

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 15 October 2024**

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

*Bills***CONVERSION PRACTICES PROHIBITION BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CASINO (PENALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PORTABLE LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Inspector of the Independent Commission Against Corruption, Office for Public Integrity and Ombudsman SA—Report, 2023-24 [Ordered to be published]

Annual Report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2024—

Report 9 of 2024

Part A: Executive Summary

Part B: Controls Opinion

Part C: Agency Audit Reports

Report of the Auditor-General—Report 10 of 2024: Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2024—Department for Infrastructure and Transport

Ombudsman SA—Report, 2023-24

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2023-24—

Pastoral Board
 South Australian Heritage Council
 Stormwater Management Authority
 StudyAdelaide
 The Office of the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-Management Board
 Witjira National Park Co-Management Board
 Yumbarra Conservation Park Co-Management Board

Regulations under Acts—

Crown Land Management Act 2009—General

Rules under Courts—

First Nations Voice Court of Disputed Returns (Reinstated) Rules 2024
 SA Health's Response to the Coroner's Finding into the Death of Jennifer Ann Collins
 July 2024

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Regulations under Acts—

Freedom of Information Act 1991—General—Prescribed Body

Rules under Courts—

Environment, Resources and Development Court (Native Title) (Reinstated)
 Rules 2024
 Environmental Resources and Development Court (Reinstated) Rules 2024
 Uniform Civil (No 12) Amending Rules 2024

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. C.M. Scriven)—

Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development—Report, 2023-24

Regulations under Acts—

Loxton Waikerie—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land—No. 2
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats
 No. 7—Camping and Mooring

Yankalilla—

No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats

Rules under Courts—

Wardens Court (Reinstated) Rules 2024

*Question Time***DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of drought.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As reported in *The Advertiser* over the weekend, there are concerns not only about the impact that the drought will have on farmers themselves but also the impact on regional businesses and the socio-economic impact on the affected regions. There will also be a blow to the state's economy as the headline of the article reads, 'Farmers reeling as drought set to leave multi-billion dollar hole in SA economy'. The estimated loss in the grain crops is around

\$1.3 billion below average annual grain returns, along with anticipated losses to the wine and other horticultural crops from drought and frost; yet, to date, the minister has resisted calls for assistance to support the agricultural sector that match the magnitude of the challenges being faced.

There is a predicted impact on the whole South Australian economy, as well as farmers and the regions, and the reduced food production can be expected to push food prices upward at a time of cost-of-living crisis. This has the potential to have a negative impact on regional and suburban areas. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister inform the chamber what the impact to the South Australian economy, in terms of dollars, is estimated to be as a result of the seasonal impact so far?

2. What contingencies is the government putting in place around the 2024-25 financial year budget as a result of the predicted impact of the seasonal conditions on the state's revenue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. Significant parts of South Australia are now experiencing drought conditions, with most agricultural regions experiencing either lowest on record or at least severe rainfall deficiency for a prolonged period. Many areas of the state are recording significant impacts to production and farm business finances as a result of the low rainfall and, for example, recent frost events as well.

The hoped-for spring rains did not occur in time to salvage crops in many regions, and Grain Producers SA, for example, are now reporting a significantly reduced estimated state harvest. Some of their estimates have been more than 30 per cent less than the previous five-year average, and potentially amount to a likely \$2 billion reduction in farmgate value, according to my advice.

Livestock producers are significantly impacted by these conditions with very poor pasture cover due to the rainfall deficit and the high volume and cost of supplementary feeding. Livestock condition remains below average and numbers have significantly increased through livestock markets with ongoing reduced processing capacity.

Each region has unique challenges, including production systems, lived experience of drought, the levels of preparedness, a farmer's ability to manage a challenging season, and particularly younger farmers in regions which have more infrequent dry seasons. The state government provides a range of support services to rural businesses and regional communities affected by hardship and adverse events. Such events might include drought, bushfires, severe floods and storms, biosecurity outbreaks and so on.

A sum of \$4.4 million was committed to the Family and Business Support Program over the next four years to ensure the continuation of the FaB mentors and the Rural Financial Counselling Service. There is also commonwealth support through the Farm Household Allowance, Farm Management Deposits Scheme, income tax averaging and other primary producer concessions.

In response to the current seasonal conditions, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions is undertaking a range of activities to actively monitor seasonal conditions and impacts, to engage with industry groups and other stakeholders, and identify additional support measures. Regular monitoring and reporting on seasonal conditions and impacts to primary production in regional communities is occurring through a PIRSA working group intelligence report and, of course, the Crop and Pasture Report. FaB mentors and rural financial counsellors remain activated to support producers, with additional resources being allocated to bolster that support.

A drought industry advisory group, chaired by the chief executive of PIRSA, has been convened to formally engage with industry and government stakeholders to identify industry and community impacts caused by drought conditions and other compounding issues. This group will provide advice to government on activities that strengthen primary producers, primary industries and communities' capacity to cope with, adapt to or change in response to the dry and drought conditions.

Drought round tables are being held across the state with key regional stakeholders to discuss the challenges and issues being experienced, and to identify gaps and potential future actions that might be required. The first round table was in the Limestone Coast on 16 September,

and the next one is scheduled for 30 October. I believe the next round table will be held in the Mid North and then other regions will follow shortly afterwards.

PIRSA is supporting Livestock SA and Grain Producers SA to host small-scale community events, which is certainly something that a number of farmers and other stakeholders have indicated to me is really important in bringing community members together. It does so in an informal setting and enables the opportunity to network and to provide an opportunity to extend key messages.

A forum with the financial sector is also being planned to engage with banks on the implications of drought and other adversity, and the impact it is having on farm businesses, and to advocate for additional consideration given the current seasonal conditions. These are some of the actions, and I look forward to further updating the chamber in future.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary: how often has the PIRSA advisory group met on this topic in the past two months and what contingencies has the government put in place around that financial year budget?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:38): The advisory group was established—I think its first meeting was about three weeks ago but I am happy to check that. As I mentioned, that is being chaired by the chief executive of PIRSA. We continue to analyse a situation which, of course, can be potentially changing quite regularly, and any budget adjustments that might need to be made will go through the usual processes.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary: can the minister confirm that the chief executive of PIRSA was away three weeks ago?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:38): Yes. I am not sure if it was three weeks ago that he was away, but certainly he didn't chair the first meeting. He expects to chair the subsequent meetings.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of drought support.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: One of the goals of the National Drought Agreement 2024-2029 is that, 'The agricultural sector and rural communities are appropriately supported in hard times, and know what support is available and how to access it.' Many farmers around the state are declaring this one of the worst years on record. As reported in *The Advertiser* on 29 September, President of Livestock SA, Joe Keynes, has insisted the Premier acknowledge their difficulties. Mr Keynes said:

We would like an early response from the government and it would be great to have acknowledgement from the premier supporting us - it would mean something. Year in, year out, agriculture gives SA a good solid economic base...we don't usually ask for much but we just need some support through this.

Miles Hannemann, Keith farmer, said in that same article that Peter Malinauskas must acknowledge the conditions facing farmers and said, 'There's an old saying SA finishes at the toll gate and that's how we're feeling at the moment.' My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister believe that her government are appropriately supporting the agricultural sector?

2. Given the \$13.53 million drought support package offered by the Victorian government to Victorian farmers, what additional new funding has the South Australian government committed to?

3. What, if any, additional new measures has the minister and her government put in place to support the agricultural sector and rural communities in this state?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her questions. In regard to the first piece of commentary in regard to the National Drought Agreement and that it is important for farmers to know what is available and how to access it, I think that is actually a very key point. It might be one of the few occasions where the Leader of the Opposition in this place and I agree: that it is important that we actually get that information out to the farmers. As I outlined in my answer to a previous question just today, there is a wide range of support that is already available.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: While the question is not directly about this, I will take the opportunity to mention, because there are still some misunderstandings around drought declarations, that members may or may not be aware that in the past there needed to be an official drought declaration to enable certain assistance to be accessed. Part of the National Drought Agreement is a recognition that different areas can be in drought conditions, not necessarily an entire area, and it is inappropriate, for example, to have declarations on this side of the road that they are in drought and the farmer across the road doesn't have that same declaration.

From memory, it has now been something like 10 years since there have been official drought declarations. I think it is important for anyone out in the community talking with drought-affected farmers and others to be aware of that.

In terms of the Premier's engagement, we certainly had multiple discussions around this, and in fact just recently in Mount Gambier I met with a number of farmers with the Premier, in addition to the other ongoing stakeholder meetings I have in a formal sense, as well as a number of farmers and other stakeholders I have met with. The honourable member referred to the Victorian government's package. My advice is that quite a number of the things covered under that package are things South Australia has already been doing.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: given states are in charge of determining assistance for farmers in drought, what new funding and new programs has the South Australian government committed to farmers across South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): As I mentioned in the answer to an earlier question today, a wide range of assistance is available. The establishment of the drought industry advisory group and also the round tables we are having around the state are continuing to inform our decisions and discussions about our approaches and actions going further forward.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of the tomato brown rugose fruit virus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: During a PIRSA update in Virginia late last week, growers were told that a SARDI testing facility was in the process of being accredited in Waite and approval was imminent, and that sampling would be required by growers in certain circumstances—for instance, if they were wanting to send their tomatoes to Western Australia or Queensland.

However, the department also announced that individual growers would have to pay the full amount for that testing, and they were told it would cost approximately \$100 per sample. To put that

in perspective, PIRSA testing processes involve 300 leaves per greenhouse, 10 leaves per sample, so 30 samples per greenhouse at a cost of \$100 per sample. If you do the math, that is a \$3,000 cost to growers per greenhouse to get their crops sampled so that they can sell their tomatoes to domestic markets. For a medium-sized grower of 10 glasshouses it is potentially \$30,000 per annum to satisfy government compliance arrangements.

My question to the minister is: will she as Minister for Primary Industries commit to subsidising the testing requirement for growers to satisfy government compliance arrangements and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question, even though it is vastly inaccurate on such a number of different matters. First of all—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: Are you kidding? I was there.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We have an interjection that the Leader of the Opposition was there. I also had a member of my office there in addition to, of course, PIRSA being the ones that were running the grower information session. They were not advised, according to my information, that they would have to pay for the cost. My understanding is that a grower asked how much it costs to do testing. That doesn't mean that the grower will be bearing the cost.

Secondly, the honourable member is referring to such cost as 'to satisfy government compliance arrangements', which clearly indicates that she has a fundamental misunderstanding of why the testing is required. The testing is required to be able to enable market access. If she had been listening to discussions over the recent weeks about this virus, a very important topic that affects so much of our industry here in South Australia, she would be aware that different states have had various different restrictions on access to their markets. New South Wales, for example, has agreed for our growers to be able to send to them if they are able to show proof of freedom from the virus or be able to show negative test results. So this is a market access issue.

In terms of paying, as I said it was not said at that meeting, according to my information, that growers would have to pay, and in fact the government has made a decision that they will not have to pay—that that cost will be absorbed by PIRSA.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Supplementary: can the minister outline to the chamber what 'CA' means?

The PRESIDENT: I didn't—

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: CA38, CA39—compliance.

The PRESIDENT: I didn't hear any reference to CA in the original answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): The honourable member doesn't like the answer to the question. She asked, 'Will the government subsidise the testing?' and my answer has been that the government won't charge growers for the testing; not a subsidisation, it simply will not charge them. She doesn't like that answer, so she wants to try for some sort of little gotcha moment.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Mr Martin.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Perhaps the honourable member would like to actually consider that biosecurity is important to our industries, it is important to our growers.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: What we have seen from the honourable Leader of the Opposition in this place on multiple occasions is that she wants to take a political lens, she wants to take political opportunism. She turns up to a meeting of growers last week, a meeting that was designed to allow growers to ask questions, and she and the member for Frome decide that, no, this

is not time for growers to ask questions; this is time for them to grandstand politically—for the Leader of the Opposition in this place and the member for Frome to grandstand politically.

Perhaps if she was responsible she would see biosecurity as something that should be bipartisan, that should have the interests of industry—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —that should have the interests of industry, but no, political opportunism is more important to those opposite and to the Leader of the Opposition in this place than biosecurity and our industry.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, no. Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Yes, seriously.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: You don't care about the regions. Total opportunists; that's what you are.

The PRESIDENT: And you, enough.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Right. Any further, and I am going to name you. I have called the Hon. Mr Martin four times now.

ROCK LOBSTER INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please update the chamber about the welcome news that South Australian rock lobsters will once again be exported to China?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question and his support of South Australian industries. It would be great if that was shared across this chamber. The news last week that the South Australian rock—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wortley, enough.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The news last week that South Australian rock lobster will once again be exported to China and available in Chinese restaurants and on dinner tables in China was extremely welcome. Trade restrictions on the sector have been extremely difficult for our state's fishery, which is largest in terms of gross value of production and is incredibly important to so many coastal and regional communities, particularly in the Limestone Coast where approximately 900 full-time equivalent jobs directly or indirectly in the sector depend on this industry and also right across the state, with another 200-plus workers who rely on the industry to support their employment.

At the peak of trade with China for the sector in 2015-16, the gross value of production for southern zone rock lobster totalled \$131 million, while the northern zone came in at \$29 million. In 2018-19, the last full year before the restrictions were in place, southern zone gross value of production was \$122 million and \$28 million in the northern zone. The most recent figures in 2022-23 demonstrate just how devastating the trade restrictions have been, with gross value of production in the southern zone only \$71 million and \$14 million in the northern zone.

Indeed, the pain that the sector was going through was evident while those opposite were still in government, which is why while we were in opposition we made an election commitment to assist the rock lobster fishery by providing a 50 per cent fee reduction in 2022-23. This in total provided \$2.6 million in fee relief for the sector. I was very pleased to deliver this election commitment early in this term of government.

But we have not stopped there. We have continued to work closely with both the South Eastern Professional Fishermen's Association and the Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishermen's Association in responding to the needs of the fisheries to assist in different ways to deal with the added pressure of the trade restrictions. These have included introducing more flexible arrangements, with 12-month fishing seasons and an earlier start to the season in September instead of October designed to capitalise on important cultural times of the year where there may be better market conditions.

I was also very pleased to stand alongside the southern zone rock lobster fishery in opposing the windfarms that were slated by the federal government off the coast of Port MacDonnell. It was a huge community win that saw that proposal changed to exclude those waters and protect the waters that sustain this incredible fishery.

South Australian exports to China rose 46 per cent over the past 12 months to a record \$4.27 billion. This was achieved after careful, respectful and patient discussions with our largest trading partner, both at the federal level and at the state level. The Premier has visited China during this period of time, as have I and also the Minister for Trade. That is in addition to the assistance that has been seen at the federal level with the restrictions and tariffs more broadly on other commodities removed.

This is so incredibly important for our state as we produce and make things that China wants to buy, so much of it coming from our regions, with exports sustaining jobs and opportunities across many industries, most notably of course wine and rock lobster but a range of other incredible South Australian sectors which will also benefit from the improved trade relationship with our largest trading partner.

I want to thank the federal government and in particular federal trade minister, Don Farrell, and his team for their diligent work. It has taken sustained and patient work from many people across industry, state and federal governments to be in the position that we are today, and I am pleased to have also been able to play some role in that.

After four or five years of trade restrictions, the rock lobster sector showed resilience and an ability to adapt, having diversified into many markets across the globe and at home in Australia. Nevertheless, the conditions continue to be challenging. I am sure that the industry will be in good stead moving forward, with the resumption of trade with China providing a huge boost to one of our iconic South Australian industries, and I would hope that is something all members of this chamber are very pleased about.

FOSSIL FUEL INVESTMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water on the topic of divesting from fossil fuel investment in a declared climate emergency.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The International Energy Agency and the IPCC are in agreement, each stating categorically that there is no room for new fossil fuel agreements if the world is to reach its goal of keeping warming to 1.5° Celsius. We cannot meet climate goals globally unless we bring an immediate halt to new and expanded fossil fuel projects. That is why May 2022 was so welcome when the South Australian parliament declared a climate emergency and committed to restoring a safe climate by transforming the economy to net zero emissions.

That motion, auspiced in the other place by Minister Close, passed both houses of this parliament in mid-2022, and that in itself was of course preceded by a petition signed by over 10,000 of our constituents calling for strong climate action and a climate emergency declaration. Yet just months later, in December 2022, ANZ was contracted by the Malinauskas government as the sole provider of core banking services for the South Australian government.

This is no doubt a lucrative contract with ANZ and it is now in place until 2027, with an option to extend for a further five years, so possibly 2032 but at least 2027, when, of course, we hope to be

hosting the COP31 in November 2026. It might just get a little awkward. It does seem that the reality check about the big banks is still in the mail for the Malinauskas government.

While fossil fuels kill as many people globally every year as tobacco—some one in five deaths—our state seemingly ignores the fact that, since the Paris Agreement, the ANZ has funded more fossil fuel projects than any other Australian bank. According to the most recent Market Forces report on Australia's big banks, in 2023 alone the ANZ lent almost \$1 billion to companies wanting to develop new coal, oil and gas projects. The ANZ also arranged \$1.5 billion in bonds for fossil fuels, demonstrating the largest appetite of the major banks for this type of backdoor finance, and over half of ANZ's bond financing went to companies with coal, oil or gas expansion plans.

On matters of principle we have divested. We have divested as a state from Russia over the war in Ukraine, and rightly so. We divested. We are fully cognisant of the health impacts of tobacco and eschew business dealings with big tobacco. We have divested. Having declared a climate emergency, how is it possible, or ethical, for this government to then just months later award a contract for core banking services to the ANZ? We should have divested. We should be divesting from those who are causing harm by perpetuating investment in fossil fuels. If we are in a climate emergency, we must take real climate action, and in cold hard cash. My questions are specifically:

1. How will the Malinauskas government put in place measures to ensure South Australia divests our banking from the ANZ if they continue to be the worst offender of the big banks when it comes to facilitating the continuation of fossil fuels?

2. What processes are and were in place to ensure any and all procurement decisions of the state are implementing our stated declaration of a climate emergency?

The PRESIDENT: Attorney, just before you attempt to answer the question, the Hon. Ms Franks you are not a serial pest when it comes to long explanations, but that was not really a brief explanation. I know that you had points to make.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:58): Thank you, sir, and I will be brief. I thank the honourable member for her question, and I will refer it to the relevant minister or ministers in another place for a response to bring back.

SHEEP ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about the sheep eID rollout.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Primary producers are currently suffering, with some parts of South Australia, including the South-East, facing the worst rainfall on record for this time of the year. Rural Business Support has reported a 40 per cent increase in clients from the South-East seeking financial counselling, with recent research showing nearly half of Australian farmers have experienced depression.

Animal welfare concerns are also being raised by the industry, with nearly 1,000 large bales of hay recently being donated to South-East producers. Coorong council mayor, Paul Simmons, has suggested publicly a range of options to assist primary producers, including to delay the rollout of eID for sheep and to offer concessional loans for primary producers in need. My question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development is: will the minister listen to the concerns of industry and do what is in her power to assist them by delaying the sheep eID rollout?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. I met with Mayor Paul Simmons a couple of weeks ago when I was in the Limestone Coast and we were able to go through quite a wideranging discussion in regard to the current draft conditions and the situation. In regard to eID, we did discuss, as I have on many different occasions, the fact that eID is about traceability.

If there is an outbreak of a serious animal disease—an exotic animal disease such as, for example, foot-and-mouth disease, which we fortunately do not have in Australia at this time—that would be absolutely devastating for all of our primary producers and livestock producers obviously in particular. So eID is about improving traceability so that we can protect that important industry.

My department, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, has continued to engage with industry and there are many different stakeholders that are a part of the discussions around eID. We will continue those discussions but it is important to realise that this is an important protection for our primary industries.

SHEEP ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary: is mob traceability for disease outbreak available with the current tagging system?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question despite it being somewhat—I thank her for her question. She should be aware that of course there is mob-based. Is this another opportunity for her to undermine the importance of eID?

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to listen.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Those opposite from day one have tried to undermine eID and yet they won't come out and say they oppose it.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, minister. What's your point of order?

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Clearly she is going into debate and having personal attacks.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I am not inviting you to discuss it with me.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In the event of an outbreak of a serious emergency animal disease—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —the speed of traceability is important. The member opposite is clearly suggesting, 'It's okay. We've got the current system. It doesn't need to be improved. Traceability on the level that underpins eID isn't important.' If she opposes eID, she should come out and say so.

