:

raising awareness within government, business and the community of the critical importance of science, research and innovation to the state's prosperity

How have you measured this objective?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can certainly go through some of the programs that contribute to doing that. There are a number of ways that we raise awareness within both the government and business community about science, areas such as science awards or programs with researchers and educators.

The state's key science awareness strategy is the Inspiring South Australia program, a collaboration between the Australian and South Australian governments, SA universities and the SA Museum. It has led to the establishment of seven regional science hubs across the state in the Limestone Coast, Yorke and Mid North, Fleurieu, Far North, Eyre Peninsula and western regions. I am also pleased to say the Kangaroo Island regional science hub became the seventh new hub in June of this year.

The program has also worked in partnership with the children's museum and Libraries of SA to launch the Little Bang Discovery Club. Also, in terms of science awareness, there is the museum of discovery. The SA government continues to partner with University of South Australia in supporting engaging science and innovation content for students and the public at the museum of discovery, formerly the science education program.

We also provide government support to a range of other awareness raising things in science such as the very popular Science Alive program, which has received state government funding for their annual Science Alive showcase at the Showgrounds. It has also expanded this year to other locations, including metropolitan south and north, and regional areas.

Mr WINGARD: I mentioned before and will just explore whether there is funding for this potentially in this program. Of the \$14.7 million that is budgeted in 2017-18 or even if it was in the 2015-16 estimate from last year, is money allocated to deliver an innovation strategy, as opposed to just the statement you talked about? I know there is another project that is being worked on—a framework, I think; there are all these different terms that get thrown around. But is there a strategy that is being put in place?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am pleased to say that after the RedFire Consulting, Alistair McCreadie review of innovation in this state, the government released a number of programs it will be engaging in. It included a statement about how we would be implementing these programs. I do not have it with me but I am happy to provide a copy of the statement to the honourable member.

Mr WINGARD: Just to clarify, and a yes or no is fine, are you looking to get an innovation strategy, or is the statement where it sits?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We will always continue to build on what we are doing. Of course, we have 10 economic principles that guide our work in this state. One of the key principles, economic priority 6, is growth through innovation, which comprehensively sets out the need and some of the policy parameters around innovation and its importance to South Australia. But we also have, as a result of further investment in this area, the statement that talks not just about the importance but those particular policy areas and the funding for those policy areas, to put that into effect.

Mr WINGARD: In the targets 2017-18, halfway down, it has, 'Invest in new projects and initiatives through the Premier's Research and Industry Fund to support the Investing in Science Action Plan.' Can you please outline the Investing in Science Action Plan and what the key criteria are for that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Investing in Science Action Plan coordinated the government's approach to science and also innovation in South Australia. It was developed in partnership with the Chief Scientist of South Australia and the Science Council. It builds on seven strategic pillars:

- to attract and retain high-calibre researchers in South Australia and build the capability of existing researchers;

- to position South Australia as leading the nation on STEM education at the school, vocational and higher education levels;
- to significantly increase the high quality research in South Australia that aligns to the state's priorities;
- to strengthen the links between education, research and industry to improve translating research into new products and services;
- to increase international collaboration in research and development, promote increased investment in South Australia based on our research strengths and help South Australian companies compete in the global marketplace;
- to sustain the state's reputation as a leader in research conducted for the benefit of society; and
- to ensure South Australia's science, research and innovation community has access to the equipment, facilities and infrastructure needed to undertake industry relevant research.

Mr WINGARD: I think that was done back in January 2014, when the Hon. Grace Portolesi was the minister. Have you looked at redefining that, given that it was put in place before the last election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Progress is monitored by the Science Council on those priorities and certainly a lot of those priorities speak to the action that we have taken in terms of making sure that we increase collaboration in that research area, which a number of those areas that are supported by PRIF are involved in, particularly the CRCs. The translation for research to conduct to benefit society and to help the economy are certainly being enacted in a big way in that nearly \$80 million investment in innovation that we made last year.

Mr WINGARD: That action plan you talk about had education investment at \$2 million in 2012-13, and \$2 million in 2013-14, but no more money in that fund beyond that. Have you reallocated funds as far as that is concerned?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Which budget line are you referring to?

Mr WINGARD: This is referring to the action plan that you just referred to. They had \$2 million in 2012-13 and \$2 million in 2013-14 in the Education Investment Fund, yet no money going forward in that sub-program. Was that allocated elsewhere or was that ended?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not know the aspects of that and I cannot remember the exact figure, but it is many tens of millions of dollars in a recent budget that has been announced for an upgrade of science facilities in schools right across South Australia, so there has been a massive, massive investment in science and recognising the importance of science as part of education. I am happy to get that exact number in the question that you have asked and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: Defence scholarships was another one there. In 2012-13 it was \$350,000; 2013-14, \$375,000; 2014-15, \$375,000; 2015-16, \$375,000. Do you know if that one has continued on or whether that one has ended?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that that is not in my portfolio area but our understanding—and if it is wrong I will correct it—but our understanding, although it is in the skills area of government, is that that is ongoing. As I said, if that is not the case, I will bring back a report.

Mr WINGARD: I will fire a couple more at you and if you can you can, and if you can't you can't; I understand. The student entrepreneurial initiative, again 2013-14, \$150,000; 2014-15, \$150,000; 2015-16, \$150,000.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I think it is the same answer. My advice is that that is now in the skills department of government and our understanding is that it is ongoing. If that is not the case, I am happy to bring back a reply to let you know.

Mr WINGARD: Hubs Adelaide, \$125,000 for 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and then, in fact, in 2015-16, it was budgeted at \$275,000.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I am happy to—perhaps with those very specific sub-programs, if you want to read them in as a mini omnibus question, I am happy to take them on notice.

Mr WINGARD: I will go through a few of those and if any of them jump out and you can answer them now, that is great. If not, I understand you taking them on notice. There are a couple here that are not in your scope and I am aware of that. There was funding for the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI) but I would not imagine that is in your portfolio. The high-value food manufacturing hub was \$570,000 in 2013-14; \$1.1 million in 2014-15; and \$1.19 million in 2015-16.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That sits in PIRSA but, again, if I can find out information about it, I am happy to bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you very much. I think we have talked about the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence. You talked about that a little while back. Science communication was \$779,000 in 2012-13; \$826,000 in 2013-14; \$843,000 in 2014-15; and \$849,000 in 2015-16.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the work that was done in that program line is now done through the Inspiring South Australia collaboration. That is that four-year \$1.52 million program with the universities, the Australian government and the SA Museum.

Mr WINGARD: So there is no state government funding in that program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is \$1.52 million total with the state government contribution. I can take it on notice and try to find a breakdown.

Mr WINGARD: We talked about digital productivity, and you were looking into that. According to these budget lines, for 2012-13 and 2013-14, it was 454 and 435. If you can let me know what is happening ongoing with that, that would be great. The other one that was all part of this is the whole-of-government R&D. Do you have an explanation of that? There was 123 million in 2012-13 and 2013-14; 127 in 2014-15; and 130 in 2015-16. Is that still all part of the science action plan?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: There is another thing I would ask you to look into for me, and I know we discussed this. The action plan is just outlining a couple of other parameters. There is the Premier's Research and Industry Fund. It makes your point. In 2012-13, the fund was 4.4; in 2013-14, it was 4.2; in 2014-15, it was 4.2; and in 2015-16, it was 4.2, but there was the Premier's Research and Industry Fund additional funding. In 2013-14, there was an extra \$1 million; in 2014-15, there was an extra \$2 million; and in 2015-16, there was an extra \$2 million, which would equate to that figure that we talked about being higher. I know you are already looking into the existing Premier's Research and Industry Fund, if you could look into the Premier's research and industry additional funding, as to whether that was just an additional fund for a period of time or whether that was—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will take that on notice and bring back a reply.