SHEEP ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Supplementary: does individual traceability increase speed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): It's her—

The PRESIDENT: Order! We've talked about that. Please answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I repeat again: if those opposite oppose eID, they should come out and say so. They would be at odds with industry associations. They would be at odds with the rest of the country which is adopting eID. They would be at odds with all of those who actually care about traceability in terms of protecting our livestock industries.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO DOMESTIC, FAMILY AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:03): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about the new consultation tool launched by the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. We are proud to have established the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence led by Commissioner Natasha Stott Despoja. As the honourable member has noted, the commission recently established an online consultation tool, known as the Share With Us survey. The survey is an important opportunity for all South Australians to contribute to the royal commission, and launched very recently on Tuesday 8 October.

Share With Us is an anonymous survey designed to gather insights, experiences and advice from anyone who has interacted with the domestic, family or sexual violence sectors. Whether they are victim survivors, individuals currently experiencing violence, those supporting others, or people working or volunteering in the sector, the royal commission is keen to hear from all voices.

The Share With Us survey is an initiative as part of the commissioner's purpose to gather advice, suggestions and insights from a wide range of stakeholders including survivors, sector representatives, experts, community groups and the broader public. The royal commission's focus is not only on understanding how our systems are dealing with domestic, family and sexual violence but also on identifying and addressing any gaps in these systems. The insights gathered through the Share With Us tool will help develop key focus areas for the upcoming public hearings and shape the final recommendations, which are due next year.

Participation in the Share With Us survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. The survey does not ask for names, contact details or any information that could identify individuals. Only a postcode is requested, and even that is optional. Respondents are encouraged to share only what they are comfortable with and are assured that their privacy is fully protected. Additionally, if participants need support during the process a list of trusted services and resources is available on the commission's website.

The Share With Us survey can be accessed through the royal commission's website or via a QR code displayed on posters, newsletters and social media. The tool has been designed to accommodate different forms of expression. When completing the survey, participants are able to choose between answering a series of questions, writing a response or uploading an audio message. To ensure the widest possible access for the community, the Share With Us tool has been translated into more than a dozen languages, and additional languages will continue to be added to support communities across our state.

For those without internet access, arrangements have been made to ensure participation is still possible. Public libraries, the Women's Information Service centre on Grenfell Street, and other support services around the state are equipped to assist anyone who is unable to complete the survey on their own. It is important to note that the Share With Us tool is not suitable for seeking immediate help. If anyone is in urgent need they should contact emergency and support services directly.

The survey is a way to capture the lived experiences and suggestions of those who wish to shape the future of domestic, family and sexual violence response systems. The stories can often reveal very specific challenges, barriers to accessing help, and the strengths or weaknesses of existing support systems. For many, being part of the survey means that their voices will be heard in the policymaking process. The most affected by systemic issues are often overlooked or marginalised, but this survey provides a way for those experiences to reach decision-makers. This is about creating a safer South Australia for all.

I encourage anyone with experience or knowledge of the domestic, family or sexual violence systems in our state to contribute to this vital consultation before the survey closes on 10 December 2024. The royal commission's work will be shaped by these voices, ensuring its final recommendations reflect the real needs and experiences of the community. I commend the ongoing work of the royal commission and encourage the community to share their experiences.

HOUSING CRISIS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question about the effect of the housing crisis on South Australian prisoners eligible for release.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The housing crisis at state and country levels has been well documented amid a lack of affordable housing and soaring rental rates. A report released in April this year found that zero per cent of properties for rent in South Australia over a highlighted weekend in March were affordable for some on Youth Allowance or JobSeeker.

As reported by ABC News just last week, Chair of the SA Parole Board, Ms Frances Nelson KC, has pointed to the housing crisis also hindering the release of prisoners from our state's prisons. Ms Nelson states that stable accommodation is absolutely critical in terms of reducing recidivism. She also cites examples such as one prisoner who should have been released in May but still cannot be housed in accommodation outside of prison, and the fact that the women's prison has some 47 per cent of its population there on remand—and a large proportion of them because they don't have somewhere else to live. This is coming at considerable cost to taxpayers, given that it costs about \$100,000 to \$130,000 per year to house a person in prison. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. What is the government doing to address the housing crisis as it relates to individuals leaving prison?
2. What, if any, proportion of existing or new public housing has been allocated specifically to individuals who are exiting prison?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for her question. The matter she refers to is of course in the portfolio area of the minister for corrections; however, it does touch on broader justice issues which, of course, interests me greatly as Attorney-General. I have corresponded with the Chair of the Parole Board when there have been questions raised and sought information from the minister for corrections.

The honourable member referred in part of the explanation of the question to the issue of housing as it pertains to prisoners who are on remand, so I will address that first—that is at the start of the system. There are people who are in our prisons on remand, and a very substantial portion, and it's even higher for Aboriginal prisoners—it might even now be a majority of Aboriginal prisoners who are on remand for a variety of reasons, but certainly one reason is a lack of suitable accommodation to be bailed to.

It is something that we have started tackling and at the last couple of budgets, through the department for corrections, there has been substantial investment into suitable accommodation for those who are on remand and not afforded bail for that very reason. So there has been significant investment that has already been made and those programs will continue to roll out and provide not just that accommodation but also therapeutic programs to some of those prisoners who are on bail.

The honourable member also referred to the other end of the system: people who are coming out of prison, often on parole but sometimes those who are not on parole but have served their sentence, finding suitable accommodation, which is always a problem but is absolutely exacerbated by the lack of rental accommodation that we are seeing in the system at the moment. It's not just this but in so many facets of those needing accommodation, particularly those who are marginalised in society needing accommodation, this is often disproportionately affecting the most.

I think I received correspondence about a particular aspect of this and I just can't remember the name of the organisation but I believe, as I understand it, there was physical accommodation found for that organisation to run for people coming out on parole and the correspondence I received I think it was last week from the Parole Board was about the possibility of recurrent funding to support that physical accommodation. Certainly, that is something I will be talking to my colleague the minister for corrections about.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR, BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:12): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking my questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding business confidence in agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: In the September 2024 Roy Morgan Business Confidence report, South Australia was listed as the second lowest state in business confidence for the months of August and September 2024. Agriculture was listed as the lowest industry business confidence at 64.2 per cent compared to the overall 97.8 per cent for all other businesses. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why, does the minister believe, is agriculture reported as the lowest business confidence in this state?
2. What actions will the minister undertake to restore business confidence within the agricultural sector?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her question. I would have thought it was fairly obvious that a state that is experiencing drought, that has experienced floods, experiencing frost would result in quite low business confidence.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I note the interjections of asking me what I am doing about frost and about drought and about floods. I don't actually have control over the weather—I certainly wish that I did. I think those opposite need to start looking at the tenor of their questions. It's something that we have continued to work with industry on. I outlined earlier in this question time the sorts of engagement that we have at the moment, the wide range of programs that is offered through the state government, as well as mentioning some of those that are available through the federal government.

The Leader of the Opposition in this place actually touched earlier on a really important aspect, which is that we need to make sure that farmers, primary producers, regional communities, members, are all aware of the assistance that is available. Through my interactions, it becomes clear quite often that some people in the community are not aware of how they can access those programs, or not aware of the existence of the programs, and sometimes not aware that if they had engaged with a program with some similarities perhaps 10 years ago that they have actually changed—for example, there might be changes to the requirements or the eligibility criteria.

I really do encourage anyone who is experiencing financial difficulties due to these many events, a number of which are compounding, to get in contact with Family and Business Support mentors. They can offer and act as a triage, if you like, or as a point of contact to be able to point people in the right direction in terms of the assistance that is available.

Some of the things that can be assisted include, for example, revising farm business plans to take into account the current conditions. There has been a lot of work done in drought preparation, drought resilience and so on. There are wideranging options that people can consider, and I would really strongly encourage them to take that first step, contact the FaB mentors and make sure that they are accessing those programs that may be of benefit to them.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:15): Supplementary: does the minister acknowledge that she does in fact have control over the government's response to drought and flooding arrangements?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:16): At least that question makes sense, as opposed to the interjections of earlier.

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Indeed, interjections are out of order, thank you, Mr President—
Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —for the reminder, for all of us here in this chamber. I think the government response to a number of difficulties, floods being a particular example that affected so much of our areas, has been significant. We continue to work with industry, and we continue to work with regional communities about the sorts of approaches that will be most useful.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:16): Supplementary: what new support services has the minister introduced during her time in the role that would, in fact, support the agricultural industry to improve business confidence?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Was that from the original answer about floods and droughts?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you don't want the minister to answer, be quiet.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Do you consider that arises from the original answer?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I do, but you provide an answer as you see fit.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:17): Thank you, Mr President. Earlier today in this chamber I outlined the vast range of options that are available. That is not to say that there might not be further opportunities, which is why we are having the round tables across the state that I also referred to earlier, why the government continues to engage both formally, for example, through industry associations, as well as less formally with myself as minister, and the Premier continues to meet with affected farmers.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RURAL WOMEN

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister tell the chamber about the importance of the International Day of Rural Women?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. Today is the International Day of Rural Women, first established by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 2007 to recognise:

...the critical role and contribution of rural women, including indigenous women, in enhancing agricultural and rural development, improving food security, and eradicating rural poverty.

The theme of this year's International Day of Rural Women is 'Rural women sustaining nature for our collective future: building climate resilience, conserving biodiversity, and caring for land towards gender equality and empowerment.'

This theme highlights the central role that women play in rural and regional communities around the world in sustainability and climate resilience. Gender equality and empowerment of women is not just the right thing to do, it is key to the global fight against climate challenges. Rural women make up approximately 22 per cent of the world's population. They are more likely to experience poverty, unequal access to education, health, social services and employment opportunities. These challenges may be greater for Indigenous women and girls living in rural areas globally.

Despite the challenges, women are responsible for half the world's food production. Globally, women have been at the forefront of implementing sustainable farming practices and climate resilience. Indigenous women in particular provide ancestral knowledge and practices to food production, which prioritise conservation and sustainability.

In South Australia, women make up 30 per cent of people working in agriculture, forestry and fishing industries, while in the food and beverage manufacturing industry women account for over 40 per cent of the workforce. South Australian rural women, like rural women globally, are at the forefront of sustainability innovation. I have spoken in this chamber before about Olympia Yarger, one of the keynote speakers at the 2024 Thriving Women's Conference, hosted by Women Together Learning (known as WoTL).

Ms Yarger is a climate action pioneer and the founder of agtech start-up Goterra, a system that uses maggots as a waste management system to process food waste, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I am advised that her system has saved more than 66,000 tonnes of carbon emissions, and this is just one example of many great South Australian rural women who have pioneered innovative and sustainable practices in their respective industries.

I am also pleased to highlight the programs PIRSA supports to advance rural women living in South Australia, the first of which is the AgriFutures Rural Women's Award and Acceleration Grant. The South Australian component of this national award has been delivered by my department for more than 10 years. The prestigious award acknowledges the key role women play in rural industries, businesses and communities, by providing \$15,000 to innovative and rural-focused projects, businesses or programs. The acceleration grant provides for up to \$7,000 for leadership and professional development for women who have an idea, cause or vision to assist them to bring it to fruition.

The next program I have also spoken about recently in this chamber, as I attended the graduation only last month. The WoTL Stepping into Leadership Program has been proudly supported by PIRSA since its inception in 2012. It is an eight-month program designed to support development of leaders in agriculture and agribusiness, and provides professional development, coaching, networking and mentoring support to 15 women for each cohort across South Australia.

Today, the International Day of Rural Woman, I acknowledge and thank the important work of South Australian rural women and also rural women globally as food producers, innovators, key contributors in their communities to wellbeing and empowerment, and key players in the global efforts to mitigate climate change.

APY LANDS GENERAL MANAGER

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about the APY lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In May I asked the minister about the selection process to appoint a new general manager to the APY lands to replace controversial figure Mr Richard King, who had been in the position since 2015, after the government decided not to renew his contract. Mr King's tenure had been shrouded in controversy, including being sacked by the APY lands board in 2018 and losing Supreme Court bids to hold an Ombudsman's investigation into the conduct that led to his sacking. Mr King still kept his \$200,000-plus-a-year job, receiving a 12-month contract extension, which expired on 31 March this year.

It has been put to me that there are serious allegations now of improper conduct in the selection process to find his replacement, with calls for an integrity investigation. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has he received complaints?
2. Is the government now considering reappointing Mr King to the position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. Just so that we are very clear about the process for appointment for a position like this, the honourable member in his explanation and question talked about the government appointing the general manager. I want to be very clear that the government absolutely does not do that. The government does not appoint a general manager.

The Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act makes very clear the process: it is the board that appoints the general manager. The government either approves or does not approve the conditions that are set down with that appointment. Governments of both persuasions have had the board appoint in the past to the position the individual the honourable member mentions, Mr King—under the former Labor government and under the former Liberal government. The government does not make that decision; it is the board that is elected at APY elections that makes that decision.

I think it was in August of this year there were further elections for the APY Executive, and new members have taken up their role on the APY Executive. I don't recall receiving any correspondence in relation to what the honourable member refers to—any allegations in relation to the process—but it will be up to that new executive board to decide on the process for how they appoint a general manager. It is not up to the government to appoint or indeed, in fact, to decide the process on the appointment of the general manager. The only role the government has, and it is quite clear under legislation, is to comment on the terms and conditions of that appointment.

APY LANDS GENERAL MANAGER

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:25): Supplementary: has the minister received a recommendation from the board to approve the appointment of Mr King?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:25): I have had correspondence from the board in relation to the appointment of the general manager. I have not approved any conditions of the appointment of the general manager, and there is ongoing discussion between the government, which approves the conditions not the actual appointment, and the APY Executive.

APY LANDS GENERAL MANAGER

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:25): Final supplementary: in that recommendation is the person recommended Mr King? Is Mr King one of those?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:26): The correspondence we have received from the duly elected APY Executive is for the reappointment of Mr King. That is the subject of discussion between the government, which approves the terms and conditions, and the APY Executive. As I say, it is the APY Executive who decide not just on who the person who is or isn't appointed is but on the process for that appointment, not the government.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Sorry, Mr President, but—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, you said 'final supplementary question' before.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It was, but it has arisen out of that response.

The PRESIDENT: No, final is final. Sit down. I need to get to the Hon. Ben Hood.

LOWER LIMESTONE COAST WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan (WAP).

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Industry groups that include the South Australian dairy association, forestry and grapegrowers fear that the outcome of the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan will result in drastic reductions in allocations. SADA chief executive Andrew Curtis believes future cuts will devastate local businesses, reduce jobs and significantly impact on families and local communities in the South-East.

It is my understanding that PIRSA is currently undertaking their own review into the economic benefit of industries that utilise water, which may inform the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan amendment process. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development are:

1. When will PIRSA's review be completed by?
2. Should PIRSA's review find detrimental outcomes for industry should their water allocations be cut, will the minister formally advocate to the Deputy Premier and water minister to ensure no cuts will be made to industry in the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for his question. A couple of points to make first of all. Firstly, of course, the water allocation plan is under the remit of the Minister for Water in the other place, the member for Port Adelaide. Obviously, I am very aware of the discussions that have been happening around the review of the water allocation plan. It is something that I think is clearly on the minds of many in many different sectors.

Overall, the discussions have been around the process so far, and whilst acknowledging that I may have some of the terminology wrong, as I am not the minister directly responsible, my understanding is that the review process is now complete and the next several years will be the amendment process, which goes through looking at all of the relevant circumstances and information available to be able to consider what changes may be necessary.

I did consider it is very important for us to have a good understanding of the economic benefits of all of the various sectors in the agricultural sector, including forestry, including dairy, including livestock, including grains, etc., and therefore the report is being undertaken. I am happy to get an update of where that process is at.

The purpose of the report, though, is to have a better understanding of the industries in the Limestone Coast to better understand how they can continue to thrive, given that there may need to be changes to the water allocation plan. I will always advocate for industries to be able to continue to thrive. I will always advocate for us to look at what is sustainable for all our industries in terms of everything that might be within the remit of government. I am happy to bring back an update in terms of where the report is up to.

LOWER LIMESTONE COAST WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:30): Supplementary: should the report demonstrate that industry in the Limestone Coast will not thrive because of water allocation cuts that may come from the amendment process of the WAP, will the minister formally advocate to the Deputy Premier to ensure that no cuts will be made to industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:30): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. The way he is putting that question is essentially saying that, if there is a problem with water supply, will we ignore it. That is essentially what he is saying. I think it is important for all industries—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —to have a sustainable resource. It is important for all communities that rely on that resource to have a sustainable water resource. That is why there needs to be regular reviews of the water allocation plans.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The plan was adopted in November 2013 and the process will be looking at what kind of amendments may need to be made. It is important that when there is a shared resource we have a responsible approach to that and I would hope that those opposite are not advocating to simply ignore changes in such an important resource as water.

SAFE WORK MONTH

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Public Sector. Will the minister inform the council about this year's Safe Work Month?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:31): I would be very, very happy to inform the honourable member about this year's Safe Work Month and I note the honourable member's lifelong commitment to the safety of people at work and his interest regularly each year in October, which is Safe Work Month, and it is—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: It didn't work for you though.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It wasn't at work. It was an opportunity for employers and workers across Australia to commit to creating safe and healthy workplaces. The theme for this year's campaign is Safety is Everyone's Business and as usual each week of the month is framed around a different theme. Week 1 at the start of October is focused on work health and safety fundamentals, getting back to basics by unpacking the fundamentals that everyone should know. This includes practically managing WHS risks, consulting with workers about work health and safety issues and training and support for workers to stay safe at work.

Week 2 is focused on psychosocial hazards and preventing psychological harm at work, encompassing World Mental Health Day. Week 3 is focused on risk management fundamentals, including how to identify hazards in the workplace and how to undertake work health and safety risk assessments. Week 4 is focused on how to effectively manage the risks of musculoskeletal injuries, one of the most common types of injuries.

This year's Safe Work Month events are coordinated by the regulator, SafeWork SA, which will be running a variety of different activities through Safe Work Month to align with the different weekly themes, including a number of webinars and culminating in something that I know a number of members of this chamber have taken part in before and that is the presentation of the Augusta Zadow Awards on 25 October. I look forward to informing the council, as I often do, about the winners of those awards in some detail in the weeks to come.

Bills

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 September 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): I rise to speak in support of this bill as the lead speaker for the opposition in this chamber. I note, with praise, that this bill comes two years after the introduction of the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Bill 2022, as initiated by our legislative colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo. When it first received royal assent on 8 December 2022, it made South Australia the first jurisdiction in the country to

mandate the public installation of AEDs. I also note the progress that has been made, and the ongoing reform that has been underway, since that original bill.

The Liberal opposition championed the intent of the bill, and has continuously worked to improve the drafting, to help ensure the best piece of legislation is enacted for South Australians. Our party had a number of concerns and questions in relation to the practical operation of the original legislation at the time, and we did attempt to move amendments to address these concerns, but without success. With this amendment bill before us we see several of those changes we suggested implemented. I note that some of the other changes to this act are:

- the removal of the compulsory requirement for the minister to establish a training scheme under the act;
- the removal of vehicles from the requirement to register;
- the alignment of requirements for software applications under section 13 with a current application, which integrates with the South Australian Ambulance Service dispatch system;
- the inclusion of multiple powers to make regulations to support the operationalisation of the act;
- a definition of an 'owner' to separate the legislative requirements for a building owner versus a tenant; and
- the inclusion of a delegation power to allow the minister to assign those duties and responsibilities to an authorised officer.

The act is due to come into operation on 1 January 2025 for government agencies, and rolls out 12 months post 1 January 2026 for other specified buildings, facilities and vehicles. This amendment bill is a demonstration that the initial legislation passed with a number of operational oversights from the original government legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to echo the concerns of the South Australian Business Chamber who, like us, continue to be supportive of the intent of the bill, but have asked the government to ensure that business representation be considered thoughtfully, such as being included on the across-government AED steering committee.

I foreshadow that I will have an amendment that has been written in consultation with the Local Government Association. My amendment to this bill acknowledges that there will be an enormous cost to South Australian councils, given the high number of buildings and facilities under their scope. The cost of implementing this legislation will in all likelihood be passed on to ratepayers. My amendment preserves the original intent of the bill whilst making the application sensible and manageable for councils, and I look forward to addressing the amendment in more detail during the committee stage.

While the government has assured us that the legislation was robust, it has now had time to move a number of amendments to fairly implement the legislation. The opposition believes the original legislation was rushed, with little consideration on how it was to operate in a practical sense within the community. Commonsense practical questions were asked by the opposition during committee toward the government about the introduction of the initial amendment bill. These included:

- that maximum penalties needed reform;
- that AEDs in vehicles would need to operate and report differently from those mounted within buildings;
- recognising that there were concerns around testing protocols;
- awareness campaign requirements; and
- responsibility allocations to authorised officers.

Here we are with many of the opposition's questions and original amendments now being acknowledged. I remind the government that when legislation of this type comes through the Legislative Council, the opposition and the crossbench take very seriously what is put before us. Our resources are limited compared to the government, and it should not be that the majority of our collective work time is spent fixing the mistakes of rushed legislation.

Again, I want to reiterate that we support the bill in its amended form. Our approach to amendment bills and to the committee process is sincere and genuine, and it is satisfying that questions asked two years ago have now come to fruition through the government's amendment bill. With that I conclude my remarks at this stage but look forward to speaking to my amendment in the committee stage.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:39): I rise to support this bill, which has returned into this place in an amended form which clarifies various elements to make for a smoother transition. This is the first legislation of its kind in Australia and I think one of the few in the world. Of course, things that do need to be ironed out, have been, and I commend the government and the health minister for the work that they have done on this since it was first put through parliament in 2022. I am proud that South Australia is leading the nation and I hope that other states will now follow our lead.

It is quite timely. Tomorrow is World Restart a Heart Day and this month is known as Shocktober, and that is a reference to the use of defibrillators. Cardiac arrest kills around 2,045 South Australians every year and the Council of Ambulance Authorities informs me that more than 30,000 people suffer cardiac arrest in Australia each year. Tragically, less than 10 per cent or so of those struck down manage to survive, and I am one of those fortunate 10 per cent.

Why do we accept these deaths? Possibly because we do not think there is anything we can do about them. Well, now we can with the installation of AEDs across our community and in public and privately owned buildings with the passage of this bill, instead of only relying on the good corporate citizens who are already doing it. This will ensure the automated external defibrillator, the AED as it is commonly known, is widely accessible. AEDs are proven to save lives. This law will save lives because AEDs are proven.

Many companies are already embarking on installation projects. I now see them at airports, in shopping centres, in office places, sporting clubs, in hotels. People and service organisations like Rotary have become quite conscious of having them available. Coles have told me that one life is saved every day somewhere in Australia in one of their stores through AEDs. That is extraordinary and gratifying.

Local government is also participating. The City of Tea Tree Gully has embarked on a program to roll out dozens of AEDs in their communities. I have also mentioned in this place previously the actions of the Kangaroo Island community, which particularly inspired me to persist with this legislation after my bill was initially rejected by the previous Marshall Liberal government.

An installation program initiated by Dr Tim Leeuwenburg has resulted in around 50 AEDs dotted around the island, which only has one ambulance and one hospital, and 25 per cent of the island's population now know how to perform CPR. They have saved lives there. We can and will have more heart-safe communities like this to achieve these positive health outcomes.

The act takes effect from January 2025. Government buildings and local government properties have two years to install AEDs, and in the non-government sector, three years. There is a list of designated buildings and emergency vehicles and public transport. Hopefully they will also go into schools. The act also has a provision for the devices to be registered and used in conjunction with the use of an app, the GoodSAM app, to identify their locations and alert first responders with experience in the use of AEDs and CPR and who are registered with 000. SA Ambulance informed me that they are pleased with the results of a trial they have been conducting.

I have had many pose questions to me about liability of citizens who come to the aid of a person who has had a cardiac arrest or heart attack. There is no legal impediment to using AED and the Civil Liability Act 1936 good Samaritan clause safeguards individuals who help in a life-threatening emergency.

AEDs are valuable pieces of equipment. There are financial penalties for noncompliance and for property damage and theft. I am delighted to see there are several protective and security innovations in this area already. The appropriate location, security, access, and maintenance of AEDs are the other main areas which will govern the availability and rollout.

Can they be safely and securely situated outside of buildings? The answer is yes. Again, this is where the combination of the GoodSAM app and mandatory registration of devices can assist in providing a user with the information or a code to unlock the box containing the device once they call 000.

I also became aware of the Rotaid device, a specially designed container which is clearly marked and illuminated. It is not only safely secured but provides real-time information about the device, including alerts on battery life and the AED pads. While the addition of Rotaid may add cost to the purchase price of the device, what it does do is provide a level of insurance to the owner and the user that the device is there and will work.

There are several models of AED out on the market. They range in price from around \$1,500-\$2,000 to as low as about \$400 for single-use devices like the Australian-made and designed CellaED, which I keep in my car. They use AI and tell the user what to do. It is very simple. CPR is crucial and needs to be also used in the application of a defibrillator. We need more people in our community to be trained in CPR. It is not a difficult or even time-consuming exercise.

The Legislative Council endorsed my motion calling on the Malinauskas government, and I hope the transport and health ministers seize upon this to make training in CPR mandatory in the process of people getting their driver's licence. This is already happening in Europe through the acclaimed 'Learn to Drive. Learn CPR.' project in collaboration with the European Resuscitation Council and the European Driving Schools Association, requiring citizens to undergo CPR courses to qualify for their licence.

This policy is driving tens of thousands of skilled life-saving drivers on their roads and into their own communities. Minister Koutsantonis has already indicated he thinks this is a good idea. I note there is a bill before us that will bring needed reform to the driving instructors industry. First aid training can easily be incorporated in a module as part of the process without much additional cost.

I cannot express my thanks enough for the support I have received from Steve Yeo at St John Ambulance in South Australia—the seed to this legislation was planted in a discussion we had in my office five years ago—and from the original yellow Wiggle, Greg Page, with his Heart of the Nation campaign to roll out AEDs. Also, many thanks for the encouragement, support and work done by our current health minister, the Hon. Chris Picton, to make this legislation happen.

My parliamentary colleague and member for Stuart, Geoff Brock, and I have joined the Heart Foundation's AED awareness campaign Shockingly Simple. Shockingly Simple will run across a four-week period, which started yesterday, Monday 14 October, until Sunday 10 November in South Australia, leveraging the timing of both Shocktober and Restart a Heart Day.

While the act provides greater accessibility to AEDs, the Heart Foundation recognises that public awareness and confidence need improvement. In response to this, the Heart Foundation has launched the month-long campaign to increase awareness and education on AEDs across South Australia in the lead-up to the act taking effect. If successful, this campaign could serve as a pilot for a potential national rollout. I urge members in this place to take part in the campaign and raise awareness.

With the Council of Ambulance Australia, South Australian Ambulance Service, St John Ambulance, and Surf Life Saving South Australia, the Heart Foundation is to host a Restart a Heart Day community activation event this Wednesday, October 16, in Rundle Mall running from 9am to 2pm. In closing, I will not be supporting the amendment put forward by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti. Thank you.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:48): I rise to speak in favour of the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024 on behalf of the Greens. The Greens supported the automated external defibrillators public access bill twice: firstly in 2020 when the Hon. Frank Pangallo first introduced a private member's bill, which was opposed by the former

Marshall government, and again when this bill came into law in 2022 with the support of the Malinauskas Labor government.

Again, we support this bill. We consider that it will aid in the implementation and rollout of defibrillators across the state in line with the intent of the original bill that was brought forward by the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I do want to acknowledge the work of the Hon. Frank Pangallo in this regard. The honourable member has been a long-term advocate in this space and I think really led the way on this. It is an exciting thing to see South Australia become the first state in the country to actually take action on this, so I commend the Hon. Mr Frank Pangallo for his leadership and of course I acknowledge the work of the minister, the Hon. Chris Picton, as well.

We know that defibrillators save lives when they are accessible. They are simple, they are easy to use and they are highly effective. The implementation of defibrillators in public access spaces is the result of advocacy from the Heart Foundation and the Ambulance Employees Association and a range of others as well. Indeed, I remember having a look at this debate years ago when I was on the Adelaide City Council when my then colleague Councillor Philip Martin moved for the city council to install some defibrillators, and I know that that has been a success at a council level.

The changes in this bill are sensible to ensure that these devices are publicly accessible without creating unnecessary burdens. They draw a distinction between the owner and the tenant of the building and this ensures that there will be greater clarity around the responsibility for maintaining these devices. There are also changes being made to the floor area definitions that will make it easier for organisations to provide access to defibrillators.

The bill also removes the annual testing requirement. I think that is an important change because we understand that annual testing has been found to diminish the life cycle of the product, which obviously was not what was intended. I note that the opposition have indicated that they will be moving amendments to this bill in response to the concerns that have been raised by the local government sector. I had the opportunity to meet with the Local Government Association yesterday to discuss their request for a new statutory immunity to protect councils from civil lawsuits that may arise where a defibrillator might have been stolen or vandalised and then a person has a heart attack and sues for damages.

In my second reading speech in relation to the Hon. Frank Pangallo's bill back in 2022, I highlighted the problem potentially being faced by councils with respect to batteries being stolen from these devices, particularly in rural areas. While I understand the intent of the opposition's amendments, and I do respect the advocacy work of the local government sector, I am concerned that these amendments could be seen as a watering down of the honourable member's bill and could potentially move us away from building owners taking responsibility for defibrillators, which I understand could rob the bill of its veracity, and that is of concern for me.

I also note that carve-outs are not being given to smaller organisations, such as sporting clubs or not-for-profit organisations, that will also have responsibility for the installation and maintenance of these devices. I also understand from some advice that has been provided to my office from the government that some of the legal concerns that have been flagged are potentially already addressed. I think the government will no doubt talk to that when they reflect on the opposition's amendments. I will listen closely to the debate but at this stage it is not the Greens' intention to support the Liberal amendments.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:53): I rise to make remarks regarding the government's amendment bill, which will make automated external defibrillators mandatory in SA public buildings. Naturally, we support the introduction of such life-saving measures aimed at protecting community members by having heart-starting equipment on hand when it is most needed.

We acknowledge that the government's systematic plan to have broad public access to AEDs make sense. However, we have consulted with the Property Council about this bill and that group have raised concerns with us, chiefly that under this amendment responsibility for installation and upkeep of AED units would rest with the landlord rather than the tenants. This bill in fact places all the onus on landlords, from registering AED units to installing them to maintaining them on a regular basis. The Property Council advises that this runs contrary to normal convention, in that tenants are

typically responsible for fire extinguishers and other health and safety equipment on their premises. Tenants expect to be responsible for this and consider it part of their duties.

In addition, we are advised that any law change that would make landlords entirely responsible for AEDs could potentially create legal issues in the event that a defibrillator unit failed to operate due to a lack of maintenance and somebody died as a result, remembering that in South Australia AEDs must be maintained and tested at least once every 12 months to ensure that they remain in working order.

Concerns have been raised about instilling full responsibility on tenants to maintain AEDs but, as I have explained, this is the norm. Under the provisions of this amendment, an AED would need to be installed in buildings or facilities for every 1,200 square metres of floor area. So to allay the fears for those who lack trust in tenants I point out that we are not talking about—these are sizeable buildings and typically professional tenants we are talking about.

After speaking to the Property Council we feel the government should contemplate and address these concerns and, if not, we consider returning to the chamber with amendments of this nature. I will put on the record that I will be supporting the Liberal amendments that have been put forward, after consultation with the local government sector.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:55): When I was about 10 years old and a student at Largs North Primary School, I was asked to write an essay about two people that I admired. The two people that I chose were cricketer Simon O'Donnell and businessman Kerry Packer. To 10-year-old Reggie they were heroes in part because when I contemplated my future goals, my young mind reckoned that it would be pretty nice to play cricket for Australia and it would probably be pretty nice to have a lot of money, so I chose those two people.

I also admired Simon O'Donnell for his resilience in the face of significant health challenges and his comeback to the Australian team after suffering from cancer, and I admired Kerry Packer in part for his largesse with the Packer Whackers. Kerry Packer was the reason I first became aware of the existence of defibrillators. Members of a certain vintage will recall that, after suffering a heart attack and being saved by one of the few ambulances in the state that was fitted with a defibrillator—which was at the time a pretty rare bit of gear—Mr Packer went halves with the New South Wales government to get one fitted into every ambulance in the state.

Having a defibrillator money level of wealth, and on top of that an evident inclination towards the expenditure of that wealth for the public good, only intensified Mr Packer's mystique in young Reggie's mind. In hindsight, the greatest thing that I probably took away from my period of admiration was a greatly justified respect for the defibrillator as a crucial life-saving medical device. The technology has, of course, evolved significantly since then and become significantly cheaper and more accessible, and we are all the better for this evolution.

There is plenty of evidence that widespread access to AEDs can significantly help in preventing deaths by cardiac arrest. According to the Heart Foundation, every minute without defibrillation restarting the heart reduces an individual's chance of surviving by 10 per cent. Members would recall the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Act 2022, a national first piece of legislation, as being brought to this place by the Hon. Frank Pangallo.

The government was pleased to support that legislation which makes life-saving AEDs mandatory in public buildings, including schools, universities, libraries, sporting facilities, local council offices, theatres and swimming pools, to help save the lives of South Australians from cardiac arrest. We know that many organisations and businesses have already chosen to install AEDs. The South Australian government has installed AEDs in some of the places this legislation mandates, including in CFS, MFS and SES vehicles.

We have also commenced a grant program to support community and sporting organisations to purchase AEDs with the first round of the South Australian AED grants program, opening in May this year, offering \$1,000 grants to not-for-profit community, cultural and sporting organisations, to assist with the cost of purchasing a defibrillator to install in their building or facility. The first round of the AED grants program provided over 200 grants to over 160 organisations across South Australia.

The AED grants program is available to assist eligible groups and organisations to have AEDs installed by 1 January 2026, in line with the legislation's requirements.

The bill before us is a result of the work of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the government on this important initiative to increase the availability of AEDs within the South Australian community, and I thank the honourable member for his advocacy.

The bill proposes to amend the act for the purpose of removing ambiguities around the applicability, scope and requirements of the act, which will enable consistent interpretation and application. Including a definition for 'owner' in the act will ensure a clear distinction between the obligations imposed by the act on a building owner versus a tenant.

Additionally, the proposed definitions seek to clarify what is regarded as a building or facility for the purposes of the act. This aims to see smaller businesses being carved out from the requirements to comply with the act, noting the act was not intended to capture small businesses and cafes. A new provision is proposed for the exclusion of certain buildings and facilities from the requirements of the act for reasons including, but not limited to:

- instances where there is a superior response mechanism in place and trained medical staff are present;
- instances in which the presence of an AED presents safety concerns; and
- instances where a building or facility is entirely not accessible to the public and the mandated presence of AEDs would not align with the intent of the act.

A new provision is proposed to enable exemptions to be made on a case-by-case basis to the requirements of the act. The bill also proposes to allow broader regulation-making powers to support effective operation of the act. A range of other amendments were thoroughly described by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the other place and by the Attorney-General's contribution in this place.

I commend those who provided feedback to the public consultation on this bill that was undertaken earlier this year. It is the government's view that this bill upholds the intent of the act whilst amendments are made to ensure that it can be maximally effective in operation. I commend the bill to the council.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:01): I thank honourable members for their contributions on this important bill. In particular, I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo for his contribution. He is largely the architect of this scheme and I commend the work the Hon. Frank Pangallo has done with my colleague the Minister for Health to see this come to fruition. I will at the second reading stage indicate that we will not support the opposition's amendments, and I look forward to the passage of this bill swiftly this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister inform the chamber whether the Civil Liability Act protects council staff who may come to the aid of a member of the public requiring an AED and, if not, will councils be exposed to extra risk and cost as a result of the acts of their staff?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I might ask for a clarification: is the question whether the passage of this bill imposes new civil liability provisions on people's duty of care?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: That is correct.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the passage of this bill will not disturb anything about how a duty of care is owed in the operation of normal law.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In regard to the obligations to inspect and maintain AEDs, is the minister aware that some manufacturers suggest inspection and testing of AEDs every three months?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It will be up to someone who purchases this to maintain it, as I am advised, in accordance with the manufacturer's instruction. I am advised that there are different levels, depending on which unit someone might buy, in relation to what may be required for maintenance. Maintenance is a very, very broad term, and some maintenance schedules, as I am advised, might be as simple as visual inspection and making sure the lights are on, as they ought to be.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: But is the minister aware that some manufacturers do suggest inspection of that, ensuring that the lights are on, so to speak, every three months?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am not aware of the exact maintenance regimes of a range of different manufacturers. As I say, the maintenance may be as simple as looking to make sure the correct lights are on for some maintenance regimes, particularly those of a short time, is my advice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister appreciate that in some circumstances in regard to some manufacturer's instructions the maintenance may actually be more onerous in some cases that are less than the 12-month period?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It will be up to those who purchase it to make the decisions based on a whole range of considerations. I am sure if someone is concerned about what is required in the manufacturer's instructions—in the range of maintenance—that may factor into the decision about which particular device they purchase.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister indicate to the chamber whether AEDs that have a longer period between maintenance are generally more costly?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is far outside my area of expertise, but as I say it will be up to individuals, organisations, companies who buy these devices to weigh up which device they buy based on a whole range of factors, I am assuming including cost and their research into their reliability. It might be that the maintenance schedules are a factor that weighs in on what product they actually choose.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I did not make a contribution at the second reading stage, but I just thought, given the discussions that have transpired I would indicate that, given some of the concerns that have been raised, I have, in the time available, of course, engaged with the minister in what I would call constructive discussions on some of the issues that have been highlighted today, including issues that have been highlighted by other honourable members.

I note that there are the concerns of the LGA. I also note that there are the concerns that have been raised with members with very late notice in the scheme of things by the Property Council and also, of course, the competing views with respect to those by other stakeholders engaged in these discussions.

I just thought it was worthwhile placing on the record that the minister has certainly indicated his willingness to work with the Property Council with respect to the concerns that they have, noting of course that there are competing interests with those as well, when it comes to operationalising the legislation during the regulation-drafting process. I note, also, the bill will be the subject of consultation after it passes. I think it is important, just in terms of how we progress, to underscore the undertaking by the minister to consult during that regulation-making phase on the issues that have been canvassed by members today.

Of course, when it comes to some of the operational issues that the LGA has also indicated, it would make sense to me that they would also be the subject of those further consultations with the government during that regulation-making phase in terms of the operational aspects of this legislation once it passes and of course noting again also the consultation phase that will follow the passage of this legislation. As such, I will not be supporting the proposed amendments that have been brought by the opposition today.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 10, after line 27—After inserted section 16D insert:

16E—Liability of councils

- (1) A council that is an owner of a building or facility, or a relevant authority for a vehicle, in which an Automated External Defibrillator is required to be installed in accordance with this Act is not liable in tort for a failure to—
 - (a) inspect, maintain or repair the Automated External Defibrillator; or
 - (b) provide the Minister with the information required for the register under section 12(2), or notify the Minister of any changes to that information; or
 - (c) take other action to avoid or reduce the risk of harm that results from a failure referred to in paragraph (a) or (b).
- (2) However, if a council—
 - (a) has been notified in writing of the destruction of, or any damage to, an Automated External Defibrillator installed in a building, facility or vehicle in respect of which the council is the owner or relevant authority (as the case may be), or any changes to the accessibility of such an Automated External Defibrillator; and
 - (b) has failed to take reasonable action in response to the notification (including notifying the Minister of a change to information required for the register within the timeframe specified in section 12(4)(b)),

the council may be liable for any damage or harm that would have been averted had the council taken reasonable action in response to the notification.

This amendment has been drafted in consultation with the Local Government Association and they have approached the opposition, as indeed they have approached the government and the crossbench, with significant concerns about certain aspects of the bill, in particular how the bill will relate to the enormous number of buildings and facilities that local councils own and the impact that this legislation would have on South Australian councils more broadly. In particular, the concern is around civil liability. In my understanding—I have, indeed, seen the legal advice provided by the LGA—that their lawyers have significant concern around councils remaining exposed in relation to civil liability in this amendment bill.

At present, councils do not bear legal responsibility for the health outcomes of the general public and in this current bill it is our understanding that councils will continue to be exposed in relation to those civil liability claims, notwithstanding, obviously, the comments from the Attorney-General previously. For instance, if they fail to properly inspect and maintain the AEDs in accordance with the manufacturer's requirements and then if a member of the public dies or suffers a hypoxic brain injury because an AED was not functioning properly or was not accessible for some reason because perhaps it has been stolen or removed by vandals that the council could bear legal responsibility for that.