Mr WINGARD: On page 70, under Performance indicators, University—industry engagement, there is a dot point that reads:

Cumulative industry funding to publicly funded research sector

Seeking annual increase, from baseline \$270 million in 2012 to \$570 million by 2017.

There is a two year lag for relevant data from the Commonwealth Department of Education and Training and Australian Bureau of Statistics. Data is by calendar year.

I am just seeking an explanation on the funding. It was targeted last year at 547 and reached 610. Then the target is 670. Can you just explain what that 'University—industry engagement' entails?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that in 2015, the cumulative industry funding to the publicly funded research sector grew to 610 million, surpassing the 2017 calendar year target of 570 million. As the original annual targets were surpassed in each year since 2015 and then the

2017 end-point target of 570 million was already exceeded in 2016, the targets for 2016 and 2017 have been reset higher than the original targets quoted in the agency statement.

Mr WINGARD: On page 68, program 3, on the grants and subsidies line, in 2015-16, it was 8 million. Then it was budgeted at 10, so it went up \$2½ million between 2015-16 and 2016-17. It has gone up \$500,000 in this year. I am keen to know your take on that increase, given that we talk about how important science, technology and the information economy is to growing jobs in South Australia. We know that we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation and have done for 31 months in a row. In regard to that minor increase of half a million dollars compared to a \$2½ million increase the previous year, is there a reason for not investing in science, technology and the information economy?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think the key element that is not captured in those figures in this page of the budget paper is the funds we talked about during the Manufacturing and Innovation stage—that \$50 million of state government money for the Venture Capital Fund, the extra \$10 million of state government money for the early stage commercialisation fund, the rapid commercialisation fund. That does not include future industries or is that—in any event, there are some tens of million dollars in recognition of exactly what you are talking about in terms of the importance of science and technology and critically, the commercialisation of some of the world-class research that our research institutions do. That is why in addition to the increase you see in this section of the budget line here, there are tens of millions of dollars of increased funding to make sure we are making the most of the excellent science that is done in our universities and translating it for commercial purposes.

Mr WINGARD: To add to that—and it has been a recurring theme throughout our day here in estimates and the different programs that we have gone through within DSD—you and I can debate about it and perhaps we need to do that. However, my statement will be that I have talked about the cuts or the reduction in the amount of funding that has gone through year on year for different programs and sub-programs and you have turned around and said, 'It has ended up coming back in another form.' Is that the way the government sees it is best to deliver this funding through specific programs, that we can invest in advertising and whatever else, as opposed to increasing these programs that are already in existence and growing them year on year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not think we see it as an either/or proposition. I think it would be foolish to lock in a commitment to only ever having the programs that you already have and only expanding current programs that you already have and closing off the possibility for new programs. Anyone involved in public policy would do both, that is, look at the efficacy of the programs you already have and if there are better ways to do what you are doing—which is what we did with the RedFire report—get some very serious advice on the best way for government to be involved in this area, particularly the translation of the research that we are doing into something that is beneficial for the economy. So, look at being open to new ideas, and that is at the very heart of what innovation is: at its centre, innovation is doing things differently.

If we are to support what is very important to the economy and making sure that innovation is at the heart of what our economy does, that is what governments also need to do. It is a case of looking at what government programs are working well but making sure that we are well and truly open, if there is a better way to do something, to do it. That might be changing particular programs, it might be continuing or expanding programs where it is working, and it might also be significant new programs as are needed.

Mr WINGARD: I appreciate that and, again, I am seeking clarification as to why you would not grow new programs within science, technology and information economy so that the money is allocated to that stream, as opposed to creating a bigger stream somewhere else where there is no guarantee that the money is going to go back to this area of—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes. If you take, for example, the early stage commercialisation fund, I do not think you would want to have a competitive grants program that necessarily you only opened up to these narrow fields of endeavour. I think by opening it up to the best possible ideas that are within the remit of TechInSA you are necessarily funding what the best ideas are and not saying, 'Unless it fits in this very small stream that's all that's going to be funded.'

Mr WINGARD: I understand, yes. We can continue the debate in the coffee lounge, I am sure. Thank you for that. I appreciate your input on that. I think you may have answered this but I am seeking clarification: the cooperative research centres were all headquartered here in South Australia—those CRCs—is that what we were—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, they are either the headquarter of the CRC or a node of that CRC located here in South Australia.

Mr WINGARD: Do you have a breakdown of which ones are the nodes and which ones are the headquarters, by chance?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We may have. Dr Adam Reid is the winner with this, by four seconds, which is good for him. The Data to Decisions CRC is headquartered in South Australia, and its lead participants include the University of SA; the Deep Exploration Technologies CRC is headquartered here in South Australia. Its lead agency in government is DSD, and it is headquartered at the lead participants, University of Adelaide. The CRC for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment is a node here, the lead government agency is the EPA and the lead SA participant is Uni of SA.

The Low Carbon Living CRC is a node here, with lead government agency DSD, with the Uni of SA lead participant. CRC for High Performance Soils is a node with PIRSA, Rural Solutions, the lead agency, with lead participants being the SA Grains Research Trust, Eyre Peninsula Agriculture Research Foundation, MacKillop Farm Management Group, Mallee Sustainable Farming, Hart-field Site Group, and, the Lower Eyre Agricultural Development Association.

The Food Agility CRC's lead government agency is PIRSA through SARDI, lead participants being the Australian Wine Research Institute, Elders and Agribusiness Australia. The iMove CRC's lead government agency is DPTI, with Flinders Uni, University of South Australia, the Royal Automobile Association and Cohda Wireless as the lead participants. The last two, the Food Agility CRC and the iMove CRC are nodes.

Mr WINGARD: Just confirming, the nodes are based—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If the honourable member wants, I can find out where the headquarters of those CRCs are, but those nodes are South Australian-based nodes.

Mr WINGARD: I want to get a bit of enlightenment, if I can, on the commonwealth grant funding and who is responsible for the strategic bids we put out from South Australia for the commonwealth grants. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 68, where it talks about getting commonwealth funding for science and the information economy on page 68; the very first dot point refers to 'identifying strategic priorities...strategic bids for commonwealth funding'. Like the blackspot funding, we get commonwealth funding for different projects. I want to be enlightened, if I can, on how many commonwealth grants are applied for each financial year and what is the ratio of successful versus unsuccessful grants.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We do not have that information, and it will not just be in my portfolios that we apply for commonwealth funding invested in science and research. There is PIRSA, and in a lot of areas of government there will be cooperation between the state government and the commonwealth. I can say that the information I do have is that, through the work the PRIF program does, over the last 14 years the Premier's Research and Industry Fund has invested in more than 150 projects, leveraging \$128.2 million from research institutions, industry partners and the Australian government. That is an example from PRIF of where we have been able to leverage significant investment from not just the Australian government but from other institutions.

Mr WINGARD: Just a breakdown there of the numbers—was there a rough number of how much came from—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Over the last 14 years the Premier's Research and Industry Fund has invested in more than 150 projects, is my advice, leveraging some \$128.2 million from research institutions, industry partners and the Australian government.