Furthermore, given that there is an obligation to inform the minister of the placement of an AED within two weeks in a manner and form determined by the minister, it is entirely likely that at some point in the future a council may fail to communicate this information given the large number of potential AEDs that councils will ultimately be responsible for again opening up the risk for civil liability claims.

In addition, it is our understanding that the legislative scheme does not provide councils with any compensation or any mechanism to recover the significant resources required to comply with their new statutory obligations and, given the large number of buildings and facilities owned by councils, it is entirely reasonable I think to conclude that the impact of this AED legislation will impose a significant cost to South Australian councils that is likely to be passed on to ratepayers by way of increased council rates.

It is pertinent to note that the Local Government Act 1999 already provides councils with a wide range of statutory immunities including in relation to stormwater, tree maintenance, exercise of powers by council members and council employees individually and breaches of duties to provide certain information, to name just a few of those.

My amendment proposes that councils be afforded a statutory immunity that covers changes to accessibility or failures to notify the minister of the installation of an AED within the timeframe except when the council has been specifically notified in writing of an issue with a defibrillator or an AED and has failed to take reasonable action in response to that notification. Obviously, if the council has been made aware of an issue, it should take all reasonable steps to address that issue, but this amendment seeks to cover the council in situations where, for example, there is vandalism or issues with maintenance that may occur without the knowledge of the council.

Finally, in response to the Hon. Robert Simms' comments that this amendment may water down this bill, I would suggest that councils still have a legal liability to install and maintain AEDs, and councils will still be exposed to the penalties in the act if they fail to do so. My amendment just limits the further civil liability for health outcomes for members of the public, which currently does not exist at all.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will provide a response from the government. As I said in my second reading sum-up, the government will not be supporting this amendment. Providing statutory immunity would, in our view, undermine the intent of the act, which requires building owners to install, register and maintain AEDs. Civil liability does not attach to an owner when there is evidence to show that reasonable steps were taken to comply with the legislation.

There was a concern raised during the passage of the original bill by the original bill's author, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, that reducing penalties would disincentivise people from taking them up. The significant penalties embedded in this act are also to ensure deterrence for noncompliance. It should be noted that final changes to the amendment bill as a result of consultation has resulted in the inclusion of an authorised officer and expiation fees to enable noncompliance to be addressed outside a judicial system.

Civil liability does not attach to an owner when there is evidence to show that reasonable steps were taken to comply with the legislation. No other organisation or agency has been or will be afforded a statutory immunity such as is suggested in this amendment. This includes private building owners and the South Australian government.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....12
Majority5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
Henderson, L.A.
Lee, J.S.

Game, S.L.
Hood, B.R.

Girolamo, H.M.
Hood, D.G.E.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Franks, T.A.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Pangallo, F.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.

Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (16 and 17) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (CHILD DEATH AND SERIOUS INJURY REVIEW COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 August 2024.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): I rise today on behalf of the Liberal opposition to indicate that we will be supporting the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) (Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee) Amendment Bill 2024. The purpose of the bill is to make provisions to strengthen the work of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee. The committee is an independent statutory body that contributes to the prevention of the death and serious injury of South Australian children.

The committee collects data on child deaths and serious injuries and their circumstances and causes, enabling it to analyse and gain an understanding of trends over time. The committee also reviews some deaths and serious injuries of children in more detail and might look for information from other agencies such as the Department for Education, SA Health, non-government organisations and private practitioners if they have provided services to the child or their family. This work places the committee in a unique position to recommend important legislative and administrative means to prevent similar deaths in the future.

Under the current law, individual focused reviews of specific cases may only commence once all other investigations, such as those undertaken by the police, the State Coroner or the courts, have concluded. In practice, the current provisions mean that there can be a significant amount of time after a child's death or serious injury before a committee can even begin its review.

This is a problem as it may decrease the potential impact the committee may have to improve child safety or to be in a position to introduce more timely safety measures to avoid harmful incidents that may be prevented. The purpose of this bill is to allow the committee to commence such reviews prior to the conclusion of other investigations, enabling more timely responses.

Appropriate safeguards remain in place to ensure that the committee does not get in the way of those investigations. The committee must consult with the State Coroner or the police commissioner, as appropriate, and the bill requires the committee to take all reasonable steps to avoid compromising the inquest, inquiry or investigation. Where relevant, the Coroner or police commissioner may also direct that the committee does, or refrains from doing, a particular thing in the course of a review if the Coroner or commissioner (as the case may be) is of the opinion that such a direction is necessary to avoid compromise to an inquest, inquiry or investigation.

The bill also includes express provision for the committee, SA Police and the State Coroner to share information for the purposes of determining whether to commence a review or in carrying out a review. There are also provisions for the protection of information held by the committee and to extend the existing protections in the FOI Act, which are consistent with the current provisions in the act.

This committee is made up of extremely well-regarded professionals from a range of fields, including legal, medical, education and social work. The sorts of incidents that lead to reviews are

incredibly tragic and distressing for the families and friends of a child who has died and for the communities around them.

Due to the potential for lengthy and complicated police or coronial investigations, the reviews must often take place a long time after the incidents themselves, meaning that there are frequently lengthy delays before the committee recommendations come to the attention of the relevant ministers. Recommendations from such reviews have, over time, provided useful public policy responses that governments have adopted in the interests of the safety and wellbeing of children and young people.

Sometimes, due to extended time delay, departmental internal reviews have already led to the implementation of responses that are subsequently retrospectively endorsed by the committee; on other occasions the committee may make recommendations that are then adopted by departments. In either case, it is vital that more flexibility be given to the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee so that where appropriate it can commence a review earlier than what is currently permitted. This would allow for more timely provision and consideration of the committee's recommendations.

Provided the State Coroner and the South Australian police commissioner are satisfied with the protections set out in the bill, the opposition supports the improvements, which appear to provide for better decision-making and help to improve the safety and wellbeing of our young people and children in South Australia. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:28): I rise to speak in support of the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) (Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee) Amendment Bill 2024 on behalf of the Greens. The death or injury of a child is always a terrible tragedy. It is vital that we do as much as we can in the prevention of child death and injury in our state.

The Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee is tasked with preventing death and injury of children. They are an independent oversight and advocacy body which review the circumstances of child death and injury. They then provide recommendations about measures that could lead to further prevention.

I understand there have been some barriers to effective and efficient handling of these reviews and that this bill aims to address those. Currently, when there is a review of a child death or serious injury, the committee is required to wait until the end of any coronial inquest. This can result in delays of up to five years after the death of a child, by which time it is more difficult for the committee to investigate and this can result in a delay in prevention measures being recommended and, indeed, put in place.

This bill allows the committee to undertake these investigations in parallel with any coronial inquest and sets out important safeguards to preserve the integrity of that process. The bill also allows the minister to refer individual cases to the committee. The Greens consider that these are sensible measures and support this bill in the hope that it can lead to more prevention of child deaths and injuries in our communities.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:29): I rise briefly to offer in principle support for the government's Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) (Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee) Amendment Bill 2024; however, I also express some concern about potential issues with transparency and accountability.

The stated aim of the bill is to enhance the ability of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee to protect vulnerable children and it is agreed that the measures, which allow the committee to commence investigations early in the process, may well prevent some tragedies from occurring in the future. However, any internal coordination and consultation between the committee, the Coroner and the police commissioner will not be fully transparent to the public, which could ultimately reduce accountability.

In addition to this, the bill exempts the committee's documents from freedom of information requests and this could limit public access to vital information and reduce transparency about how government department decisions are made. In this way, there is limited scrutiny of the committee's work, which can undermine the public trust in the committee's findings and recommendations.

Further to this, the bill prevents the committee from being compelled to provide evidence or documents, and while this provision protects sensitive information, it also risks limiting external accountability and it could make it harder for the public or legal bodies to assess whether the committee is truly effective in its role.

Consequently, I do welcome and support this bill's intention to improve child safety by enhancing the efficiency and flexibility of the review committee but am somewhat concerned that these new powers are not accompanied by strengthening measures to improve transparency and accountability.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:31): I rise to speak in support of the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) (Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee) Amendment Bill 2024. As we have heard, the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee was established in 2006 with the critical task of reviewing tragic cases to help prevent future harm to children.

It is vital, of course, that this committee can act quickly and effectively to identify issues and implement improvements, rather than waiting for years for the conclusions of a Coroner's inquest or criminal investigation. Sadly enough, we have heard of more instances of deaths than any of us wish to recount and what also certainly does not help is having to wait for those outcomes.

The current legislation limits the committee from reviewing such cases, creating delays in the implementation, of course, of very necessary safety reforms when it comes to children, and the bill addresses that issue by allowing the minister to refer a case to the committee despite it being the subject matter of an ongoing Coroner's investigation or police investigation. Importantly, it includes safeguards to ensure that the committee's work does not interfere with those processes, which is critical.

Further, the bill expands the ability of the State Coroner and SA Police to share information with the committee, ensuring that it has access to all relevant details when reviewing a case. This has been an ongoing issue in this area when it comes to cross-agency sharing of information that relates to children and families who are the subject of these sorts of reviews and one that I understand the minister is working towards completely addressing. In my view, it has taken us a long time to get to this point, but I am glad that we are getting closer through this measure, but it is one that certainly needs to be addressed wholly sooner rather than later, in my view.

The bill also seeks to extend the committee's exemptions from FOI requests to documents prepared by the committee held by other agencies. This does strengthen the confidentiality necessary for the committee to carry out its work. It raises, though, in my view, a broader question in terms of the oversight of this committee remaining under the Minister for Education or whether that should be placed under the Minister for Child Protection, given the clear crossover between child deaths and the child protection system. I make that point as it is one we should be very mindful of in terms of these considerations.

I note, of course, the historical context of where agencies sit, dating back to 2016 and the Nyland review, and the need to separate Families SA from Education, but of course subsequent changes in relation to child protection are also sitting outside the scope of that, so there is still a bit of a mishmash there. Whilst the reasons for the changes were very pertinent at the time, I think they warrant further clarity, particularly when it comes to this bill sitting under the education portfolio.

In October 2022, I lodged an FOI request with the Department for Child Protection seeking information on the number and ages of children under the care or supervision who had died, and the results were alarming. There were 58 children who had been known to the DCP dying between 2019 and 2022, eight of whom were living in state care. That disclosure ignited an ongoing media campaign for greater transparency and accountability, and it is clear that more needs to be done in this area.

Just recently, and following on from discussions that many of us have been subject to, the Chief Executive of DCP, Jackie Bray, confirmed that 11 children known to the department had died in 2023-24—children who were either under guardianship or involved with the department due to safety concerns.

We have been promised, and there are commitments on the record now, that the number of these tragic deaths will now be included in the department's annual report, which is a step towards greater transparency, but in my view, given the issues that we have just talked about, particularly in relation to FOIs and the need to actually go down the path of lodging an FOI to get release of that sort of information, and also having to wait for a coronial inquest to be completed, at which time we will know everything surrounding a child's death, I am not satisfied with an annual reporting mechanism. It is a step in the right direction.

Of course there are privacy issues at stake but certainly these, for my part, will be the subject of further discussion because details such as the ages of children, the cause of death and the reasons for their involvement with the department are details that, at this stage, are not going to be, as I understand it, included in that disclosure. Clearly, we need to do more in this space in terms of those disclosures. These are very much in the public interest and we cannot afford to be waiting for FOIs to be lodged with departments before we find out what the true state of those numbers is, however harrowing they may be for all of us.

With those concerns in mind, I may ask some questions, depending on the feedback we get from the minister during the committee stage, and seek more clarity on these matters, but I indicate my support for this bill as a step forward in ensuring the safety and wellbeing of South Australian children.

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (16:37): I rise to speak in support of the bill. The death of a child is an incomprehensible tragedy in all circumstances. The Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee does the important but heartbreaking work of collecting data on the circumstances and causes of child death and serious injury and analysing it. Accurate information and data collection is essential to prevention; that is a fact.

In some of these tragic cases, time is of the essence, and the ability of the committee to start their investigation in a timely manner will impact their potential to improve child safety through their review and recommendations. This bill aims to grant the committee more flexibility regarding when it can commence a review. Currently, the committee may not review a case unless a coronial inquiry has already been completed, the Coroner requested the committee carry out a review, or the Coroner indicates that there is no present intention to carry out a coronial inquiry.

The bill allows the committee to commence a review into a case that is the subject of an ongoing coronial inquest or inquiry of criminal investigations. The Attorney-General outlined some of the safeguards present in the bill to combat any potential compromise to an investigation, inquiry or inquest in his second reading speech, which I will refer to. The bill provides safeguards by:

1. Requiring that in such a case the committee consult with the State Coroner or the Commissioner of Police, as the case requires;
2. Providing that the committee must take all reasonable steps to avoid compromising the inquest, injury or investigation; and
3. Enabling the Coroner or the commissioner to give directions to the committee as to the things they should or should not do during the review, if the Coroner or the commissioner is of the opinion that such a direction is necessary to avoid compromising an inquest, inquiry or investigation.

In support of this cooperation, the bill will permit South Australia Police, the State Coroner and the committee to share information for the purposes of determining whether to commence a review or in the carrying out of a review.

The nature of these investigations is extremely sensitive and as such any information gathered must be treated carefully. The bill will provide that a person cannot be compelled to give evidence of matters that are made known to them as a member or staff of the committee. Under this bill they also cannot be compelled to produce a document prepared or made for the purposes of a review or through the work of the committee, or provide any information that became known to them in the course of a review. I thank the committee for the difficult but necessary investigations they carry out and commend this bill to the chamber.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:40): I thank honourable members for their contributions on this important bill. I note there may be questions during the committee stage, and I look forward to answering those and the speedy passage of this bill, hopefully later this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am wondering whether the Attorney can perhaps provide some clarity around why it is that this committee does sit under Education and not Child Protection. That would be good.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that this probably could sit reasonably comfortably under a number of different ministers. It does not just collect information in relation to deaths of children in state care, but very broadly and that is why it sits with the minister it sits with.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As part of the discussions that have taken place in relation to this particular issue, noting of course that not all children who will be reported here have contact with DCP, aside from the FOI provisions, are there other mechanisms to ensure the sharing of information between the committee, Education and DCP where appropriate and where there are children who have had contact with more than one of those agencies?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that, yes, there is. There are provisions specifically under this bill about sharing the information and the general provisions that apply across government for information-sharing principles and guidelines.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Further to that, will this also be the subject of further work the Minister for Child Protection is doing to ensure better sharing of access across agencies when it relates specifically to children who are in contact with DCP?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have specific advice, because we do not have that department advising, but what I can say is that as a general proposition I know the Minister for Child Protection, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard, is always looking for ways to improve the system as much as possible.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just finally, and I am not sure if I missed this, proportionally speaking is there some indication of how many children who are the subject of the reviews under this bill do actually have contact with DCP?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised we do not have that on hand. If it is possible I am happy to undertake to go away and, if we can find that information, provide it to the honourable member at a later time.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PERSONAL MOBILITY DEVICES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 September 2024.)

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:47): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill and note that I have a couple of amendments, or an amendment that will trigger two amendments, as per what the member for Unley moved in the other place that was unsuccessful. While I welcome the fact that the government and the opposition are essentially on a unity ticket with this—we are looking to legalise personal mobility devices, to send them out into the wild—in response to concerns raised about public liability insurance we feel the amendments I will be bringing are necessary to protect the public.

I will go into detail in the committee stage, but suffice to say that applying the nominal defendant scheme to the use of personal mobility devices is about responding to the community's concerns about liability and compensation in cases of hit-and-runs and the inevitable accidents that will occur on our streets and our footpaths. It is a safety net that we believe is necessary and which groups like the RAA have pointed out as a concern for them with this bill.

In his second reading explanation, the minister acknowledged that general insurers do not yet have suitable products and that it is hoped that data will become available in the future to help price the insurance cover affordably for these personal mobility devices (PMDs). Until that time, however, the opposition is concerned that people injured as a result of e-scooters will fall through the cracks.

In response to the minister's reasoning that it ultimately comes down to personal responsibility and comparing the current situation to that of bicycles, it is worth highlighting the fact that these personal mobility devices are going to be potentially many times heavier and in some cases faster than a pushbike is.

We also want to address the fact that the statistics on claims against the nominal defendant scheme are very low and that ideally this would be just a temporary measure until the private sector brings suitable products online in terms of insurance.

To be fair, the minister on one hand has admitted that there is merit and good intention behind these amendments and, given the advice received by the opposition that it may be some years before sufficient actuarial data is gathered for insurance purposes, we reiterate that a nominal defendant scheme is a safety net of last resort and it is worth pursuing.

I also note that the minister suggested his department would seek costings on the implications of this amendment and impacts on insurance premiums for third-party insurance and I would be interested to know if that information will be forthcoming.

In his second reading, the minister confirmed that regulations setting out the details of the new legislation will be drafted and consulted on prior to possibly commencing in early 2025 and I welcome the government moving speedily on this because, as I observed earlier, we are essentially in agreement with this bill, notwithstanding the concerns about public liability that have been raised. The minister specifically mentioned that device dimensions, speed and mass will be considered and consulted on. Given that, I wish to briefly put on the record some of the proposals put to the opposition and to the minister for consideration in drafting those regulations.

Electric Skateboarders, EUC and Onewheel South Australia, also known as SAESK8, has flagged an issue that arose from the YourSAy survey results regarding weight limits. They want to ensure that a low weight limit of 25 kilograms is not introduced as it would restrict the lawful operation of many of the safest devices on the market. I understand there are self-levelling devices on the market that can range from 12 to 55 kilograms and of course for the more heavyset individuals—I might include myself in that in some cases—using PMDs, they will require a device with a powerful enough battery at the higher end of this scale.

SAESK8 warns that setting a low-weight threshold would discriminate against heavy users of these e-devices and encourage us to follow the lead of some other jurisdictions, such as Queensland and the ACT. Indeed, many of their suggestions are drawn from those interstate jurisdictions and, given that the minister is in receipt of the same correspondence I am, I will not mention every single one of them but instead encourage the minister's favourable consideration for their proposals.

Another worthy aspect of further consideration that I am passionate about is how we encourage greater public transport patronage by allowing these devices on our PT network. From my briefing with the department, I know that they are looking at how this could be done. Legitimate safety concerns regarding PMD batteries do need to be considered. I am sure that these will be worked through, and I know that in some evidence with regard to those batteries it usually is when they are on charge that we have issues with them causing fires or exploding, but I certainly hope that the department does consider how we might be able to utilise PMDs and storage of them on our public transport.

I am told that many of the SAESK8 members are supportive of this move and passionately believe that they should be permitted on public transport because, ultimately, they are considered a last-mile form of transportation and have a limited battery that can sometimes leave PMD users stranded. I have also heard from some parents that it would be really useful for their kids to be able to get to and from public transport heading to school with their PMDs and then be able to get home in a quick fashion, so they are not sitting there or having to walk long distances and of course there are the dangers associated with kids being out too long.

With those remarks in support of the bill, I look forward to further debate in the committee stage where I hope honourable colleagues will see the wisdom of incorporating the nominal defendant scheme as a safety net for the inevitable and unfortunate circumstances where accidents occur.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:53): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Personal Mobility Devices) Bill 2024; however, I also express my concerns about the safety and responsible use of e-scooters. In principle, I support the use of e-scooters. They are a convenient alternative for those who choose to avoid using public transport and motor vehicles for their intents and purposes. They provide a quick and flexible way to navigate urban areas and shorter distances without the hassle of traffic congestion or waiting on a fixed bus schedule and they allow the user to travel at their own expense, determining their own route and timeframe. It is a practical solution to a modern-day problem.

My only concern regarding the use of personal mobility devices is that there are preventative measures in place ensuring they are used safely and responsibly. Should this bill come to pass, there would be no obligation for the owner of the e-scooter to register a personal mobility device consistent with registering a motor vehicle.

E-scooters present themselves as an insurance liability and should an accident resulting in injury or death occur using a personal mobility device other road users or pedestrians will not be able to claim compulsory third-party insurance due to the actions of the user of a personal mobility device. With those comments, I put on the record that I will be supporting the Liberal amendments to this bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:54): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Personal Mobility Devices) Bill 2024. As we have heard, the bill provides the legislative framework to allow privately owned personal mobility scooters to share our roads and footpaths. We know that they offer a range of benefits, including improved accessibility and convenience, if you are so inclined, particularly for those who rely on them for short-distance travel.

Much of the details, such as who can use these devices, speed limits, weight restrictions and other operational rules, are going to be the subject of further consultation and outlined in the regulations, so that is a bit of a wait and see space. As I have said, this is really the framework, so I will not rehash the specifics of that bill today. Instead, I will highlight a couple of key points of concern for me.

First, the issue that has been raised by other honourable members, namely that of insurance. As we know, unlike motor vehicles and motorbikes, these personal mobility scooters do not require registration and will not be covered by the CTP insurance scheme. I am not entirely satisfied with that position, but I also do not know that it has been appropriately addressed in the bill, so I will be seeking some further clarity during the committee stage debate regarding risk and liability. As it stands, the bill leaves those matters to civil actions between the parties involved in an incident, and it does create potential implications for users and pedestrians alike.

I have engaged in discussions now with the RAA in particular and acknowledge also that the market for scooter insurance is still developing. It is not even a space that they can move into right now because it is still in its infancy if you like. I do note though that Queensland has introduced a product, and it is possible we might see similar offerings emerge in South Australia at some point in the future.

Secondly, I want to draw attention to the ongoing issue surrounding 50cc motorbikes, often referred to as mopeds. That also remains a grey area. It does not tie directly in with this, but I like to lump them all in the same basket. We had really good outcomes in terms of driver education training when it comes to motorbikes.

Now we have the mobility scooters being dealt with, and I am hopeful the government remains true to its word that soon we will deal with the issue of those mopeds on the roads as well because there are questions around what happens when a vehicle does not quite fit the definition of a motor vehicle, motorbike or scooter. I understand, of course, that this bill does not in any way capture those vehicles, but I still remain of the view and am hopeful that those discussions will prove fruitful in terms of clearer guidance to avoid any confusion down the line.

I would also like to raise a practical issue of commuters using scooters in conjunction with public transport, particularly trains, and that is another area where I have been engaged in discussions with the government and also with the RAA. We know that many people use these devices to cover the first and last mile of their commutes: scooting to the train station and then from the station to their final destination, whether that be work or university or whatever the case may be. I am certainly keen to see, if we are going to go down this path of allowing these personal mobility scooters, that they be able to be taken onto trains, particularly in relation to what we call the first and last mile.

The only other point that I would raise, and we have seen an instance I think it was interstate just recently—I am not sure which jurisdiction it was in—but I do note the responsibility of users when it comes to these personal mobility scooters. I think we saw an incident that certainly piqued my interest in terms of how we recharge them. There was a fire, I think it was in an apartment complex just recently, reported on in another jurisdiction.

There is a responsibility on users to make sure they are using the right equipment to actually recharge these scooters because they do pose, as has been seen, a risk to property and life if we do not use the appropriate, I suppose, ones that are issued with—I am not exactly sure how it works, but there is a potential hazard there in terms of fires. That was actually a pretty bad fire and I understand that there may have been charges laid as well against the individual in question because of the extent of the damage that was caused as a result.

So there is obviously some personal responsibility that comes along with using these in terms of ensuring the safety and the right equipment when it comes to firing them up, if you like—pardon the pun. In conclusion, while I support the bill, I think there are of course those important questions that need to be addressed. I do understand, as I have said, that this is a developing space so we may not be able to be in a position to deal with them now, but I look forward to perhaps getting some clarity from the minister responsible in terms of some of the issues that have been raised during the committee stage debate.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to call the Hon. Mr Pangallo who, by the way, is apparently celebrating a rather significant birthday today, so on behalf of the chamber, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, we wish you all the very best.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Singing is out of order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:01): Thank you, Mr President, and thank you to the fellow members. I rise to speak on the personal mobility devices bill. From the outset, I want to be clear that I am not opposed to e-scooters and other battery-powered transport devices. They do have a place. They are cheap and a greener form of transport, although you would like to think that the government could be more, or just as, enthusiastic about getting those likely to use these devices to

jump onto public transport instead. However, this must be one of the most reckless and irresponsible pieces of legislation I have seen go through this place.

Bizarrely, I have heard members today raise real concerns, yet they will wave this through. This is just typical of the populist policies of the Malinauskas government, giving the green light to these powered motor vehicles to be allowed onto our roads and footpaths without the proper consideration of safety and damage protection to other road and footpath users and to the riders themselves. Foolishly, the opposition leader, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, also fell for this populist trap and kept cajoling the transport minister to legalise them.

Neither Mr Koutsantonis nor Mr Tarzia have, to my knowledge, sought to do substantive research nor sought the advice from sections of the community who have an opposing view on safety and commonsense grounds. The minister, of course, points to the so-called overwhelming response to one of the government's YourSAy surveys in support of them.

Now, 2,000 responded and he claims on that basis that all South Australians are in favour of them. That is hardly scientifically based, nor would it represent the views of the majority. Why does the government not base all its legislative policy agenda on what a fraction of punters think on YourSAy?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Don't give them a hint. Even the RAA has thrown its support behind them without really considering the dangerous consequences most likely to unfold when allowing all manner of unregulated contraptions to hit the road and create even more congestion and hazards for its membership base, not to mention the public liability issues. This is poor and irresponsible public policy by a government and an opposition only interested in tapping into a pop culture, a young pop culture.

What I have been saying for the past five years of trials—and this must be the longest trial of anything anywhere in the world—is that safety and proper regulation must be the key priorities; that is, safety for pedestrians, other road users and those who hire and ride these powered motor vehicles that can reach speeds of up to 60 km/h, and regulation because these vehicles do not meet any Australian standard, unlike cars and motorbikes.

These are powered vehicles, not pushbikes. They are being sold and driven at speeds on roads even though their use is illegal. They are causing house fires because their lithium batteries are highly combustible and difficult to extinguish. Check out the figures I sought through freedom of information from the Metropolitan Fire Service about the dozens of house fires caused by bikes, scooters, vehicles and equipment powered by lithium batteries: the damage bill runs in excess of \$100 million. It will not be long before lives are lost, and then what?

E-scooters have caused scores of injuries and fatalities interstate. SA Health does not keep specific data on presentations from traumas caused by e-scooters. While hospitals in other cities keep records of the number of presentations from traumas to riders and pedestrians caused by e-scooters and personal mobility devices, SA Health chooses not to for reasons known only to them. The hire operators themselves self-report, something I do not consider to be a reliable or credible source of evidence.

While they do issue infringement notices occasionally, SA Police are still wilfully blind in enforcing compliance after blatant breaches of the regulations: no helmets, age restrictions, riding illegally on roads. But of course, SA Police were consulted. Wrong! No, they were not.

When we posed this question in our briefing on the legislation, we were told they assumed SAPOL would utilise an already understaffed force to have officers using radar guns to police scooter speeds—radar guns. Are they going to chase these offenders through the streets and footpaths of Adelaide because they do not have any registration or identification? As I walked in and out of Parliament House this week I saw several riders still breaking the law. There were two people, an adult and a child, riding on one e-scooter on the road; one was not wearing a helmet.

They are strewn over footpaths and block access at traffic light crossings, impeding the visually impaired. Many cities around the world have banned them. In December, Unley council

abandoned its two-year trial because of complaints they were littering their streets and causing hazards. Beam promised it would collect 80 per cent of its scooters every single night, regardless of whether they needed to be recharged. I want to see evidence of that.

The companies operating these motor vehicles for hire have complex, and in my view dodgy, liability compensation cover in case of death or injury caused to third parties by recklessness or carelessness of riders. Conditions of hire vary with each provider; they are broad and users tick off on them without scrolling through the fine print on their phone because they are in a rush to get mobile.

Let me give an example: you are walking down King William Street and you get hit from behind by a hired scooter and are badly hurt. If the rider either is not wearing a helmet or is under age, the company does not have to pay because they have exclusions if the rider is in breach of laws. How is that fair? It has happened. Alarming loopholes exist that can lead to massive medical and legal bills. Insurance? Registration for proof of ownership? None of how to protect users or third parties is in the legislation.

I have met with Mark Giancaspro, a law lecturer at Adelaide University, and David Brown from Adelaide University's Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law Scholarship Unit, who published a paper in 2022 on who is liable if you are injured or killed riding an e-scooter. The paper calls for a uniform regulatory framework and that means a national code balancing the risks and benefits of e-scooters and setting up liability for compensation in case of death or injury. If a rider is reckless and careless, they are responsible for injuries caused to others.

Here is where it gets tricky and dodgy: some e-scooter operators exclude liability except where it is caused by their negligence. Councils could be liable if an accident occurred due to a damaged pavement or road, but it would need to be proven that the council had breached its duty of care by not making repairs. The same applies for persons who might trip over a scooter that has been dumped on the footpath. I have spoken to constituents badly hurt from tripping over scooters strewn on city streets who were unable to get any form of compensation from either the operator or the council.

The visually impaired are frustrated, having to avoid being hit or sidestepping those parked alongside traffic lights at pedestrian crossings, preventing them from accessing the crossing buttons. As Giancaspro and Brown point out, it is much harder for third parties who are injured because only parties to a contract can incur rights and obligations under the contract, so if you are hit or trip over one, you have no contractual rights against the company.

Also, many riders are either unaware or do not read the fine print of contracts of hire via an app. These agreements are long and complex pieces of legal mumbo jumbo. Do riders really take any notice of them? Well, no, and the operators know this. This must be fixed. Third parties are being placed at risk without any hope of getting compensation. The government has an obligation and a responsibility to them.

There is no uniformity in their use by minors. Some refuse to allow them; others allow over 16 with parental consent, yet many adults would be unaware of clauses which avoid insurance entitlements if an unauthorised minor is injured or a rider was not wearing a helmet at the time. You also do not need to have a driver's licence, even though you might travel on a road with it.

It is not a pushbike: it is a powered motor vehicle under Australian Road Rules; yet, what is this government and feeble opposition doing? Not only are they waving through the opaque legal responsibilities of the hire operators but they are also opening the floodgates to private owners with no legal liability or protection in the event something goes horribly wrong. The priority must be a duty of care for every member of the community.

I note that the Hon. Ben Hood at least has come up with an amendment that allows a normal defender to claim like you could with car accident insurance, and I will certainly be supporting that.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:12): I also rise to speak in favour of the Statutes Amendment (Personal Mobility Devices) Bill 2024, and might I also congratulate the Hon. Frank Pangallo on his special birthday today. The Greens have been long supporters of e-scooters and e-skateboards as an important mode of transport in our state. We recognise in particular that we are in the middle of a

climate emergency and one of the ways that we can reduce carbon emissions here in our state is reducing the number of cars on the road, and so we do see e-scooters as playing an important role in that regard.

We are pleased to see that the government has taken up the recommendation of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport that private-owned e-scooters should be permitted by legislation. E-scooters are a clean, green transport alternative. They reduce congestion by getting cars off the road and they allow users flexibility to get to where they need to go in an efficient way. They are increasingly being relied upon in many cities around the world as a form of travel.

We have seen e-scooters for hire on the streets of Adelaide over many years. Indeed, when I was on Adelaide City Council, there was a proposal that came to the council for us to undertake a trial ahead of the 2018 Fringe Festival, and that trial ended up being extended over many years, so I do welcome the fact that we are going to see a consistent approach being taken.

One of the problems we have had in South Australia around e-scooters is an inconsistency within the law. Whilst we have had a number of local councils that have allowed people to hire e-scooter devices, individual use has been prohibited. Despite the fact that you can actually purchase an e-scooter from a store you can only use it on your own private property. This has created, I think, a lot of confusion for law-abiding South Australians who are seeking to do the right thing but make the assumption that if you can buy an e-scooter in South Australia then surely you should be able to use it on the streets of our state. So, finally, that has been cleaned up.

One thing that was really interesting for me, having the benefit of being on the public and active transport inquiry, was that we heard evidence that allowing individual ownership of e-scooters does actually promote safety outcomes, and that is because if you are hiring an e-scooter and you are participating in the kind of festival environment of a trial and it is not your own device then you might be more likely to engage in risky behaviour. But if you are actually using your own device, that you are more familiar with and you have purchased, you are more likely to take care of it and you are also more likely to know how it works and that reduces some of the risks associated with this.

It is important to note that the issues that honourable members have raised regarding pedestrian safety I think are very important and did need further consideration from the government. Indeed, one of the issues that we heard quite a bit of evidence around was this issue of insurance. I want to refer members to some of the recommendations from the public and active transport inquiry. I will read some of the recommendations out for the benefit of government members who I know have not read all of the inquiry recommendations.

An honourable member: Some of us have.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Some have, I wish the transport minister had because we might have addressed some of the issues that have come to us with this bill. Recommendation 8 is particularly important and relevant, I think. It states:

The Committee recommends that the matter of compulsory third party insurance for private and commercial e-scooters be referred to the Attorney-General for review and advice.

The Hon. F. Pangallo interjecting:

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: An interesting question: the Hon. Mr Frank Pangallo asked whether this happened. I will be asking that question of the government in the committee stage. They have had two years to undertake that work so I am assuming that has happened. It states further:

The Committee recommends that the state government resolves:

- (a) the classification ambiguity regarding commercial and private use of e-scooters, specifically whether they can be regarded as a motorised vehicle or as a bicycle; and
- (b) outstanding matters regarding high insurance excess amounts, easily voided insurance policies, and the power of e-scooter providers in deciding the outcome of insurance claims.

One of the committee's findings was that:

There is potential for increased use of e-scooters in metropolitan Adelaide, but liability and accountability are highly complex matters that go beyond what the Committee can achieve...and Legislation and policy surrounding the

use of small personal e-mobility vehicles (not just e-scooters) should be a matter of ongoing review by state government in collaboration with stakeholders.

I do not know what the outcome was of those recommendations. Indeed, I reached out to the minister, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, when this report was handed down in February of last year. I reached out again requesting the opportunity to meet with him so that I could draw his attention to some of these recommendations but, sadly, the opportunity never arose and so I am not sure whether or not these issues have actually been addressed by the government.

Some of the other issues that came to light worth highlighting for the benefit of this debate are:

The Committee recommends that state government, in collaboration with local government and other stakeholders:

- (a) legislates to enable the use of privately owned e-scooters and other personal mobility devices in public spaces, in line with other jurisdictions

Tick; that is good. It goes on:

- (b) considers adopting definitions of e-scooters and e-personal mobility devices consistent with National Model Law;
- (c) considers ways that e-scooters and e-personal mobility devices can be safely moved into bike lanes on roads without compromising the safety of cyclists or device users;
- (d) reviews speed limits of e-scooters and other e-personal mobility devices on footpaths to better protect the safety of pedestrians; and
- (e) gathers data on the use of private and commercial e-scooters and other e-personal mobility devices, including compliance and injuries to pedestrians and riders.

I welcome the fact that the government has moved on some of these matters, but there are some issues here that they do not appear to have addressed and that I intend to raise during the committee stage. I do make clear that I am supportive of the bill. I welcome this reform in terms of cleaning up some of the ambiguity we have in South Australia, but I am concerned that the issues around liability have not been addressed. I wonder whether or not the government has undertaken the level of consultation that was envisaged by the parliamentary inquiry when we made those recommendations.

Given that, and in the absence of any approach being made by the government to the contrary, I will support the amendments from the Hon. Ben Hood because I think we do need to have some sort of model in place to address some of the insurance implications. I look forward to some of the discussion that unfolds during the committee stage, and I will have a few questions to ask of the government around how some of the issues have been addressed.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:20): I stand to support the bill. It amends the definition of a motor vehicle under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to exclude electric personal transporters, known as EPTs, as defined in the Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Regulations 2014, that may be driven on or over a road in accordance with an approval by the minister under section 161A of the Road Traffic Act 1961.

The purpose of the bill is to make sure they cannot be deemed an uninsured motor vehicle and provide some protection to the nominal defendant from claims involving personal mobile devices, known as PMDs, that were privately owned or hired out by commercial fleet operators. If passed, from the date of introduction of this bill an EPT is excluded from the definition of a motor vehicle. The bill provides a broad framework for the safe use of privately owned PMDs (currently defined as EPTs) on roads, footpaths and shared paths.

The bill also moves the definition of 'bicycle' from the Road Traffic Act 1961 itself into regulations to allow for changes to the definition over time as new types of bicycles come onto the market. The key points of the bill are that it characterises a PMD as a new type of vehicle for the purposes of both the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. It includes a power that will allow the device's dimensions, its maximum mass and speed, network access, the minimum age of the rider and the rules they must follow to be specified in regulations.

Having the specifications in the regulations enables flexibility into the future, ensuring that a quick and effective response to new devices and technologies is possible. Classifying a PMD as a vehicle means they will be treated like a bicycle. This has several advantages: it means they can be provided similar network access as for bicycles and the same road rules will apply, meaning that the conditions of use should be easily understood; and it will allow police officers to use their existing suite of powers to stop the rider, give directions and possibly charge them with riding under the influence.

Similar to bicycle riders, the offences of 'drive with prescribed concentration of alcohol' (under section 47B of the Road Traffic Act 1961) and 'drive with prescribed drug' (under section 47BA of the Road Traffic Act 1961) will not apply, as those offences are aimed at drivers of motor vehicles. Although police will not have the power to breath test or submit PMD riders to a drug test, the offence of riding under the influence (under section 47 of the Road Traffic Act 1961) will apply to PMD riders if police observe and are satisfied the rider is under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs.

PMDs will not be motor vehicles for the purpose of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 or the Road Traffic Act 1961. There will be no requirement to register PMDs, nor a requirement for the rider to hold a licence or insurance. This is consistent with the approach taken by other jurisdictions.

As is currently the case for crashes involving bicycles, other road users will not be able to claim under compulsory third-party insurance for death or injury due to the actions of a rider of a PMD. This means the nominal defendant scheme is protected from unfunded liabilities, which is an appropriate outcome given the device riders will not contribute to any compensation fund. To allow otherwise would impact insurance premiums paid by ordinary motor vehicle owners. A PMD user involved in a crash will be treated the same as a bicycle rider. It will be a civil matter between the parties. It is hoped that in future general insurers will develop suitable products when sufficient data on the risk profile is available, allowing them to price insurance cover affordably.

I turn to the regulation-making power under section 116 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. There will remain a risk of unfunded liability for the compulsory third-party nominal defendant scheme and Lifetime Support Scheme arising from the bill for any unregulated or unregistrable devices, for instance those that will fall outside of what is allowed as a PMD. The regulation-making power will require vehicles to be explicitly defined as to be excluded from the section, for instance devices that are modified and future emerging technologies that have not been approved to operate on roads.

The bill characterises e-scooters as a new category of vehicle, called PMD, under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. The PMD will be excluded from the section 5 definition of a motor vehicle in the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and from the section 5 definition of a motor vehicle in the Road Traffic Act 1961, but they will be included in the section 5 definition of a vehicle under the Road Traffic Act 1961. The bill allows delegated legislation to specify the detail about the use of PMDs, such as dimensions, maximum mass, maximum speed, access, age and rules, including the definition of a PMD.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:26): I would like to place on the record my thanks to the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Russell Wortley for their contributions.

I would like to perhaps draw together and comment on a few of the things that were referred to. As the Hon. Connie Bonaros said, this is certainly a developing space and a lot of the information that members are seeking—some of that will no doubt become available as the regulations are drafted. Other matters, it is quite accurate to say, are still developing, because e-scooters and their regulation is relatively new in Australia.

The Hon. Frank Pangallo said the RAA was supporting this without considering safety issues and other issues. I apologise if I am paraphrasing and may not have the exact words right, but it was words to that effect. I think that is simply underestimating the value the RAA puts on safety issues. I think they are certainly well qualified to be able to provide input, which is, as I understand it, what they have done.

In terms of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport, I want to thank, again, the select committee for the work they have done. This has enabled a lot of work within this bill to be able to utilise the work that was done through the select committee. I am advised that in developing options for a regulatory model the department has considered the findings of the select committee, and that has been done alongside analysis of the public consultation on personal mobility device use in South Australia as well as review of other jurisdictions' regulatory models.

I am advised that elements of the select committee's recommendations were picked up through the consultation themes that were put forward for public comment, particularly the aspects relating to private use, network access and treatment in terms of application of registration and insurance requirements. In short, the report was used to inform the content of the public consultation for PMDs.