Mr WINGARD: You do not have a breakdown on that as to what is—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have a breakdown of those 150 projects in front of me, no.

Mr WINGARD: I am more interested in the breakdown of the percentage of money that has come from the federal government, as opposed to other institutions.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Adam Reid and Andy Dunbar do not have much to do in the next couple of weeks, so we will make them do that, sure.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic, that would be great; it would be good to know what we are getting there. To elaborate while you have the gentlemen here, with DSD's role in negotiating those contracts and those deals with the federal government, do we have a close relationship with the federal government as far as getting our share of those grants?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I think that is one of the strengths in South Australia: in a number of areas, particularly in this area, we have a pretty close working relationship with the federal government, and I think we do quite well in terms of the amount we are able to leverage in terms of what we do as a state.

Mr WINGARD: And do you keep tallies of what our share is compared to other states and how many applications we make?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If we have those figures, I will see what I can supply.

Mr WINGARD: Fantastic. Dan, did you have one on the blackspot funding that you wanted to ask?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Do you have the line reference?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, I have: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 69, halfway down, it talks about the 're-profile of expenditure across the forward estimates associated with round 2 of the Mobile Black Spot program' at \$800,000 into the regional areas for our friends.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question is: can you share with the committee the locations that the state government proposed that were not successful in round two?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have the full list here. What I can say is that we put forward locations after consultation with the whole range of stakeholders. The federal government chose what they would fund. We are not privy to why the federal government chose what they did. We have asked a number of times. Certainly, the Australian National Audit Office has been heavily critical of the process in round 1 and the lack of transparency, and has made recommendations to remove the politics from this. That did not appear to happen in round 2 and we are none the wiser about how they chose what they chose.

We put up \$2 million, and the federal government decided that they were not interested in using the whole amount that we put up. They only used two-thirds of that, so with the money left over we went to the telcos and looked through a list of priorities. Safety is a particular concern for the emergency services, what areas were thought most critical. The telecommunication operators came back with what they could do with the money that we had and, as we outlined a couple of months ago, four new mobile phone towers were being built as a result of that co-investment with the state government.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sure, but the process, as I understand it, was that along with the money and consultation with the telcos, local councils and other involved organisations, proposals were put forward, so the question was: of the proposed locations that were not successful, and also considering the other four that you said were not successful but you pursued, what other locations did you propose that did not proceed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have that information with me. I can tell you some of them. Most were very high in our areas and included the Sevenhill area in the Clare Valley; the Wasleys area where, obviously, we had terrible bushfires a few years ago; Yahl, outside Mount Gambier; and Blanchetown in the Riverland. I can go back and I will have a look to give an idea of areas that were not funded by the federal government. I am more than happy to do that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That the state government proposed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes. I will come back with what we proposed that were not funded.

Mr WINGARD: Can I just refer to the comments you made earlier about the Premier's Research and Industry Fund, which is having its expenditure reduced, as we discussed. You mentioned the commonwealth grants that came as well, and you mentioned that there were other private entities that also contributed funds towards those types of grants. Could you outline some of the private entities that contributed as well to this grant funding?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The PRIF funding that we talked about was \$128-odd million. What are some of the private entities that fund that?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, that actually contribute.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They would be many and varied. It could be things like the RAA or the grains council, universities or private industries like Cohda Wireless, in the iMOVE CRC. A whole range of different representative bodies, universities or private industry would have contributed to those funds as well.

Mr WINGARD: What programs do the private enterprises contribute towards? Is it just the Premier's Research and Industry Fund or are there other funds that private entities contribute to as well?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Primarily for these research purposes, I am advised that it is PRIF that is the primary vehicle for those consortia that involve private industry funding.

Mr WINGARD: Are there others, or there are no others and it is just PRIF, or there could be a couple of others?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: A lot of grants programs will involve matching funds from those receiving the grants. The South Australian early stage commercialisation fund that we went into a lot more detail about during the Manufacturing and Innovation estimates is one such example where it requires matched funding. In that sense, any company that receives those 26 or 27 approved grants from the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund will have matching funding from private industry.

So, in a sense, there is a whole range of areas in this space where what we do in a government leverages matching funding. The Venture Capital Fund is probably another example of that where, from the \$50 million South Australian Venture Capital Fund, there is required to be at least equal private sector private equity to make that investment. So, in a whole range of areas we are setting things up to leverage off private industry funds as well as what the state government contributes.

Mr WINGARD: Which probably leads me to the Premier's Research and Industry Fund. Just to clarify the way that is done, is that done as a grant or is that done as matched funding? Is it two for one? How does that work?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It varies, depending on what the grant or the program is.

Mr WINGARD: Can you elaborate on how it varies and for who? Is it depending on the size of the grant?

The CHAIR: Briefly.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: One example would be the research consortia program that we talked about earlier that has one added to it each time, where for round 1 it is about even between the institutions and what the state government puts in. So, it will vary, depending on the particular program.

Mr WINGARD: Is it possible to get a breakdown?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For example, the CRCs, for a total of \$750,000 of state government funding the leverage is something like approximately \$15 million of cash and in-kind contributions, so it is wide and varied, the leverage from state government funds, depending on the area.

Mr WINGARD: Is it tabled anywhere so I can go and have a look?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: With 150 projects, I know the folks in DSD have a fair bit of spare time. But if it is easily done, I will see what I can bring back.

The CHAIR: Excellent. Thank you, minister. With that, as per the declared timetable, I declare the examination of proposed payments adjourned until later today.

Sitting suspended from 14:17 to 14:30.

Membership:

Mr Marshall substituted for Mr Wingard.

Ms Redmond substituted for Mr Bell.

Mr Treloar substituted for Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Duffy, Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Ms A. Reid, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of State Development.

Ms N. Saunders, Executive Director, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Department of State Development.

Ms P. Chau, Director, Performance and Governance, Department of State Development.

Ms S. Bartlett, Manager, Strategy and Support, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Department of State Development.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, minister, appearing in your capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. I would ask you at this point, minister, to introduce any new advisers you have with you and then proceed with an opening statement if you wish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, Chair. The new advisers since we had a break include Nerida Saunders, on my right, the Executive Director of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation in the Department of State Development, and Sheryl Bartlett, the Manager, Strategy and Support, Aboriginal Affairs.

The CHAIR: Minister, do you have an opening statement?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, not really.

The CHAIR: Leader, do you have an opening statement?

Mr MARSHALL: Mr Chair, my questions all relate to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 66 and 67. I will not be moving away from those two pages. There is plenty of detail on those two pages that will keep us going, I am sure.

My first question relates to the bottom point on page 66 which talks about the \$800,000-worth of expenditure last financial year on the proposed treaty framework. Can the minister provide us with some breakdown on that expenditure to give us a better understanding of how the treaty framework is being developed and what the framework specifically comprises?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I advise that that budget line is in relation to the consultation process we announced in December last year, starting discussions with Aboriginal South Australians about treaty processes that included salaries, including the Treaty Commissioner, Dr Roger Thomas, his support staff, outposted Crown Solicitor services, with supplies and services as part of that consultation.

I can advise that as part of that consultation process, over the last 120-odd days a communication was undertaken via various platforms: face-to-face meetings and engagements with

more than 600 people across South Australia, detailed written submissions, hard copy and online survey responses received from almost 300 people, more than 200 hits to a dedicated website, targeted Facebook, emails, distributions, various outreach across different media platforms and I think something like 11,000 kilometres travelled by the treaty team in undertaking this consultation.

The consultation team has talked about the fact that in their memory they cannot remember a more detailed and comprehensive statewide consultation in Aboriginal Affairs. So, I am very pleased, Mr Chair, that on something as important as this is to Aboriginal South Australians there has been such comprehensive consultation.

Mr MARSHALL: Who is on the treaty team?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The treaty team comprises Dr Roger Thomas as the Treaty Commissioner. Virginia Leek is the outposted Crown Solicitor. There are support officers Dale Agius and Owen Sharpe.

Mr MARSHALL: Nevertheless, the \$800,000 in a six-month period; can you provide this committee, not necessarily today, with some further detail about how that \$800,000—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can provide some detail on the \$800,000. It was initially budgeted for \$800,000 to be spent. Of that, there is a surplus left over. Of the \$800,000, \$242,642 in total has been spent: on salaries totalling \$167,531; outposted Crown Solicitor services of \$40,680; and supplies and services \$34,431

Mr MARSHALL: Are you saying that only \$242,000 was expended?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There has been \$242,640 spent in the months since the consultation started in earnest in February.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you; but I do not know how that reconciles with the comment on the bottom of page 66, because it says there, 'The \$1.2 million increase in expenses is primarily due to...', including the development of the treaty process, which is \$0.8 million—presumably that is \$800,000. Why are you saying it is now only 200-and-something thousand.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The reason it is an increase is because it was not in the original budget, because this funding was announced in the Mid-Year Budget Review, which is why it appears as an increase.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, but this is a comparison, if you read the heading, the estimated result, compared with the budget.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, it is compared with the budget from the year before. Every single bit of it is an increase on the year before because there was none in the budget the year before.

Mr MARSHALL: Perhaps if you just listen to my question before you answer it, because you are answering a question that I am not asking. You had an original budget.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Zero.

Mr MARSHALL: Zero?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, from last year's budget it was a zero, yes.

Mr MARSHALL: And then you have an estimated result for the end of last financial year, compared with that original project, which was zero. It is saying that it has gone up \$800,000. You are telling me it went up 200-and-something. That is the question; do not answer the wrong question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not mind repeating what I said before. The original budget for 2016–17 was \$848,000. The actual spend in 2016–17 was a total of salaries: \$167—

Mr MARSHALL: That is not what it says on your pages in the budget.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is what the actual spend ended up being, subject to the finalisations of this year's figures. I will go through it again: salaries \$167,531, \$41,680, \$34,431 for a total of \$242,642. Budgets are estimates about what might be spent.

One thing we can say about the budget for treaty is that this is not a process that you can go back and have a look at what how much discussing a treaty has cost before. We have not done this; this is new and it builds on South Australia leading the way in Aboriginal affairs, as it has done under the stewardship of Labor for so long.

Mr MARSHALL: So what is the budget for the treaty process this current financial year, and where does that appear on page 66?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that it will be incorporated in various aspects, including supplies and services and employee benefits expenses across the various budget lines. The indicative budget for this financial year is \$944,000 for the treaty process.

Mr MARSHALL: Just for clarity, what was the expenditure last financial year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It was \$242,642.

Ms REDMOND: I would still say that at the bottom of page 66 you are talking about the 2016-17 estimated result. That is what the heading is. And you are talking about a \$1.2 million increase, of which \$800,000 is attributable in 2016-17, according to your note, to an \$800,000 variation of the treaty process. That is what your note says.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is \$800,000 variation from the last budget. I think you are fundamentally misunderstanding what it is trying to say there.

Ms REDMOND: There is a \$1.2 million variation from the last budget.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, but primarily attributed to—

Ms REDMOND: \$800,000—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —at the time the budget was being put together, what was budgeted at the time, of \$800,000 for the treaty processes, of which \$242,000 is the actual for the year.

Ms REDMOND: That does not make sense to word it like that.

Mr MARSHALL: If you have not spent the money, it could not possibly appear in the estimated result, could it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We do not have an actual result for this financial year.

Ms REDMOND: It is the estimated result for 2016-17. That is your outcome.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, \$242,000 is the estimated result.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to get—

The CHAIR: Minister—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If that is the most important thing that you have in Aboriginal Affairs, I am happy to spend the hour talking about this.

Ms REDMOND: Well, you just—

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, I actually do appreciate the point both you and the leader are trying to make but speaking over each other does not help, and not listening to the minister does not help. If you let him answer in full and then question his answer, that is fine.

Mr MARSHALL: I could ask it another way: if only \$242,000 was a variance related to the treaty process, where is the other \$956 million, because it says it is an over-budget expenditure of \$1.2 million, so if you could just tell us where that other \$958 million is.

Ms REDMOND: Thousand.

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, \$958,000. You are quite right. I am so glad the member for Heysen is here.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The difference between what was estimated to be spent, the \$0.8 million for treaty and the \$1.2 million, equates to \$400,000, and I am happy to take on notice and bring back replies into those elements that make up that \$400,000; I am very happy to do that. I do understand that for the vast majority of the Liberal team that have never come close to being ministers, this is a difficult process, but I am happy to bring back an answer and inform them more thoroughly.

Ms REDMOND: I take exception to the comment by the minister. The process of estimates is our entitlement to ask the minister questions and he seems to be deliberately avoiding this question. His document clearly says that there is a—

The CHAIR: Do you have a question, member for Heysen?

Ms REDMOND: Yes. Can he please explain why, if there is a \$1.2 million variance in the estimated results of the year that has finished—

Mr MARSHALL: Compared to the original budget.

Ms REDMOND: —and it is because of an \$800,000—

Mr MARSHALL: Actual spend.

Ms REDMOND: —actual spend.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: There is a bit of a tag team going on. If one person could speak at a time, that would be very helpful, for Hansard, if not me.

Ms REDMOND: The minister has lots of advisers at no doubt great expense, Mr Chair.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, I am happy to bring back a reply into that \$400,000.

Mr MARSHALL: Alright, if \$944,000 is the budgeted expenditure for treaty this current financial year, what is the budget for the following years of the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can answer that. In the current financial year, it is \$944,000; for 2018-19, the budgeted amount is \$957,000; for 2019-2020, it is \$967,000; and for the final year of the forward estimates, 2020-21, there is \$700,000 budgeted against that.

Mr MARSHALL: What was the cost of establishing the Office of the Treaty Commissioner? Were there any establishment costs?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The establishment costs would be included in those costs.

Mr MARSHALL: That \$242,000.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The \$242,642 that I have already outlined would include whatever costs to establish and those first months of operation that have included that statewide consultation process.

Mr MARSHALL: Is the Treaty Commissioner a full-time position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, the Treaty Commissioner is a full-time position.

Mr MARSHALL: What is the remuneration for that position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is approximately \$190,000 for the full-time Treaty Commissioner, but if that is wildly wrong I am happy to bring back an answer and fully correct that.

Mr MARSHALL: Approximately \$190,000 in his total package.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is my advice, but I do not have a written figure in front of me. If that is significantly incorrect, I will bring back a reply to correct that.

Mr MARSHALL: The budget for 30 June this year was 47 FTEs. The estimated result was 59. Do those additional 12 people relate to this treaty organisation or team?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that three of those relate to the treaty process. Others relate to allocations for Aboriginal Heritage Act review implementation and also relate to positions for the Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you give a breakdown for those additional 12 people? It is three for the treaty process over and above the original allocation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Two for the Aboriginal Heritage Act review implementation, one further FTE for the Stolen Generation Reparations Scheme and three for other areas and overheads, which have not been reflected in the budget.