Should this gain support at this next vote, I look forward to some of the specific questions being raised in the committee stage and being able to explore some of those further. I commend the bill to the chamber.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Further to some of the points I raised in my second reading speech, I wonder if the minister could address this issue around recommendation 8 of the public and active transport inquiry, which is the recommendation that asks that the Attorney-General consider the issue of compulsory third-party insurance for private and commercial e-scooters. In particular, it was recommended that the state government resolve the classification ambiguity and also issues around high insurance excess amounts. Did the Attorney-General look into this issue of third-party insurance for private and commercial e-scooters and what did he advise?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, as compulsory third-party insurance falls under the remit of the Treasurer, the work on this bill was done in conjunction with the CTP Regulator.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The committee received a lot of advice from legal academics around the potential legal ambiguity around dealing with the issues of insurance. Did the government get any legal advice around those issues to inform its consideration of this approach?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the work was done closely with the Compulsory Third-Party Regulator and the Lifetime Support Authority, given of course that the Lifetime Support Authority has considerable experience in this kind of space.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: What was the advice of the Lifetime Support Authority with respect to this question?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the Lifetime Support Authority provided input, but that of course was also side by side with information sought from other jurisdictions and that the legal framework that is being proposed here is consistent with a number of other jurisdictions that have introduced e-scooters in their states or territories.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The minister has just said that there was input from the Lifetime Support Authority and indeed the CTP Regulator. If there was input by them, regardless of whether it is consistent or inconsistent with other jurisdictions, what was their input into the development of this bill?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that their position was that personal mobility devices should not be covered under either the compulsory third party nor the lifetime support schemes.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can I ask the minister if she is aware of the speeds that these personal mobility devices can reach on roads? Is she aware of how fast they can go?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it would depend on the particular device as to what speed they are capable of, but one of the purposes of this legislation is to allow speed limits

that will be proposed to actually be enforced. That will be done in terms of the speed limit development based on research and consultation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I refer the minister to recommendation 7 of the report of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport. One of those recommendations was that the government reviews speed limits of e-scooters and other personal mobility devices on footpaths to ensure better protection of pedestrians. What action was taken in relation to that recommendation? Has that been taken on board in crafting this legislation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there have been discussions and consultation with other jurisdictions as well as the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, and we are looking at national best practice in terms of the way forward here in South Australia.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just so I am clear, did they actually review the speed limits, or you just simply looked at what happens in other states and said, 'That's it'? Did you look at changing them here in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In considering what limits applied in the current trials, considering the work that has been done by the CASR, and considering what is the situation in other jurisdictions, I am not sure how else you would describe that than as a review.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Referring the minister again back to recommendation 7 of the report, another recommendation was that the government consider ways that e-scooters and other personal mobility devices may be safely moved into bike lanes on roads without compromising the safety of cyclists or device users. I understand that does happen in some other jurisdictions. What consideration was given to that recommendation in crafting this legislation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that under the new framework, e-scooters would be permitted in bicycle lanes, so that is one of the things that would be enabled through this legislation, according to my advice.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The government will be unable to control the speeds of these devices and the speeds at which they can travel and, as I have mentioned, it is up to 60 km/h. What speed are they allowed to go on footpaths, and what obligations do riders have to use or have on their device a warning alarm to notify other users? If you are walking on a footpath, you will not be able to hear these devices approaching because they are silent.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the specific limit will be set by regulation and that is obviously something that there will be consultation about. It is also expected that personal mobility devices will be required to have a bell or similar device as a warning measure.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: During the consultation process, why did the minister not consult with SAPOL?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the department did consult with SAPOL.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: That is not what the police have told me and members of my office. What consultation did the department do with the Metropolitan Fire Service?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there was not direct consultation with the Metropolitan Fire Service. Notwithstanding that, of course, there was wideranging consultation and any interested party was able to be involved in that.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Devices of around 55 kilograms are coming onto the market, as I described in my second reading speech, which have more advanced safety features and can be better supported for heavy riders. The YourSay consultation references some support for small increases to weight restrictions allowing up to 30 kilograms. Is the government open to permitting higher weight limits of 30 kilograms or higher, given the advanced safety features and power requirements of heavy riders?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the weights will be determined through regulation and that will be informed by roundtable discussion. The expectation and intent is that the organisation, SAESK8, which we understand has provided similar feedback to that referred to by the honourable member, will be part of that consultation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Will that be retrospective? There are already hundreds of these devices that have been bought privately. How would you know what they weigh or what they are capable of doing once the legislation goes through? Will they still be legal on our roads?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that in terms of private ownership, any e-scooter or personal mobility device that was used following the passage of this legislation and implementation would need to comply with the characteristics that are outlined in the regulations once they have been developed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just for the clarity of the record, when it comes to the issue of speeds, which have not been landed on yet, can the minister confirm that for the purposes of this legislation personal mobility devices will be treated like a bicycle, for instance, under the Road Traffic Act—they will be subject to the speed limits, penalties for breaching speed limits, penalties for DUIs, penalties for drug offences and operating one of these when under the influence of drugs or alcohol? So, in effect, they are going to be treated like other motor vehicles, or indeed bicycles, when it comes to things including speed, drugs, drinking, and anything else—reckless driving or reckless operating.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that when it comes to drug driving or drink driving—or, as the case may be, riding—personal mobility devices will be treated in the same way as bicycles currently are. When it comes to speed, I am advised that currently bicycles are limited in terms of the speed as being the same as the general speed limit for motor vehicles. It is proposed that under this framework it will actually be more conservative for PMDs than the current framework for bicycles when it comes to speed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just on from that, then, can you confirm that, regardless of what speed these things can reach, there will be speed limits, and if you breach those speed limits you will be subject to the laws that apply in relation to the operation of other vehicles, if you like, on the road?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Yes, that is absolutely correct.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure suggested during the committee stage in the other place that his department would no doubt be costing the implications for this amendment on insurance premiums for third-party insurance and would make them public. The amendments I am referring to are the amendment in my name and previously in the Hon. Vincent Tarzia's name. Does the minister now have those costings?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, following the passage in the House of Assembly of this bill, the department reached out to the CTP Regulator, who has outlined that there are significant and multiple variables, which makes modelling extremely difficult and, to paraphrase, it is therefore incredibly difficult to quantify what the potential costs would be at present.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Again, just to refer the government back to the recommendations of the parliamentary inquiry into public and active transport, one of the recommendations at part 7 was asking the government to gather data on the use of private and commercial e-scooters and other e-personal mobility devices, including compliance and injuries to pedestrians and riders. Is that something that the government has done to date, or will they undertake to do so as part of this new regime?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the intention is to put in place appropriate mechanisms for collection of data and being able to analyse that as time goes by. I am advised that in Queensland they put in place a monitoring system and then were able to make appropriate changes as that data became more fulsome and where it indicated a need to change.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I just want to clarify, again, for the record—and I referred to this in my second reading—that the government is, indeed, engaged in discussions, which I hope are constructive, in terms of the first and last mile and consideration of the ability to take personal mobility scooters or devices onto trains for those people who are choosing to do that, and what are the sorts of considerations that are actually being taken into account in respect of that.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the honourable member for her question and the opportunity to place that on the record. The bill does not deal specifically with public transport in

terms of whether personal mobility devices can be taken on them. That would, in fact, be part of the Passenger Transport Regulations. The intent is to have, as part of the consultation going forward, discussions around that. Currently, the Passenger Transport Regulations have limitations, which would be dependent on the device specifications, particularly in regard to size. Of course, it is essential to get the right balance between the users of PMDs and other users of public transport; for example, those who utilise wheelchairs or other mobility devices.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am assuming that will also include the requisite certification requirements around the actual personal mobility devices in terms of their power. I do not know what the terminology is, but I think the minister knows—batteries.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that a number of specifications, such as those referred to, can be considered in terms of whether it is appropriate to include them in particular standards or requirements. All of that will occur in the development of the regulations during that period of consultation and discussion.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Hood-1]—

Page 3, lines 3 to 8—Delete clause 3 and substitute:

3—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

(1) Section 5(1)—after the definition of *drug driving offence* insert:

electric personal transporter means an electric personal transporter (within the meaning of the *Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Regulations 2014*) that may be driven on or over a road in accordance with an approval of the Minister under section 161A of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*;

(2) Section 5(1), definition of *motor vehicle*—after 'part of the vehicle' insert:

but does not include an electric personal transporter

Note—

Section 116 however treats electric personal transporters as if they were uninsured motor vehicles for the purposes of claims against the nominal defendant.

3A—Amendment of section 116—Claim against nominal defendant where vehicle uninsured

Section 116(1), definition of *uninsured motor vehicle*—after 'is in force' first occurring insert 'or an electric personal transporter'

This amendment deals with phase 1 of the changes and replaces clause 3 of the bill so as to treat electronic personal transporters as if they were uninsured motor vehicles for the purposes of the nominal defendant scheme in section 116 of the Motor Vehicles Act, whilst still excluding them from the definition of 'motor vehicle' for the rest of the act.

The proposed changes in amendment No. 1 are to insert a definition of 'electric personal transporters' for the purposes of the amendment. The purpose of this definition is the same as being used by the government in their amendment to the definition of motor vehicle to exclude electric personal transporters from the definition of motor vehicle to the act, essentially the same as what the government is doing, as we do not want them to be included in the registration and licensing provisions of the act, but to include a note highlighting that while these are not generally treated the same as motor vehicles they will be treated the same as motor vehicles for the purposes of the nominal defendant scheme in section 116.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: With the indulgence of the chamber, I might address the overall concerns about the amendments being moved by the Hon. Ben Hood collectively, given that they are all interlinked.

The government opposes the amendments for the following reasons: while an injured party may be able to claim against the nominal defendant, if there is no requirement on the personal mobility device rider to hold compulsory third-party cover, or CTP cover, there is likely no recourse under the Lifetime Support Scheme, so in that respect the amendments would appear to lead to inconsistent outcomes.

The approach of not requiring compulsory third-party insurance cover is consistent with the treatment of bicycles in South Australia and with that in other Australian jurisdictions that have legalised the use of personal mobility devices. This means that the nominal defendant scheme is protected from unfunded liabilities, which is an appropriate outcome given that device riders will not contribute to any compensation fund. To allow otherwise would impact insurance premiums paid by ordinary motor vehicle owners.

A personal mobility device user involved in a crash with a pedestrian or with another PMD user will be treated the same as a bicycle rider. It will be a civil matter between the parties. It is anticipated that in the future general insurers will develop suitable products when sufficient data on the risk profile is available, allowing them to price insurance cover affordably.

Legalising private use of PMDs is anticipated to result in response from the market so that, when insurance products become available, riders can sign up to it, as is the case for bicycles, which gave rise to similar liability risks and issues. As per bicycles, for privately owned PMDs it will be in the rider's interest to hold insurance.

Commercial PMD operators can continue to be required to have insurance protection in place through conditions imposed in local government permits issued to allow them to operate PMDs for commercial purposes. PMD riders will be under a duty to stop and render assistance under section 43 of the Road Traffic Act 1961 that applies to drivers of other vehicles, with penalties applying to those who fail to comply. Can I just ask a question of the mover of the amendment?

The CHAIR: Please, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Is the mover of the amendment proposing that there should be a registration scheme as part of this and, if so, how much would users of PMDs be charged for such registration?

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: No, that is not what we are proposing with these amendments.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Is the honourable member proposing that motor vehicle owners should therefore have their premiums increased to cover CTP for these PMDs?

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: What we are proposing with these amendments is to safeguard against injury from these devices and the fact that the government see it fit that some magical place in the future will be able to provide insurance for these devices. It is to ensure that the public do have some level of surety to be able to claim against injury.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Is the honourable member happy that motor vehicle owners would have increases in premiums to cover the increase in compulsory third-party liabilities?

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Has the government done the costings, as I asked previously, with regard to what the impost would be on premiums?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I asked you a question. You have not answered it.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicate the Greens will support the amendments from the Hon. Mr Hood. I do note the concerns of the government. I had not had the opportunity to hear the government's views on the amendment. They were never put to me before today's discussion. Once these amendments pass the chamber, if there is an opportunity to work with the government and address concerns between the houses, the Greens are open to doing that.

Our concern consistently has been that, if we are undertaking a significant reform like this, we need to look at issues of insurance and liability, given that there is a distinction between these devices and bicycles. They often do weigh more than 50 kilos, so they pose a significant risk potentially, so it is something that needs to be considered. If there are significant implementation issues with what the Hon. Mr Hood has proposed, I am open to discussing that with the government,

but for today we are certainly on board with inserting this into the bill so that we can get some movement on this issue.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am quite astounded at the fact that the Liberal opposition is standing in this place moving an uncostered amendment that will force up premiums for all other premium payers in this state and is completely blasé about it. And we have the Greens over here saying, 'Yes, we'll get on board with that. It doesn't matter that we don't know what the figures are. It doesn't matter what the cost is going to be to every other CTP payer in the state, we're going to force it through tonight.' I am just astounded, and this will come back to you—both of you. Come on, Black!

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise to support the honourable member's amendment. What a phony point for the minister to make and also the Hon. Mr Hunter: 'Will you accept premiums being affected?' That is just so disingenuous.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I say to the honourable members: who will pay for somebody who is crippled or killed as a result of irresponsible activity or use by the riders of these devices? Who will pick up the costs for that?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Who will pick up the cost for that, I say to the minister? I support the honourable member's amendment—it just makes a lot of sense. We are not dealing with pushbikes here. I am not sure whether any of the members in this place who have just raised their objections have even ridden one. I have ridden one, and I managed to get a greater speed than it was supposed to be governed at, and that shows how difficult it is to control these vehicles.

They are very heavy and they can cause a lot of damage, even by hitting somebody at 20 km/h, yet we have an irresponsible government saying, 'Why should we have some insurance cover for people who get hurt innocently by these devices?' These are powered motor vehicles—we are not talking about pushbikes. They are powered motor vehicles that people will not even be able to hear if they are coming from behind.

So I commend the member for his move. This is what should have happened when these devices were allowed onto our streets. There is limited liability for some of those contracts that the hire companies have at the moment, and I have already pointed out in my speech that you could actually drive a prime mover through them. I have spoken to people who have been hurt by these devices and who have not been able to get any compensation at all. It has cost people their careers. One person was so badly injured they were not even able to go back to work and they could get no compensation for it.

I think it is irresponsible and disingenuous of this government to totally brush aside that people not be able to get some sort of compensation in the event of reckless behaviour by a rider on a road or a footpath. It is just outrageous.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I think it is important to note that we did actually ask in the committee stage questions about legal advice that had been obtained by the government and the work that had been done to look into some of these insurance issues, and we did not get really a satisfactory answer in terms of the work that has been undertaken.

Again, if the government wants to come back and engage with us, and try to address some of these issues, the Greens are absolutely open to that but, in the absence of these issues being taken seriously, I feel that it is appropriate to say let's actually move down the pathway that has been suggested by the Hon. Mr Hood. It is for the government then to do the costings and come back with an alternative.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It is a difficult one, and I note the intent of the amendments. While I have been listening to these discussions, I have been thinking about bicycles as well and the work that we have done on bicycles previously, which also do not fall within the schemes that we are discussing. I guess the bottom line is that if you are injured on one of these, then obviously your access will be to the Lifetime Support Scheme or NDIS. I am concerned about the fact that we do not have data on both sides in terms of what the cost will be and whether it will result in an increase to premiums for road users as well.

Given the fact that we are talking about these, I do note that the government has also, in terms of the regulation, taken into account limiting the weight and speed to make them as safe as possible. But the question I have been asking myself this whole time is: how is this any different to a bicycle on the road and their lack of ability to claim from the same scheme, given that they can, of course, travel at great speeds as well and the equity in that? It is a difficult one.

I am wondering, also, whether there is the opportunity to revisit this issue when the regulations are drafted in terms of the speed and weight limits, and there is actually data available on both sides of the equation in terms of the accident rates, if we can call them that, and whether indeed the government has actually contemplated whether then there would need to be thought given to bicycles as well being included in the scheme and what that would do, given that we are talking about mobility devices in the absence of bicycles.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I think the Hon. Connie Bonaros makes a good point, remembering that we also have electric bikes that are currently in a similar situation to what is being described in that if there is a crash involving a bicycle, whether it is an electronic bicycle, the issue is treated as a civil matter between the parties. I am further advised that the amendment as put forward by the Hon. Mr Ben Hood does not include the Lifetime Support Authority, according to my advice. Therefore, if he is intending to have a catch-all, his amendment does not achieve that outcome. That will be another reason that the government will be opposing the amendment.

But I do come back to the original question that I asked, and clearly there would be increased costs to the CTP scheme. If personal mobility device users were to be covered in the way that is proposed, that can only mean either the opposition proposing registration for PMDs and then potentially bicycles and e-bicycles too—perhaps that is where they are planning to go—or it involves an increase in costs of insurance premiums for all other motor vehicle owners. The government will be opposing these amendments.

The CHAIR: I am going to put the amendment in the name of the Hon. Ben Hood. The question I am going to put is that clause 3 stand as printed, so if you are going to support the Hon. Ben Hood you are going to vote no.

The committee divided on the question:

Ayes8
 Noes.....10
 Majority2

AYES

Bourke, E.S.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Scriven, C.M. (teller)

El Dannawi, M.
 Maher, K.J.
 Wortley, R.P.

Hanson, J.E.
 Ngo, T.T.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Girolamo, H.M.
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Simms, R.A.

Centofanti, N.J.
 Henderson, L.A.
 Lee, J.S.

Franks, T.A.
 Hood, B.R. (teller)
 Pangallo, F.

PAIRS

Martin, R.B.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Question thus resolved in the negative.

The CHAIR: The question I put is that new clauses 3 and 3A as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. Ben Hood be so inserted.

Question agreed to.

Clause 4.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Hood-1]—

Page 3, lines 11 to 18—Delete clause 4 and substitute:

4—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

- (1) Section 5(1), definition of *electric personal transporter*—delete the definition
- (2) Section 5(1), definition of *motor vehicle*—delete 'but does not include an electric personal transporter' and substitute:
but does not include a personal mobility device or a device or vehicle of a kind excluded from this definition by the regulations
- (3) Section 5(1), definition of *motor vehicle*, note—delete 'electric personal transporters' and substitute:
personal mobility devices
- (4) Section 5(1)—after the definition of *P2 licence* insert:
personal mobility device has the same meaning as in the Road Traffic Act 1961;

These amendments are consequential. They deal with phase 2 of the changes under the government's bill where the terminologies propose a change and we move from the current electric personal transporters to the new terminology of 'personal mobility device'. All these amendments do is deal with the terminology change while preserving the effect of the amendments in phase 1, for example that personal mobility devices be included in the nominal defendant scheme but not otherwise be counted as motor vehicles for the purposes of the Motor Vehicles Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Hood-1]—

Page 3, after line 20—Insert (before the present contents which will now be redesignated as subclause (2)):

- (1) Section 116(1), definition of *uninsured motor vehicle*—delete 'an electric personal transporter' and substitute 'a personal mobility device'

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

**CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:20 the council adjourned until Wednesday 16 October 2024 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***PUBLIC SECTOR DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT DATA**

356 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 June 2024). Can the Minister for Human Services advise—

1. What was the percentage of people with a disability working within the South Australian public sector as at 30 June 2023?

2. In a table format, all South Australian government agencies percentages of people with a disability in their workforce and date of when that data was most recently recorded per agency?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector has advised:

1. As at 30 June 2023, the percentage of people who have disclosed a disability working within the South Australian public sector is 1.35 per cent.

2. The percentage of people with a disability employed in each agency as at 30 June 2023 is publicly available on OCPSE's Workforce Information Report Data Dashboard:

<https://www.publicsector.sa.gov.au/about/Resources-and-Publications/Workforce-Information/workforce-information-data-dashboard/workforce-information-data-dashboard>.

Updated data for the year to 30 June 2024 is currently being finalised and will be published at the same location in the coming months.

FARMERS

358 The Hon. S.L. GAME (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development advise:

1. What is the government doing to protect mum and dad farmers from exploitation by processors unwilling to offer a fair stock price?

2. What protections are in place for cattle farmers experiencing predatory behaviour which affects their livelihood?

3. Does the minister support the code of practice for the beef cattle industry in South Australia similar to what the government introduced to regulate the dairy market?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

- We know that over 95 per cent of farms in Australia are family owned and operated to this day, however our South Australian producers have established sophisticated businesses, they utilise cutting edge technology and precision techniques, as well as sustainable and data-driven methodology to ensure they are adapting to the changing demands of food and fibre production.
- The beef cattle industry in South Australia plays a crucial role in the state's economy, providing employment opportunities, supporting local communities, and contributing significantly to export revenues. There are more than 2,800 beef producers in South Australia who generated revenue of \$1.86 billion in 2022-23.
- These beef cattle farmers are known for their commitment to sustainable and ethical farming practices, ensuring high-quality beef production while maintaining the health of their land and animals. Our South Australian premium beef products are highly regarded both domestically and internationally.
- The Department of Primary Industries and Regions works across all areas of agriculture to advance the prosperity and sustainability of South Australia's primary industries and our regional communities.
- In 2024, cattle prices in South Australia have experienced fluctuations influenced by several factors. On average, prices have been impacted by high supply levels and international market dynamics. The Eastern Young Cattle Indicator (EYCI), a benchmark for cattle prices in Australia recorded by Meat and Livestock Australia, recovered from a low of 349c/kg in October 2023 to higher levels by the end of June 2024. Although still below the five-year average, strong export demand continues to support cattle prices in 2024.
- Livestock SA is the peak body for grassfed cattle producers across the state.
- In the summer of 2023-24, they ran a number of Red Meat Connects Communities' BBQs series across regional areas of South Australia to promote the exceptional products grown in SA, as well as discuss the challenging conditions and enduring strength of the industry. These events were supported by PIRSA as well as the SA Drought Resilience Adoption and Innovation Hub.