Mr MARSHALL: You are still three short.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Sorry—2½ FTEs are relating to unassigned staff as of 30 June 2017.

Mr MARSHALL: Just for clarity, are we saying that the total number of people working on treaties is three—the commissioner, Mr Agius and the legal officer?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, it is three plus the Crown.

Mr MARSHALL: Who is the third?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Owen Sharpe, as I think I outlined earlier in my response to your answer, is part of the treaty team. There is the commissioner, two support staff and the Crown Solicitor.

Mr MARSHALL: Has the Treaty Commissioner appointed any external consultants to assist with the work of the consultation as part of this 2017-18 forward estimate?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that no, he has not. Our Treaty Commissioner, Dr Roger Thomas, a former professor of Adelaide University and a former manager of the heritage branch of the department, is one of the people with the greatest expertise at consultation with Aboriginal communities across this state. I think if someone was embarking on consultation with Aboriginal communities, Dr Thomas is probably one person who would be engaged to help with that process.

Mr MARSHALL: You are referring to Aboriginal communities. How many Aboriginal communities are there in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The answer is that there are many Aboriginal communities. There are typically recognised to be 40 to 50 Aboriginal groups or nations across South Australia. Of course, that is not the same as Aboriginal communities, and it would depend entirely on how you chose to define an Aboriginal community. Right across metropolitan Adelaide, there are areas that have significant Aboriginal populations that would be an Aboriginal community. There would be many dozens of Aboriginal communities right across South Australia, and it would depend. Would you include homelands throughout the state on the West Coast and on the APY lands as communities? There would be many Aboriginal communities right across South Australia.

Mr MARSHALL: With regard to the potential groups that could engage in the treaty process, how many are there?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, that is the whole point of consulting. We have not ruled out or ruled in exactly how that will work.

Mr MARSHALL: But there could be 40 or 50 treaties in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That was why we consulted. We are not going to be in the process of saying, 'This is how a treaty will or won't work.' That is why one consults in Aboriginal Affairs policy.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, but you announced this in December of last year. Presumably you had something in mind when it was taken to cabinet that was envisaged. Are we talking 40 or 50—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, I think that misses the point. There are a number of different ways that Aboriginal Affairs policies have developed. All too often, Aboriginal Affairs policies developed in a context of doing things to Aboriginal people rather than with Aboriginal people. I think

the whole point of what we are doing is to make sure that we consult widely. As I said in relation to this treaty team, I think this is probably the most thorough statewide consultation a government has ever engaged in with Aboriginal South Australia. When you ask what we wanted to do at the start, I think that entirely misses the point. We did not have a preconceived, 'This is how we want to end up and we will have some sort of sham consultation to get there.' That is not what we have done.

Mr MARSHALL: With regard to the treaty, there was some talk originally about trying to consult to decide whether there would be one single treaty for the state or whether there would be multiple treaties. Have you reached a position on that yet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Certainly, these questions have formed a large part of this consultation about what is the party that the government negotiates with and reaches agreements with. There are different jurisdictions around the world, and we are, I think, the only one of those countries that we compare ourselves with—like the US, Canada and New Zealand, for example—that did not have some form of treaty upon colonisation of our country. Victoria started a process where its initial starting point is an agreement with Aboriginal Victoria, and they are going through the process of how that might work with a representative body to start engaging that process.

Certainly, I am aware that there has been a range of views expressed across South Australia as to the most appropriate way. Dr Thomas has now given a report to the government that it is now considering. So, in the not-too-distant future we will have more to say about that initial consultation and how that is informing what we do from here on in.

Mr MARSHALL: Will any form of compensation be offered to the Aboriginal communities or nations that you are negotiating with as part of this treaty process, as per other jurisdictions around the world, many of which you have just mentioned in your comments to the committee?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, I have to say that is not something that is featured at all to any degree in the consultations that have taken place. As I said, the people who have been involved in this have described it as the most comprehensive statewide consultation with Aboriginal communities. It has not featured compensation as part of treaty to any significant degree whatsoever. As I said, we have not closed our minds to what we might do as a result of that consultation but it is certainly not something that is featured.

Mr MARSHALL: Just for clarity, you are ruling out compensation as a part of this treaty process.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I did not say anything—

Mr MARSHALL: You said it had not been raised.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, this is not something that to any degree has been raised as part of the consultation.

Mr MARSHALL: So, nobody has raised compensation as part of the entire consultation so far.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I certainly have not heard it and in the reports that the Treaty Commissioner has given it has not featured at all heavily as part of the consultation.

Mr MARSHALL: But some people have raised it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will have to check and find out if, in fact, any single individual has raised it. I will have to check on that but it has certainly not been any major part of consultations that have occurred so far.

Mr MARSHALL: But the government is prepared to consider requests for compensation as part of the treaty process?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We are going to have to look and see what comes out of the consultations. We are not closing our minds off, as I said. That is the point of consultation.

Mr MARSHALL: When will the consultation be finished?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: At this initial stage, as I said a few minutes ago, the commissioner has finalised the report and we are now considering the Treaty Commissioner's report.

Mr MARSHALL: So he has provided a report to the government which the government is now considering.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Treaty Commissioner provided a report, I think a week ago, at the end of July, a report which we will now consider.

Mr MARSHALL: Does his position continue now that that report has been provided to government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Absolutely. This is an ongoing process, as we went through earlier. It is budgeted in the forward estimates and his position continues.

Mr MARSHALL: There was some talk initially, when it was first talked about, of four treaties.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, there was not.

Mr MARSHALL: No.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No.

Mr MARSHALL: There has never been a number put on it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No.

Mr MARSHALL: Because we still do not know if we are going to have one or 40.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think you, as shadow Aboriginal Affairs minister, raised four treaties. I have no idea where you got that from. That was the first that I had heard.

Mr MARSHALL: We have heard little from the government.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think that has been made up, largely.

Ms REDMOND: Minister, I appreciate what you said in your earlier comments about how broad the consultation has been across the state, but how has the commissioner gone about ensuring that all the relevant groups are consulted? I ask this question specifically in relation to the Mirning people, who had a native title claim which stretched basically across the Nullarbor over to Point Culver in Western Australia from about Fowlers Bay, but who were left out of the ultimate native title determination. I believe that was largely because they are no longer really resident on those lands and are largely dispersed into Port Lincoln, suburban Adelaide and various other places up to Port Augusta. I am wondering how you ensure that groups like that—and there may well be others—are not left out of the process.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, this is the most thorough consultation that the people who have been involved can remember. I am sure you will find a person somewhere who might not have been involved in this particular consultation, as is the case with any consultation.

The Treaty Commissioner I know has embarked on a thoroughly exhaustive process of contacting as many groups as possible, whether it is the PBCs or native title claimants groups. I think there have been two or three meetings with statewide native title claimant groups. I know that the Mirning have been involved in at least one or two consultations on treaty, as well as others on the West Coast: the Wirangu, Kokatha and Maralinga Tjarutja representatives have all been involved in consultations on this particular process.

Mr MARSHALL: If we could move on now to the stolen generations reparations. What is the budget allocation for this current financial year for the reparations scheme for both individual applications and also for group applications?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is for the year-to-date actual for 2016-17; we do not have a final figure on the actual for 2016-17, but it is in the order of \$300,000 to \$400,000 for the spending in 2016-17, which is comprised of the cost of administering the scheme, of going through the process of assessing applications, getting further information and of conducting meetings with individual

applicants. For the 2017-18 budget year, \$5.63 million for the stolen generations individual reparations scheme is the budgeted amount.

Mr MARSHALL: Is there anything in the forward estimates beyond this current financial year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No; that is the nature of the scheme—it is budgeted for the 2017-18 scheme to make those payments to individuals in the current financial year. I note that there has been significantly more interest in this scheme than we expected. As the honourable member knows, because he has looked at those issues before, estimates range from groups and from the ALRM, but some of the estimates were that up to 300 people might apply for the scheme from the estimates we had before us.

I can inform you that, based on when the scheme closed at the end of March this year, there were 447 applications for that scheme. It has shown that this has resonated heavily and there has been significantly more interest in the scheme than we thought originally, based on the information we had when we first launched the scheme.

Mr MARSHALL: When will successful applicants be advised of the outcome?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We do not have an exact date for when successful applicants will be advised. With the much higher number of applications than were originally expected, there is significantly more work to do going through the applications, assessing the applications, and every applicant was given an opportunity to meet face to face to tell their story and have it, if they wished, told to the independent assessor.

I am advised that, to date, over 200 applicants have met with the independent assessor already as part of the individual reparations scheme. They are continuing to be processed, and we will process them as quickly as possible, but with a much higher take-up than was originally expected we do not have a final date, but as soon as possible. Later this year or early next year is the anticipation.

Mr MARSHALL: In March of this year, you made a statement that successful applicants would receive the same amount. Have you determined what that amount is yet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, we have not, but that will be based, as the Tasmanian scheme was based, on the number of applicants who are successful. There is a total of \$6 million in the individual reparation scheme. It will depend on how many applicants are successful as to the quantum that will be received.

When the scheme was initially set up, you might remember, it had been the intention that there would be an assessment of the amount that would be applied out of the scheme based on each applicant's history and what effect that had on them later in life. Overwhelmingly, there were responses from the Aboriginal community and those members of the stolen generations that that could lead to two family members being taken under the same circumstances and different life outcomes, receiving different amounts, or members from the same community, and the overwhelming feedback was that that was an undesirable consequence, so we pretty quickly made the decision that, like the Tasmanian scheme, it would be that if an applicant qualified for the scheme it would be the same payment for all applicants.

Mr MARSHALL: Is there any plan to increase the original budget allocation to cope with the additional number of applicants?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, we made it quite clear at the start that this was the funding, as they did in Tasmania, this was the pool that the government had budgeted for and that that would, as we had initially envisaged, on a scale be made as ex gratia payments to members of the stolen generations who qualified and accepted the payment, but as I have said, now it will be an even amount across all people. We do not know yet how many of the 447 applications will be successful, but as the applications are worked through that will be determined.

Mr MARSHALL: If all of them are successful, then people will be paid \$12,000 or \$13,000, rather than the original \$50,000?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We never said that everyone is going to get \$50,000. I do not think we ever said that. When the scheme was originally envisaged, it talked about, as I said, that sliding scale of up to \$50,000. As I said, we listened very carefully to feedback on consultation that we engaged in, and it was abundantly clear that it was not desirable to have that sliding scale up to \$50,000, but to have an even reparation scheme for applicants who were successful, and not just successful but ones who elect to take our payment.

One thing that has come out of the scheme is that although some sort of reparation is an important part of the recognition, for many it is not the only one. I would say that for a lot whom I have talked to it is not the major part of the scheme. The major part is, regardless of the amount of money, the recognition that this all actually happened. Certainly, with over 200 applicants already having met with the independent assessor, the feedback I have as well is that the ability to spend that time talking to the person who is going to make this decision, letting them know how this affected your life and what the outcomes have been, is an extremely important part of what this scheme is doing.

Mr MARSHALL: Does it remain the government's intention to provide individuals who have applied for reparations who are either unsuccessful or dissatisfied with the amount awarded with funding to seek legal advice on their position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It has never been the government's intention to provide people who are unsuccessful with amounts to gain legal advice. What the government said consistently when the scheme was announced, and it is still the case, is that \$1,000 will be provided to everyone to whom an offer is made. Anyone an offer is made to will have the ability to have \$1,000 worth of legal advice about whether to accept the offer or not.

Mr MARSHALL: If the fund for payments is \$6 million, what is the total cost to government for the payments and the administration of this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The total cost of the scheme is \$6 million.

Mr MARSHALL: This is for payments to people and the overheads? I think \$6 million is just the payments to the recipients?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have some better advice. The administration costs are estimated to be \$1.47 million, and then on top of that is the \$6 million for the ex gratia payments.

Mr MARSHALL: So, the total cost is \$7.5 million?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, \$7.4 million, is my advice.

Mr MARSHALL: The minister told the estimates committee last year that if there were compelling medical reasons, urgent applications could be expedited to allow partial payment ensuring recognition in the applicant's lifetime. Have any such partial payments been made and if so, how many and what was their total cost?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have a total cost. I can take that on notice and bring back a reply. What I can say is that there have been 11 interim payments made from the scheme as of 19 July. These have been ones where there have been compelling reasons due to the medical circumstances of individuals that have warranted not waiting until the whole scheme had finished but to make a part payment from the scheme for individuals where a medical condition would mean that there is a possibility that that person might be too sick or not around when—

Mr MARSHALL: What was the value of that payment, or those payments, on an individual basis?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised it is in the vicinity of \$5,000 for the interim payment, so that would constitute part payment once all the scheme has been recognised. It is something where some cases have been rushed very, very urgently. A lot of members of the stolen generations are now quite elderly, and we know that life expectancy in the Aboriginal community is, tragically, much shorter than the rest of Australia, so it has been something we have been very conscious of. In some of these the officers involved have gone above and beyond in turning some of these around exceptionally quickly and getting the information needed as a matter of urgency, rushing them to

make these part payments to make sure there is that act of recognition in a part payment while they are still alive.

Mr MARSHALL: Has anybody passed away after submitting their application for this reparation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have information in front of me, but I will take that on notice and find out a proper answer. So, is your question if anyone has passed away after a partial payment has been made?

Mr MARSHALL: No, after they have lodged their application. Applications closed in March, so presumably it was open for several months beforehand. The question is whether anybody has passed away since they have made their application for this reparation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, someone who has passed away without a part payment being made?

Mr MARSHALL: Either, really.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have that information, but I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr MARSHALL: But are there any or none that you are aware of?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not know. We think there may have been some who have received a part payment who have since passed away, but I will want to double-check that to bring back an accurate answer.

Mr MARSHALL: Okay. If they have passed away after making the application but before you have determined your final position, will this payment be ultimately made to their estate?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is the intention.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you tell us what the total remuneration paid so far to the independent assessor for the stolen generations scheme has been and the estimated total amount that is going to be paid to him over the life of this program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have that information in front of me. I am happy to take that on notice and provide a response.

Mr MARSHALL: Is it a full-time position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No. I am advised it is not a full-time position. I am happy to take it on notice. So, the question is the total amount from last year's budget that has been paid to the independent assessor?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, so what was it last financial year, and what is it for the current budget for this financial year? You might be able to answer this one from your advisers: what is the contract for that role per annum on an annualised basis?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advisers are nodding their heads in a way that indicates that we do not have that here but are happy to take on notice and bring back that reply.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much. Just a question regarding the continual review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act. Can the minister inform the committee when the review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act actually began? I know it pre-dates your time and that of other honourable members in this chamber currently who have held that august post.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Aboriginal Heritage Act was first introduced in 1988 in South Australia, and I suspect that since that time, under both shades of political persuasion in South Australia, there have been reviews of that act. There was one major review in December 2008. There was a draft amendment bill in 2013 to the Aboriginal Heritage Act, and in mid-2015 a new reference group was set up. In 2016, there were some amendments made to the Aboriginal Heritage Act that we are—

Mr MARSHALL: That has all passed; legislation for that has passed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The legislation has passed. There are regulations that need to enact that scheme to create the registered Aboriginal heritage bodies that have gone to the State Heritage Committee and are in the order of weeks away from being finalised.