- PIRSA initiated and runs Family and Business (FaB) mentor services available to help primary producers and regionally based agricultural business owners through free financial counselling, emotional wellbeing and counselling services and emergency recovery when needed.
- Additionally, PIRSA runs, through Rural Business Support, the Rural Financial Counselling Service (RFCS) which has been supporting farmers and rural-related businesses by providing free and independent financial counselling to eligible farmers, fisheries, foresters and small enterprises experiencing financial hardship. These advisors are knowledgeable about the process and documentation required for application to the Commonwealth Farm Household Allowance, Regional Investment Corporation Loans, and any available PIRSA funding and grants.
- The South Australian Small Business Commissioner is able to assist small businesses with advice and negotiations support on a range of contractual and other disputes.
- There are existing codes of practice for the livestock industries in Australia, which have been established in collaboration with industry to maintain the welfare of livestock across the country.
- In relation to codes of conduct relating to contracts and pricing, the Dairy Industry Code of Conduct is a mandatory code under section 51AE of the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 which came into effect on 1 January 2020. The code provides a fairer process for negotiating contractual arrangements between dairy farmers and dairy processors. It improves the balance in bargaining power between dairy farmers and processors. The code also includes dispute resolution and mediation processes.
- The code is a result of extensive stakeholder consultation with dairy farmers and processors and introduced by the commonwealth Department for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.
- I encourage those in the cattle industry with an interest in fair and open industry negotiations to communicate with their state industry bodies regarding the opportunity to develop a code of practice for their industry.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT BUDGET

360 The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise:

1. The 2023-24 target for new jobs secured through Invest SA was 4,000 but only 799 have been achieved. What is the reason for the significant shortcoming?
 - (a) Why has the 2024-25 target remained at 4,000?
 - (b) What will Invest SA do different over the forward estimates to achieve this target?
2. What is the breakdown of the 4,000 new jobs that will be secured through Invest SA in 2024-25?
 - (a) How many of those jobs will be full-time, part-time, contracted, or other?
 - (b) Which industries will receive this job growth?
3. How many inbound and outbound government trade missions, as opposed to business trade missions, have been conducted in the last 12 months?
 - (a) Where were these trade missions to?
 - (b) What was the expenditure for each mission?
4. Are the new trade offices in Frankfurt and Washington DC fully operational?
5. Are the two trade offices used to expand South Australia's presence in India new or existing offices?
 - (a) Where in India are these offices located?
 - (b) Are these offices fully operational, and if not, when are they expected to be?
 - (c) What kind of funding has been allocated to these offices?
 - (d) Are these offices managed by DTI or AusTrade?
6. What is the visitation of each of South Australia's international trade offices?
7. What is the breakdown of the individual earnings and business value of each of South Australia's international trade offices?
8. Do performance indicators between each of South Australia's international trade offices differ, and if so, how?
9. Has any consideration been given to expanding Brand SA's board to provide representation for regional South Australia?

10. The 2024-25 budget records awareness of the benefits of buying local has increased to 90 per cent among the South Australian population. How is this figure determined?
11. The 2024-25 budget records an 'increase in shoppers actively seeking local products.' How is this recorded?
12. Is there a target for the number of business missions to global events that the government seeks to achieve?
13. As recorded in the 2024-25 budget, which markets are deemed 'priority' by the government?
14. The 2023-24 budget set a target to 'engage consumers to switch a portion of their spending towards local product and produce.' What change in consumer spending has been seen?
15. How will the 'Buy SA For SA' campaign address the value of buying local amidst a cost-of-living crisis?
16. What has the uptake of the state brand been, and is there a target for increased use of the state brand?
17. Why are services from Shared Services and DPC no longer offered to DTI for free, as they were in 2022-23?
18. Which grant funding projects are ending in 2023-24 or reducing in 2024-25?
19. How does the Department for Trade and Investment measure client satisfaction?
20. Which 400 businesses received export services from the Department for Trade and Investment in 2022-23?
- (a) What is the department's criteria for which businesses they provide services to?
21. Did DTI meet its savings targets in the last financial year?
- (a) Is the department still committed to saving \$4.6 million this financial year?
- (b) What operating efficiencies are still implemented across the department?
22. The 2022-23 budget provided \$1.1 million per annum from 2024-25 to re-launch Brand SA. This budget provides \$1.0 million to continue and enhance Brand SA. Is this funding two different initiatives, or the same money?
23. Is the investment attraction program—titled 'Positioning South Australia to thrive in the global economy' in the 2024-25 budget—a new program this year?
- (a) How many grants have been awarded in the past 12 months, and are expected to be awarded each year?
- (b) Which existing programs will be extended under the investment attraction program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1. Invest SA ultimately secured an estimated 881 jobs as the full year result for 2023-24. Budget reporting is compiled before the full year result is confirmed, hence the upgraded figure. Invest SA has continued to meet and exceed its capital expenditure target of \$750 million, facilitating just over \$1 billion of investment into South Australia.

Companies make investment decisions based on current and predicted economic conditions, with job creation estimated.

Recent trends in foreign direct investment (FDI) markets data shows that job creation from foreign investment has declined across Australia, contracting 9 per cent year-on-year to May 2024.

South Australia has experienced strong job creation through investment facilitation over the past decade. On average, investment facilitation activities have created around 3800 jobs per year since October 2015.

(a) Invest SA predicts a boost in job creation in 2024-25 following the Economic Recovery Fund delivery. Additionally, several large projects will commence during 2024-25, including the Hydrogen Jobs Plan.

(b) Invest SA utilises major events to attract and bring targeted investors and businesses to South Australia, promoting the South Australian economy and its competitive strengths.

This includes major events such as Gather Round and LIV Golf.

Over the last 12 months, Invest SA has attracted around 540 senior business leaders/investors to South Australia from 450 companies from strategically targeted sectors through major events, including 155 interstate and 182 foreign companies. Engagement with these investors will continue.

2. Due to the dynamic nature of investment attraction and the global economy, Invest SA advises forward predictions are challenging.

Invest SA targets the below sectors of opportunity:

- Creative industries;
- Critical technologies;
- Health;
- Minerals and energy;
- Defence;
- Space;
- Food, wine, and agribusiness (including green economy); and
- Tourism.

Outcomes for 2024-25 will be reported on after 30 June 2025.

3. The Department for Trade and Investment hosted 22 inbound missions, 16 from government and six from business. It also delivered two outbound ministerial missions, both of which included support for South Australian businesses to attend trade shows and elements of the program.

(a) See table in response to question below.

Mission	Destination	Total Cost (\$AU)	
Arab Health Conference	UAE		
Bio International 2024	USA		
China International Import Expo	China		
ProWine Mumbai	India		
Foodex 2024	Japan		
Gamescom 2023	Germany		
Gulfoods 2024	UAE		
BIO Korea	South Korea		
SA Wine Grand Tasting Korea 2023	South Korea		
Singapore Week of Innovation and Technology Business Delegation	Singapore		
Tech Delegation to Innovation Leaders Summit	Japan		
Taste of South Australia Trade Mission to China	China		
Tasting South Australia in New Zealand	New Zealand		
Vinexpo Asia 2024	Hong Kong		
Total Cost of Outbound Missions			844,687

4. Yes.

5. In April and June 2024 respectively, the department for trade and Investment opened two new Austrade embedded offices in Mumbai and Chennai, India. These offices replaced the previous single office in New Delhi.

(a) Mumbai and Chennai.

(b) Yes, they are fully operational.

(c) Funding for these offices has been allocated by the Department's International offshore network budget.

(d) The Department of State Development manages the South Australia overseas offices and sub-contracts office location and operational support through Austrade.

6. The overseas network does not facilitate external 'visits' to each office, but instead coordinates outreach, engagement, and events with stakeholders via appointment.

7. The international trade offices support all South Australian businesses by providing market intelligence, opportunity identification, networks and introductions and the delivery of major trade and investment events and exhibitions.

When South Australian businesses travel to the respective markets, teams provide briefings to companies and assist industry bodies and chambers to coordinate market engagement.

8. The KPIs are achieved through a one team approach, meaning that overseas offices, DTI sector teams and onshore staff all contribute.

9. Brand SA's advisory board is a skill-based, diverse board, comprising high-profile South Australians from a diverse range of sectors.

The current board members have experience living, working and running businesses across South Australia, including in our regional areas.

10. Market research was conducted with South Australians in March 2023, prior to the launch of the Buy SA. For SA campaign and again in April 2024 to measure changes. This showed a 6 per cent increase in the reported understanding and importance of buying local.

The research showed 90 per cent of South Australians now associate the state logo as a marker of local goods (up from 72 per cent pre-campaign).

11. Market research was conducted with South Australians in March 2023, prior to the launch of the Buy SA. For SA campaign and again in April 2024 to measure changes.

12. The South Australian government dynamically targets its support and market activations toward global events that align with priority sectors.

13. The department's priority markets are supported by the international network of offices and are listed on the department's website.

14. The encouragement to 'switch a portion of spending toward local product and produce' is a message of the Buy SA. For SA campaign, rather than a measure of the campaign.

15. Buy SA. For SA. is fundamentally about building the local jobs and economic proposition in South Australia. Our government, in bringing back Brand SA (cut by the former Marshall Liberal government), believes promoting consumers to buy local is both meritorious and widely supported by businesses and the South Australian community.

16. Currently 9,615 businesses are registered to use the state brand. Brand SA aims to maintain average growth of 1 per cent, per month, which has been achieved over the 2023-24 financial year.

17. There is no change to the arrangement.

18. The South Australian Landing Pad Program is being replaced by the Investment Attraction or Acceleration Program which has the same funding.

19. Customer satisfaction rates are captured through surveys following the conclusion of the activity or program.

20.

Team 3	CW Wines	Degree Trading	Riverland Wine Centre
Airborneologic	Australian Grain Export Pty Ltd	Lannister Group	Bickfords Australia Pty Ltd
Kemgro	Centre State Exports Pty Ltd	Jia Yuan Australia Pty Ltd	Macro Group Australia
Kersbrook Cherry Farm	Maggie Beer Holdings Ltd	Rymill Coonawarra	Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association
Secure State	1847 Winery (SA) Pty Ltd	Metala Wines Pty Ltd	Currawong Extra Virgin Olive Oil
Limestone Coast Wines Pty Ltd	Accolade Wines	Oleapak Pty. Ltd.	Thomas Foods International Fresh Produce Pty Ltd

Team 3	CW Wines	Degree Trading	Riverland Wine Centre
KIN Premium Australian Seafood Pty Ltd	Viterra Australia	Cimicky Wines	Morris Fine Food
Balco Group	Kirrihill Wines Pty Ltd	Patritti Wines	Mountain Fresh Fruit Juice
Thomas Foods International Pty Ltd	Bureau Booths	Earth Adventure Pty Ltd	Cropify
South Australian Dairy Farmers Association Inc t/as SADA Fresh	Eight at the Gate Wines	Ausland Export Pty Ltd	CSP Global
Ozroll	Barristers Block Wines	Australia Wines & More	Bastion Technology Services
Mondello Produce Plus	Beston Global Food Company Limited	Praxis Labs Pty Ltd	Flinders Gin
Impression Gin	Dandelion Vineyards	McGregor & Young	Sentek Pty Ltd
Dr Bianca Piscioneri Elementet (GGDS)	J.T. Johnson & Sons Pty Ltd	Hill-Smith Family Vineyards	Tav Systems Pty Ltd
First Hand Vintners	TRC International Pty Ltd	Microtek Australia Pty Ltd	Coffee Complex
Shedmate	ESpy Ocean	Teague Australia Seed and Grain Brokers	Byre Vineyards
Royal Gold Mills	Pindarie Pty Ltd	Global Export Management Pty Ltd t/a Gem Solution	AWRI
Bliss Trade Pty. Ltd.	Cellr	Ruwi Pty Ltd	The Still Co
Thomas Cappel Seafoods Pty Ltd	X Frame Australia	Opal Empire & Jewellery	Prepd Hydration
Get Greg	Four	Tiimely	San Remo Macaroni Co. Pty Ltd
APEG—Australian Produce Exporters Group	ISD Cyber	Emeras	Prime Consulting International
Access Unlimited Lift	James Anthony Consulting	Tguard	Hedonist Wines
Frigid Solutions Pty Ltd	Mirage Photonics	Tucker Creative	Sons of Eden
T Bar Australia Pty Ltd	Teagle Excavations	Synergy Seeds Pty Ltd	Fortnynja Pty Ltd
Biobin Technologies Pty Ltd	Vaxmed Pty Ltd	Interpredata	Aurizn
Kimchi Club	Roundwood Solutions Pty Ltd	Ceravolo Orchards	Nexlec
Mumanoo Group Pty Ltd	Consunet	Flindersd Food Pty Ltd	Data Sagacity
Tindo Solar Pty Ltd	The Prep House	Kay's Amery Vineyards	DEWC T&E PTY LTD
GoMicro	Howard Vineyard	Negotiants International Pty Ltd	Derma Department
Bionat Australia Pty Ltd	Brockenhack Wines	Enviroganic Export Pty Ltd	Almondco Australia Ltd
Blue Lake Dairy Group Pty Ltd	Golding Wines Pty Ltd	Grassland Nutrition	Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association
Littlewood Agapanthus Farm	Yangarra Estate Vineyard	Zonte's Footstep Pty Ltd T/A Off Track Wines	Bickford's Australia Pty Ltd
Mighty Craft Operations Pty Ltd	Lambert Estate Wines Pty Ltd	Virginia Farm Produce (also called Farmer Group)	Maggie Beer Products Pty Ltd
Rubber Side Down Global Pty Ltd	Mallee Estate Wines	Sidewood Estate	Moutain Fresh Fruit Juices
Fusetec 3D PTY LTD	The Hidden Sea	Leconfield Wines Pty Ltd	Prohibition Liquor Co. Pty Ltd
Pristine Oyster Farm Pty Ltd	Schubert Estate	Axiom Precision Manufacturing	YFResh Pty. Ltd.
Pru Raymond	Swan Wine Group	Anomaly	Morambro Creek Wines
Cape Jaffa Wines	Hither & Yon	Plasma Shield Pty Ltd	Beerenberg Pty Ltd
Robarra Pty Ltd—THE TRUSTEE FOR Robarra Unit Trust	Vinteloper Wines	Numedico Pty Ltd	Cygence
Robarra Broodstock Sanctuary & Hatchery	Teusner Wines	AuCentra Therapeutics Pty Ltd	Digital Resilience

Team 3	CW Wines	Degree Trading	Riverland Wine Centre
Brayfield Park Pty Ltd T/A Brayfield Park Lavender	Kangaroo Island Pure Grain	Flourish Pharmaceutical Australia	Gangguru Beverages Pty Ltd
Phoenix Corganica	Cut Hill Distillery	Syneos Health	AUSKAMA Pty Ltd
Earthling 3.0 Pty Ltd	Thistledown Wine Company	Gnomix Pty Ltd	Healthy Garden Australia Pty Ltd
AGILEX Biolabs Pty Ltd	Mayura Station	Kiratech	Solinnov Pty Ltd
Bec Hardy Wines Pty Ltd	Coffin Bay Spirits	FERRONOVA PTY LTD	Dulwich Bakery
Cancer Research SA Pty Ltd	Western Abalone Processors Pty Ltd	CMAX Clinical Research Pty Ltd	Port Lincoln Pet Treats Pty Ltd
Ai Group	Australian Fishing Enterprises	Soniclean Pty Ltd	JIRRA Enterprise Space PTY LTD
AIIA	Tony's Tuna	Omni-Health Pte Ltd	Sim & Mack
Apxiom	Mitani Group	Barristers Block	St Marys Vineyard
Avance Clinical Pty Ltd	Cucina Classica	Vitis Drinks	NQRY Pty Ltd
Avinet Pty Ltd	Casarsa Almonds	Galvanized Wine Group	Price's Wine
AWS	NEVANA FINE PASTRIES PTY LTD	The Carob Kitchen	Elev8 Resilience
Bleasdale Vineyards Pty Ltd	GOOD COUNTRY HEMP	Murray Street Vineyards	Vasttech
Export Finance Australia	Praetorian Aeronautics	Hydro 2050 Pty Ltd	Re-Time Pty Ltd
Fleet Space Technologies	Clockwork Distilling Pty Ltd	Terre a Terre Pty Ltd	Calmology
Glaciem Cooling Technologies	Macro Meats—Gourmet Game Pty Ltd	SIMPLY OLIVE AND BEE PTY LTD	Global Hawk Pty Ltd
Cloudstep	Obela Fresh Dips & Spreads Pty Ltd	HorseRecords	Easychef
Kelly Engineering	Stoller	All Natural Bakery	Enzo's At Home
Lightforce Group	DEWC Systems	Yours Truly Chocolates	De Bruin Engineering Pty Ltd
Link4	Clean Life Australia	Paracombe Premium Wines	Free Run Juice
Mayne Pharma International Pty Ltd	Elwa Energy Savers Pty Ltd	Wines by Geoff Hardy	Shaifiullah Shafiq
Micro-X Ltd	The Yoghurt Shop	Food Services (Tuckers Natural)	EP Global Designs
Nova Farms	Buzz Honey	Never Never Distilling Co.	Australian Vintage Limited
Presagen Pty Ltd	Nocelle Foods	Loom Wine Group	Z WINE ? Barossa Valley
Redarc Electronics	Osmond Saint	Nuage Interiors	Taylor's Wines Pty Ltd
Seeley International Pty Ltd	Pendleton Estate Pty Ltd	Bow Wow Treats	Thorn-Clarke Wines
Stone & Chalk	Creative Native Foods	MIDNIGHT ANYTIME BLINDS PTY LTD	Hidden Bench Estate Winery
Cyberops Pty Ltd	Continental Taralli Biscuits	MEDTEC PHARMA PTY LTD	Raidis Estate Wines
Enabled	South Australian Lobster Company	Xynoptik Pty Ltd	Oliver's Taranga Vineyards Pty Ltd
The Rite Journey	Yumbah Mussels (formerly Eyre Peninsula Seafoods)	Xynoptik Pty Ltd	Laughing Jack Wines
RecWise Pty Ltd	Cohda Wireless Pty Ltd	Splose	Golden Amrita
Ignition Custom Engineering	Bird in Hand Winery	Novafast Holdings Pty Ltd	Geoff Hardy Wines
Cassandra Mamone Jewellery	Tanunda Vinteners Pty Ltd (T/A Rockford Wines)	Trust In Taste	Gemtree Vineyards Pty Ltd
Van Schaik's Bio-Gro Pty Ltd	NDE Solutions	Sixty Eight Roses	CooperBurns
Clevertar Services Pty Ltd	Golden North Pty Ltd	AES Cultivate Pty Ltd	Hare's Chase
First Drop Wines Pty Ltd	Pure Origins Pty Ltd	Amplified Beauty Australia	Atze's Corner Wines