Mr MARSHALL: Who were you consulting with for the \$600,000 worth of expenditure last year and the \$500,000 this year and who is conducting this review in its 10th year? There is usually a book published in its 10th year, Mr Chairman, you know, consultations of the act. We could have photographs of the five or six ministers who have been involved.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Exactly what that money is being spent on, I am happy to take on notice and bring back a breakdown of that money. Certainly what I can say, off the top of my head, is that there has been consultation over most of this last financial year on the regulations and the establishment of things like registered Aboriginal heritage bodies that have involved a native title PBC of other involved Aboriginal heritage groups, but the exact breakdown of how that sum has been expended, I am happy to take on notice.

Mr MARSHALL: Do you plan to have any legislative proposals back to the parliament—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In relation to—

Mr MARSHALL: The consultation that is outlined in your own budget, what you have just outlined to the house.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I have said, there has been consultation on regulations that are probably now only weeks away from being presented to parliament.

Mr MARSHALL: Excellent.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is in relation to changes to the Aboriginal Heritage Act?

Mr MARSHALL: Correct.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just checking.

Mr MARSHALL: With regard to governance on the APY lands, and this is another area where there has been a lot of consultation over an extended period of time, are there some supplementary elections to be held very soon on the APY lands?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I understand that there were two or three of the electorates that had supplementary elections scheduled to be held to fill nominations that did not have nominations during the general election for the female member for those areas. I think that they have been held at least in one, maybe two, but I need to get some further advice on whether there are now positions filled in those areas. I am happy to get some further advice. I think there are two areas. I will bring back the exact advice.

Mr MARSHALL: With regard to that total program of governance on the APY lands, can you provide an update to the committee on what the total costs of that have been to date?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The total governance program, are we talking about the review that was conducted and the legislative changes that occurred before the most recent elections that were conducted under those legislative changes or are we talking about the ongoing work that both Minister Scullion, as the federal minister, and I together regularly contribute towards governance training on the APY lands?

Mr MARSHALL: I am mainly interested in what the state government's involvement is, what the original costs of the governance review were and then also what the ongoing costs are. I understand that the state government meets the costs of the elections, which I think are conducted by the South Australian Electoral Commission?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just so I am clear, and I will need to bring back a cumulative total in various areas, are you requesting the cost of the Layton review that was conducted, I think, about 2013 that led to the changes under which the current elections—

Mr MARSHALL: If that is accessible that would be helpful.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will have to take that on notice and bring back a reply. Were you also asking about the cost of conducting elections in the APY lands?

Mr MARSHALL: Is that the South Australian Electoral Commission?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, the South Australian Electoral Commission.

Mr MARSHALL: Is your division contributing to the cost of those elections?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, no. I am advised that we do not contribute to the cost. They are the costs that were met by the budget for the Electoral Commission to conduct those elections.

Mr MARSHALL: And so supplementary elections—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice and see if I can find an answer—it is not from my portfolio areas—about how much those elections—

Mr MARSHALL: Very helpful. Thank you very much.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I aim to please.

Mr MARSHALL: I now have some questions regarding Aboriginal regional authorities. What are the budgeted costs of implementation of the Aboriginal Regional Authority Policy in 2017-18 and across each year of the forward estimates?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised, once we have actual figures in, it will be in the order of just over \$300,000 in 2016-17. The budgeted cost for 2017-18 is \$455,000; for 2018-19, it is \$400,000; and for 2019-20, it is \$400,000.

Mr MARSHALL: In addition to this cost, is there any funding which is going to be provided directly to those Aboriginal regional authorities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that that funding includes any funding that is provided to regional authorities for the administration of that regional authority.

Mr MARSHALL: What conditions have been applied to that funding which has been provided to those regional authorities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am aware that there are funding agreements in relation to the provision of that funding. I am happy to see if I can bring back further answers on the exact nature of those funding agreements with the regional authorities, but certainly there are individual funding agreements with regional authorities about what is required for any funding for administration of those regional authorities to particular groups.

Mr MARSHALL: They are not a large amounts of money because you have three—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They are not large amounts of money; nonetheless, I am happy to bring back responses to what are the conditions. There are regularly conditions around how money for grants or administration is expended. This will not be something that is entirely different from many other areas of government.

Mr MARSHALL: How many additional regional authorities does the minister expect will be established over the next four years?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: When the policy was established, it was looking at two regional authorities being established each additional year in the forward estimates.

Mr MARSHALL: It is not clear from the activity indicators in the budget papers: the target for 2016-17 was one, the estimated result was three, and then the target for next year is an additional two.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In the initial year there were very high-quality applications on the back of trials that occurred for regional authorities, and there were three regional authorities in the first year. The ambition is for two regional authorities, years after that.

Mr MARSHALL: When does the government intend to introduce legislation to support the policy, given that the minister told last year's estimates that the legislation would be introduced early this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We are consulting on any legislation to support this policy. The first three regional authorities were announced in December last year. We are looking to see how they operate and indeed to see if a legislative framework is the optimal way to go.

Mr MARSHALL: So, in fact we might not have—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, we will see how they go and we will keep consulting with those regional authorities to see if legislation is the best way to underpin what they do.

Mr MARSHALL: Usually legislation comes before you do it. It begs the question as to why you would need it, if you have already done three and you did not need it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, there are a couple of different approaches. You can consult and you can work with Aboriginal communities, or you can just go out on your own and put legislation in and make policies and do things to Aboriginal people. That is not what we choose to do.

Mr MARSHALL: The question I have now is about your COAG agenda, because that comes under this area. What matters did the South Australian government place on the COAG Aboriginal affairs agenda in the 2016-17 financial year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the federal Liberal government abolished the ministerial council on Aboriginal affairs. In years past in a former position I was involved as a chief of staff to a minister for Aboriginal affairs. Ministerial councils on Aboriginal affairs have been abolished, which I think is a great shame. I know that many ministers from around Australia over the last 12 months have been discussing the fact that a number of jurisdictions are now looking at stolen generations reparation schemes. A number are moving towards treaty discussions with Aboriginal people. It is a great shame that we do not have that ability as ministers to discuss what is occurring in other states.

In January-February of this year, we attempted to organise a meeting of ministers from around Australia. Due to a number of circumstances, including elections occurring, particularly in WA, only a number of jurisdictions attended. There was an informal meeting of ministers of Aboriginal affairs that occurred in Perth only a month or two ago, so although the current Liberal government has abolished ministerial councils for Aboriginal affairs, I am very pleased to say that Aboriginal affairs ministers have now taken up the challenge amongst themselves to have such meetings.

I have to pay credit where it is due. The current federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Nigel Scullion, has been a great support to Aboriginal people in South Australia in a number of areas that he has been involved in. I think most months, at least, I talk to minister Scullion in depth about areas that are of concern to us both. Certainly, in relation to the Closing the Gap agenda, minister Scullion is looking to get together all ministers of Aboriginal affairs from around Australia to discuss this. As I said, credit where it is due, and I want to thank Senator Scullion for the leadership role he has played in terms of re-establishing some of that dialogue as well in Aboriginal affairs.

Mr MARSHALL: Maybe the minister might like to ask his department to update the annual report because the first item in the annual reports states that the responsibility of the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation division is to provide:

...strategic advice and leadership in whole-of-government Aboriginal Affairs policy, jointly [leading] the State's participation in the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) Aboriginal Affairs agenda...

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Certainly when, essentially, the ministerial council for Aboriginal affairs was abolished, it was taken up by the Prime Minister and first ministers. We remember the then prime minister, Tony Abbott, was going to be the prime minister for Indigenous Australia. I think one of the attempts to do that was to not have Aboriginal affairs ministers meet or discuss, but to have that on the Prime Minister and the first ministers' meetings.

It is something the department does contribute to when those agenda items are discussed on what are obviously very, very busy agendas between prime ministers and first ministers. The Closing the Gap agenda is probably the most significant area that the COAG process deals with.

There is a process underway to refresh that Closing the Gap agenda and, as I said, minister Scullion is looking to get all of the ministers from around Australia together as a part of that process.

Mr MARSHALL: Did you and your officers provide all answers to the omnibus questions in this portfolio for last year and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have any information in front of me. I have provided lots of answers to lots of questions from estimates last year.

Mr MARSHALL: My understanding is that you did not. Will you make a solemn commitment now to provide answers to all the omnibus questions in the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation—

The CHAIR: The minister does not have to make any solemn commitments to anybody right now.

Mr MARSHALL: We have not had any answers from last year. Isn't that the committee Chair's responsibility? Maybe you should have a look at that.

The CHAIR: No, in fact it is not, it is the house's responsibility, but, in any case—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We will do our best to provide whatever answers we can to inform this committee in terms of whatever reasonable answers can be provided in the areas that this budget line is responsible for.

Mr MARSHALL: In particular, I am interested in the grants and subsidies. Will you be able to provide a detailed listing of what has been paid out in the 2016-17 year, and what is envisaged in the \$6.1 million for this current financial year? In particular, I would like to ask about the status of a commitment that has been made over an extended period of time to the Jawun organisation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can and I will do one better and bring back an answer from what makes up some of the grants and subsidies to external groups in that budget line. I can advise that, from the budgeted line for 2016-17, one of those was grants to Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara to administer Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act. This includes the management of lands vested in Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara and the provision of effective and culturally sensitive service to leaseholders. Part of that also comprises the Aboriginal Lands Trust, with just over \$1 million to administer the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act. This includes the management of lands vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and the provision of an effective and culturally sensitive service to those leaseholders, the head leaseholders and the sub-leaseholders.

It also includes, for the 2016-17 budget, just under \$700,000 to Maralinga Tjarutja to administer the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act. It includes about \$300,000 for the Aboriginal regional authorities, which we have talked about. It includes in the 2016-17 budget about \$200,000 to Jawun Indigenous corporate partnerships, to support the establishment of Indigenous partnerships in South Australia.

Mr MARSHALL: Do you know what the total amount to—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: You have asked a question, so I am giving you an answer to this question. It includes in the 2016-17 year a grant to Reconciliation SA—of which I believe the member is the nominee of the Liberal Party on the board—of just over \$200,000 to support the core business of Reconciliation SA. This is an increase in funding from the previous year to reflect levels of funding provided by interstate bodies. It includes just over \$170,000 to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement to provide an Aboriginal visitor service aimed at reducing self-harm and deaths in custody in Adelaide, Kadina, Murray Bridge, the Riverland, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Ceduna, Coober Pedy, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier.

It includes just over \$150,000 to the Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation (RASAC) to help with office administration expenses and community council administration in communities. It includes approximately \$100,000 to Nunkuwarrin Yunti of South Australia to support the operation of the SA link-up program, Bringing Them Home, to assist in family reunification. It includes approximately \$100,000 to Supply Nation to support the development, hosting and maintenance of the South Australian Aboriginal business register website called Aboriginal Business

Connect. It has included in the past funding to the Aboriginal Foundation of South Australia and also funding to APY Law and Culture.

Mr MARSHALL: What is the total expenditure from the government for the Jawun organisation? When did this begin, and is there a contract that underpins that arrangement?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that there is a funding agreement with Jawun. It is about \$200,000. In 2014, there was a commitment of \$1.025 million over four years to support the expansion of the Jawun program into South Australia. This facilitates secondment programs to enable the transfer of corporate skills sectors and expertise to Aboriginal communities.

The Department of State Development has provided funding for Jawun to establish that presence in South Australia, and the program has facilitated 15 successful six-week secondments with the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority. It has brokered 10 corporate partnerships with the Australian and South Australian governments, Downer investments group, EY (Ernst Young), the RAA, IBM, QBE Insurance, the Westpac Group, Woodside Petroleum, Bendigo Bank and Adelaide Bank, in addition to the funding provided by the South Australia government for the expansion of Jawun into this state.

The South Australian public sector has established a secondment program to support South Australian government employees in the Jawun program. Under this agreement, the government is committed to providing a minimum of four secondees per year at ASO7 level or above to partner Aboriginal organisations for a period of up to six weeks. This aspect of the program is administered by the Office for the Public Sector. I am advised that as of July 2017, six public sector employees have participated in the engagement program.

Mr MARSHALL: For clarity, what did we receive for the \$200,000 we paid last year? Was it six secondees into the private sector?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, the secondees from the public sector are in addition to the funding we provided. What we have received from partnering with Jawun is 15 successful secondments from the private sector with 10 corporate partnerships with the private sector.

Mr MARSHALL: That was last financial year.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They were down on investment. I am advised that it was the last financial year and it might reach back to when the program was established. I will take that on notice and clarify that point. As I said, it was corporate partnerships with areas like EY (Ernst Young), IBM, QBE, Westpac, Bendigo Bank, etc.

Mr MARSHALL: Whose responsibility is it to determine whether or not Jawun have met their obligations under the contract, and are you assured that they have?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is the Aboriginal affairs part of DSD, and I am not aware that they are falling short of what they are supposed to be doing.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister commit to having a reconciliation of what was originally envisaged and what has been delivered because, as you point out, there is more than \$1 million expenditure on this program to date.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take that on notice. I do not think there has been more than \$1 million expended to date. It was \$1.025 million over four years for the program.

Mr MARSHALL: Starting in 2014-15.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Starting in 2015-16.

Mr MARSHALL: I see—announced in 2014-15, okay. There is one question with regard to the interpreter service additional money that the government has announced in the budget, which we wholeheartedly support on our side of the parliament. Can the minister give some indication as to whether this money comes in addition to the interpretation services already provided within agencies, including the Courts Administration Authority, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, SA Health, SAPOL and the Department for Correctional Services?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can advise that this is all new money. This is new money in addition to anything that is budgeted for in specific departments.

Mr MARSHALL: And so there is no—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There is no reduction in any department as a result of this. It is all new money.

Mr MARSHALL: How many Aboriginal interpreters are currently available in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have that figure with me but I am happy to take it on notice for the honourable member.

The CHAIR: Minister, I want to thank you and your advisers for your time today and all your hard work, ladies and gentlemen. With that, I declare the examination of the proposed payments be referred to committee A.

At 15:32 the committee adjourned to Tuesday 1 August 2017 at 09:00.