Team 3	CW Wines	Degree Trading	Riverland Wine Centre
Gelista	The Gourmet Entertainer/Trace Foodsteps	Apiwraps	Majella Wines
CourseBox.AI	ebottli	Alpha 8	Parker Coonawarra
Tarac Technologies Pty Ltd	Predict Australia Pty Ltd	Economical Energy PTY Ltd	Thompson Wines
Mischief Brew	Aerobond	Sequential Pty Ltd	Farmer's Leap Wines
Davroe	CarChem	Martins Brand House	Broken Feather Pty Ltd T/as Merite Wines
Little Tin Co	Fivecast Pty Ltd	Natralus	Art Lab Solutions
Air Water Global	Oztaia	Hydro-dis	Caperplants
Presto Capital	Roar Sugar Group Pty Ltd	3 Footed Monster	Turkey Flat Vineyards Pty Ltd
Archimedes Consulting Pty Ltd	DunGud Hair Care	The Yummy Kitchen Co Pty Ltd t/a Native Indulgence LTD	Tim Adams Wines Pty Ltd
Big Screen Video	PodPac Pty Ltd	Billet Lab	Sparc Technologies Limited
CAMMS Group	Yumbah Aquaculture Ltd	Kwiktech	Kindship
Visione Group	Eyewoolf Enterprises Opty Ltd	Wellteam	KOI Trade
SIUNO	Stichting Sunified Foundation	Blue Lake Milling Pty Ltd	Clarity Aquatic Pty Ltd
Teamgagge Pty Ltd	Paisley Wines	Bremerton Vintners Pty Ltd	AML Technologies (AMLT)
Corryton Burge	Watkins Family Wine	Global Horticulture Trading Pty. Ltd.	Global Value Partners Co., Ltd (GVP)
Seppeltsfield Wines Pty Ltd	IOT Consultants	Specialised Solutions Pty Ltd	Good Intentions Wine Co. Pty Ltd
Ferguson Australia Pty Ltd	Ripen Tech Pty Ltd	PCWI	DSL Pacific
Chaffey Bros Wine Co Pty Ltd	AICraft Pty Ltd	Green Frog Systems Pty Ltd	Prism Defence Pty Ltd
You Knead Sourdough	Trellis Technologies	Gradermate	Rossi Boots
Goldilocks Suit	entX	Hayes Family Wines	Green Hill Publishing
Prophecy International Holdings Ltd	Personify Care Pty Ltd	Australian Premium Wine Group Pty Ltd	Lumin Sports Technology Pty Ltd
Cloudpurge	Xapify & Xapimed	Queenies Australia	Pickstar
Add-Life Technologies	Surgical Order	Unisa	Vailo Lighting
Electrolux Home Products Pty Ltd	Fircy	Saber Astronautics	Chapman Capital Partners
Myvenue Pty Ltd	TC Pinpoint Pty Ltd	Myriota Pty Ltd	Woodside Cheesewrights
Identify	Maxim Skate Pty Ltd	QuantX Labs PTY LTD (prev CRYOCLOCK P/L)	Squib Group
ScreenAway	App Demo Videos	Redarc Defence & Space	JCT Healthcare Pty Ltd
Boat to Bowl	Equatorial Australia Launch	Infinitus Aero Pty Ltd	Air Radiators—Industrial Pty Ltd
Clean Seas Seafood	OpSys	Australian Institute for Machine Learning (Uni of Adelaide) AIML	Cabot Knee Balancer
Daycone Pty ATFT t/a/ Tucker's Natural	Makers Empire	Hart of the Barossa	SmartSat CRC
Ottimo Arancino	Sage Automation	SIALAS WINE	CareApp
Hubble	Organic Hill Wines	Coopers Brewery	Leki Australia Ltd
Claymore Wines Pty Ltd	Smidge Wines	Neutrog Australia Pty Ltd	Real Time Data
Seed Terminator Pty Ltd	Ashton Valley Fresh	Khamed Pty Ltd	Hex20
Central Market	Torrens Valley Orchards	Steriline Racing Pty Ltd	Angel Seafood
Balnaves Coonawarra	Wirra Wirra Vineyards	Lumination	Wilco Technologies
Treasury Wine Estates (South Australia)	Georgie Paws	Angove Family Winemakers	Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula

Team 3	CW Wines	Degree Trading	Riverland Wine Centre
The Chateau Tanunda Estate	Maine Beach	Tobruk Engineering (also known as BEHN—Integrated Mobility Solutions)	Corcillum Systems
Stehr Group Pty Ltd	Samex Australian Meat Co. PTY LTD.	Integra Foods	Hannibal AI
Kilikanoon Wines Pty Ltd	CCW Wines Ltd		

(a) To be eligible for trade services, businesses must have an ABN registered in South Australia at the time of provision of service.

21. Yes.

(a) The Department of State Development is committed to achieve the savings announced in the 2022-23 Budget.

(b) Operating efficiencies and cost pressures continue to be managed within existing resources.

22. Funding for Brand SA in the 2022-23 budget provided \$2 million in 2022-23, and \$2.025 million in 2023-24, reducing to \$1.051 million in 2024-25 and \$1.077 million in 2025-26.

The 2024-25 budget provides additional funding to maintain an annual budget provision of approximately \$2 million.

23. Yes.

(a) The Investment Attraction Program is a new initiative, no grants have been awarded in the past 12 months. The program aims to provide up to 10 grants each financial year.

(b) The Investment Attraction Program replaces the South Australian Landing Pad Program.

ROAD SAFETY

361 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services advise:

1. Can the minister outline how many new road safety cameras were delayed from the originally announced roll-out schedule, including their locations?

2. Can the minister outline what works will be completed on Main Road, Cherry Gardens as part of the Adelaide Hills Productivity and Road Safety Package in 2024-25?

3. Can the minister outline of the budgeted metropolitan and regional expenditure split for the Road Safety Maintenance Package in 2024-25?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has advised:

1. A trial of the technology for mobile phone detection cameras was conducted in 2023. As part of the procurement process the trial outcomes were evaluated, and a recommended preferred supplier was selected.

The contract negotiation processes with the preferred supplier concluded in January 2024.

Following this, 13 mobile phone detections cameras were installed under stage 1 across five locations in metropolitan Adelaide:

Stage One			
Locations	Metropolitan Area	Lanes*	Cameras*
North-South Motorway, Regency Park	North	3	3
Port Road, Hindmarsh	Central	3	3
Port Wakefield Road, Gepps Cross	North	2	2
South Road, Torrensville	Central	2	2
Southern Expressway, Darlington	South	3	3
	TOTAL	13	13

* One camera per lane.

Four more cameras at two more sites will be installed as part of stage 2, scheduled to be completed by the end of 2025.

2. Works that will be completed in 2024-25 on Main Road, Cherry Gardens as part of the Adelaide Hills Productivity and Road Safety Package are between Black Road, Coromandel Valley and Chandlers Hill Road, Cherry Gardens, weather permitting.

The final treatments, expected to be completed in December 2024, will include:

- Road widening to achieve consistent three-metre-wide lanes between Black Road and Chandlers Hill Road (where possible).
- Curve widening to achieve a consistent 3.2 metre lane width at the identified locations.
- New road surface, safety barriers, road signage and line marking including centre line audio tactile line marking plus drainage enhancements.

3. There is a \$35 million (over three years) Road Safety Maintenance Package funded by the state government. Funding for the road safety maintenance package will commence from 2025-26. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport has budgeted \$155 million for 2024-25 for road maintenance.

RECREATION, SPORT AND RACING DEPARTMENT

362 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise:

1. How much will the move for all department staff to the new SASI headquarter cost the department?
2. Did the government provide a grant to Forestville Hockey Club to assist them in constructing their new facility at Unley High School?
3. Can the minister confirm if any money is allocated in 2024-25 for the department to work with state sporting organisations on business cases to assist with seeking future government funding?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

1. \$200,000 was allocated from the agency's existing budget for the relocation, however it is anticipated significantly less will be required. The majority of the expenditure against this allocation relates to preparing the Kidman Park site for ownership transfer, a decision made by the former Liberal government.
2. Forestville Hockey Club received the following funding from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing (ORSR) for the Unley High School project:
 - 2018 Sport Surfaces Program (round 1)—\$995,000 to investigate, design and construct a new multi-purpose synthetic pitch at Unley High School.
 - 2022 election commitment—\$2 million to construct a synthetic pitch, club room, change rooms and lighting at Unley High School.
3. At this stage no funding has been allocated for this purpose. However, ORSR has developed a number of resources including a business case template that state sporting organisations can use to scope out projects in preparation for government and other partner funding consideration. Organisations are encouraged to contact the ORSR for more information.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

366 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Human Services advise:

1. Can the minister provide the below questions in a table format: breakdown of consultancy expenses and consultancy services provided to the Department of Human Services for FY2023-24, with column detailing if the service was or wasn't budgeted for, and when it was approved?
2. Breakdown of the unbudgeted \$9.2 million received in FY2023-24 as 'other income from state government'?
3. Intra-government transfers received result in FY2023-24 and budgeted for FY2024-25?
4. Intra-government transfers expensed in FY2023-24 and budgeted for FY2024-26?
5. Breakdown of the \$17 million estimated net gain on disposal of assets and explanation as to why it was not budgeted for?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised by the Minister for Human Services:

1. Can the minister provide the below questions in a table format: breakdown of consultancy expenses and consultancy services provided to the Department of Human Services for FY2023-24, with column detailing if the service was or wasn't budgeted for, and when it was approved?

During 2023-24, DHS has engaged in three consultancies totalling \$0.32m: Consultancies	Purpose	Actual Payment	Budgeted	Approval Date
BDO Services Pty Ltd	Investigation of Public Benevolent Institution status for Disability Services	\$5,000	Yes	25/08/2023
CTG Security Matrix Pty Ltd	Review current scope of cameras at Kurlana Tapa	\$19,800	Yes	08/03/2024
H/Advisors APA Pty Ltd	Provide strategic advice and assist in developing a 'transformational plan' for Disability to transition into a NDIS provider.	\$50,000	Yes	06/09/2023
Richard Dennis	Review of the South Australian <i>Disability Inclusion Act 2018</i> for Strategic Policy and Reform.	\$34,560	Yes	16/05/2023
University of Adelaide	Establish a new trauma-informed case management model for Youth Justice and Exceptional Needs.	\$70,000	No	26/05/2023
Yellow Wig Communications & Project Management	Provide project management services, expert advice and support to Screening	\$76,520	No	30/11/2023
Zed Management Consulting	Identify and assess the current gaps in services and support for young people in South Australia for the Early Intervention Research Directorate.	\$59,280	Yes	30/11/2023
All consultancies below \$10,000		-		
Total		\$315,160		

2. Breakdown of the unbudgeted \$9.2 million received in FY2023-24 as 'other income from state government'?

Description	2023-24 \$'000
OTHER INCOME FROM STATE GOVERNMENT	
Funding for an adjustment to the State NDIS contribution following the cessation of in-kind arrangements on 30th September 2023	(6,000)
Extension of funding related to early intervention programs	(1,308)
TVSP costs centrally funded	(657)
Additional NGO indexation supplementation	(1,183)
SAES remuneration indexation— costs centrally funded	(113)
TOTAL	(9,261)

3. Intra-government transfers received result in FY2023-24 and budgeted for FY2024-25?

Description	2023-24 Estimated Result \$000	2024-25 Budget \$'000
INTRA-GOVERNMENT TRANSFER REVENUE		
National Education Reform Agreement	(21,230)	(21,474)
Community Development Fund	(3,000)	(3,000)
APY Lands Task Force Programs	(2,676)	(2,631)
Screening Transformation Project	(2,100)	(1,750)
Mental Health Community Visitor Scheme—Contribution	(557)	-
Other	(1,040)	(265)
TOTAL	(31,316)	(29,060)

4. Intra-government transfers expensed in FY2023-24 and budgeted for FY2024-26?

Amounts budgeted in the 2023-24 estimated result and 2024-25 budget represent estimated funding transfers across a range of programs and are unable to be broken down into detailed amounts.

5. Breakdown of the \$17m estimated net gain on disposal of assets and explanation as to why it was not budgeted for?

Administered Items for DHS reported a net gain on the disposal of assets of \$17 million in the 2023-24 estimated result, relating to the former Disability SA campus at Highgate Park. The net gain on disposal of assets

represents the difference between book value for accounting purposes and the total sale proceeds. Due to the unique nature of the site, a specific sale proceed target was not set at the time of the sale process commencing.

DISABILITY FUNDING

367 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Human Services advise.

1. Can the minister provide in a table format the below questions: breakdown of the sales of disability goods and services (as the Department of Human Services Disability Services Program) in FY2023-24 and budgeted for FY2024-25?
2. Breakdown of those receiving assistance as part of the DHS Exceptional Needs Unit and Voluntary Out of Home Care, including ages, timeline of entering the unit, timeline of entering Voluntary Out of Home Care, and lengths of stays in various out of home accommodation as at June 30 2024, 2023, and 2022?
3. Breakdown of referrals received by the Exceptional Needs Unit, including the acceptance of the referral, and what alternative arrangements were made for the unaccepted referrals, as at June 30 2024, 2023, 2022?
4. How many people with disabilities are, as at June 30 2024, in hospital and non-permanent housing waiting for permanent, needs-matched, accommodation?
5. Breakdown of how many people with disability have been evicted from community accommodation as at June 30 2024, 2023, and 2022 and what was the reason for eviction?
6. Without disclosing individual residences, what are the locations of the Community Accommodation places?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised by the Minister for Human Services:

1.

Description	2023-24 Estimated Result \$'000	2024-25 Budget \$'000
SALES OF GOODS AND SERVICES		
Revenue from service delivery to clients	(116,137)	(152,591)
Other	(780)	(738)
TOTAL	(116,917)	(153,329)

2. The Exceptional Needs Unit (ENU) supported 838 clients across 2023-24, 652 clients in 2022-23, and 433 clients in 2021-22 (The service experienced significant growth in 2023-24 due in particular to a new Care Service Pathway (CSP) created to transition former Community Connections Care Services clients to the ENU). The average timeline for individuals or families entering the ENU is between two-four weeks. The average age of clients the ENU supported in 2023-24 was 37 years old, in 2022-23 was 34 years old, and in 2021-22 was 31 years old. The average total duration of ENU supports that ENU clients received was approximately 1.4 years for 2023-24, 1.6 years for 2022-23 and 1.8 years in 2021-22.

Note that Voluntary Out of Home Care (VOHC) is a service response delivered by the Specialist Family Support Pathways (SFSP) program. SFSP is one of four service delivery programs in the ENU, and the above data includes client information from all ENU programs.

In 2023-2024, SFSP supported 77 clients, with 45 clients in VOHC. In 2022-2023, SFSP supported 75 clients, with 48 in VOHC. In 2021-2022, SFSP supported 57 clients, with 45 in VOHC cohort. The average age of SFSP clients in 2023-24 and 2022-23 was 14 years old, and in 2021-22 was 13 years old.

The average duration that each SFSP client has been in the program by financial year include:

- Approximately 2 years' duration in 2023-24
- Approximately 1.7 year's duration in 2022-23
- Approximately 1.2 year's duration in 2021-22

The ENU and the NDIA meet fortnightly to endorse referrals into the SFSP program. On average, there is a timeline of approximately two-four weeks for acceptance into the SFSP program, noting that urgent situations occur where referral into the program occurs in less time.

Across 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 there has been a total of approximately 67 clients in the VOHC cohort, with an average of two-plus years stay in ENU-funded accommodation per VOHC client.

3. The Exceptional Needs Unit (ENU) received 481 referrals in 2023-24, 229 referrals in 2022-23 and 272 referrals in 2021-22.

The ENU intake committee accepted 242 referrals in 2023-24, 113 referrals in 2022-23 and 137 referrals in 2021-22.

Where referrals are not accepted, the ENU provides the referrer with a capacity-building response containing recommendations for alternate action and supports where appropriate. The broad eligibility criteria of each ENU program is available on the public-facing internet page and the ENU operates a duty service that provides information, advice and initial screening of enquiries into the unit. The ENU frequently delivers presentations about the work of the unit to various parts of the sector and seeks to advocate and collaborate across government regarding various gaps and system barriers for complex clients.

4. DHS Disability Services does not collect this information or have visibility of all people with disabilities in hospital and non-permanent accommodation waiting for appropriate accommodation within South Australia.

At 30 June 2024, DHS Disability Services was supporting 20 people within the short to medium-term transitional accommodation service—Transition to Home (T2H). T2H accepts people who no longer require clinical care and are medically able to be discharged into a safe community environment to build their independent living skills and find suitable longer term community housing options.

5. DHS does not collect this information but, where DHS was the housing provider, there were no NDIS participants evicted. DHS Disability Services were notified of one participant who was receiving support services by DHS that did not have their lease renewed by their housing provider.

6. DHS Disability Services supports South Australians to live where they choose and receive assistance with daily living across multiple locations:

- 192 disability accommodation sites across metropolitan Adelaide
- 12 disability accommodation sites on the Limestone Coast
- three disability accommodation sites on the Yorke Peninsula
- one residential aged care site at Northgate
- two Transition to Home sites at located at Noarlunga and Semaphore, with additional satellite units located at Daw Park and North Brighton

DISABILITY SERVICES

377 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Human Services advise:

1. How are the sales of disability goods and services advertised?
2. If the minister plans to continue the growth of the sales of goods and services?
3. Which stakeholders were consulted at the roundtable event for the review of regulatory framework for supported residential facilities?
4. What matters were raised by the stakeholders?
5. What community consultation will be undertaken for the development of a new Supported Residential Facilities Act?
6. What the minister hopes to achieve with the best practice model for supported residential facilities?
7. Will the best practice model be co-designed?
8. What is the timeline for the consultation and implementation of a new best practice model?
9. What funding and timeline has been allocated to the state autism strategy?
10. Can a copy of the initial response to the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability be produced?
11. When will the government provide a comprehensive response to the royal commission?
12. Which stakeholders have been consulted thus far to develop the initial response and the comprehensive response to the royal commission?
13. Did the stakeholders endorse the government's initial response?
14. Does the minister acknowledge that her government has failed to provide a comprehensive response to the royal commission by the recommended response completion of March 30 2024?
15. How many changing place facilities will result from the partnering with the commonwealth and local government?
16. What process will be used to identify locations for the changing places?

17. What budget and FTEs have been allocated in FY2024-25 to support local government develop new Disability Access and Inclusion Plans (DAIPs)?
18. Does the minister still hold a Disability Minister's Advisory Council?
19. How many meetings have the council had and how many have been attended by the minister?
20. The list of the members of the advisory council?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised by the Minister for Human Services:

1. The Department of Human Services (DHS) Disability Services provides information about its services at www.dhsdisabilityservices.sa.gov.au and at industry expos.
2. DHS will continue to provide services for those who choose its services.
3. 39 stakeholders across commonwealth, state and local government.
4. Stakeholders expressed support for the following:
 - safeguarding of residents;
 - new or amended legislation;
 - a more centralised approach to improve consistency, jurisdictional certainty and safeguarding in the context of the skillsets and capabilities of regulators;
 - a more coordinated approach to address the needs, welfare and rights of children and young people;
 - stronger tenancy rights for residents; and
 - protections for vulnerable cohorts
5. DHS will engage with regulators, proprietors, residents and other jurisdictions.
6. New SRF legislation will support a more centralised approach to provide greater consistency for facilities and residents while better meeting the needs and expectations of the community and improving safeguarding.
7. DHS is committed to ongoing engagement with relevant stakeholder groups including government authorities, SRFs and residents. to ensure improved outcomes.
8. DHS is seeking to complete initial stakeholder consultation in early 2025 after which it is expected draft legislation will be prepared and subject to further consultation before being considered for introduction to parliament.
9. The SA Autism Strategy 2024-29 (the strategy) covers a five-year period. Approximately \$100 million of additional state investment has been committed to autism-related initiatives since 2022 and further investment will be considered in response to action plans developed under the strategy along with ongoing responses to the disability royal commission and NDIS review—including the proposed development of foundational supports.
10. Yes.
11. An initial and comprehensive response—totalling 208 pages—was released on 31 July 2024, the same day as all jurisdictions except the Northern Territory, and has subsequently been tabled in parliament. In addition to this document, DHS released easy read documents focused on: a summary of the recommendations; the royal commission response consultation; human rights and governance; autonomy and access; education; employment; housing; criminal justice; First Nations people with disability; disability services; oversight and complaints; and a final document 'Next Steps and Conclusion'.
12. DHS consulted with a range of stakeholders to inform its initial response, including people with disability, their families, carers, service providers, peak bodies and lived experience advisory councils/committees. JFA Purple Orange ran six workshops on key themes of the disability royal commission so people with lived experience could provide their input into the response. The Minister for Human Services hosted a workshop with the disability sector to seek their views.
13. The royal commissioners themselves did not agree on all recommendations so the government expects and welcomes a range of views on both the royal commission and our response to it. Consultation with key stakeholders informed the government's initial response and DHS will continue to engage with key stakeholders to inform implementation and ongoing consideration of recommendations that are subject to further work.
14. Through the Disability Reform Ministerial Council, disability ministers released a joint statement on 5 March 2024 noting that all governments would formally respond to the disability royal commission after 31 March 2024. This was to ensure governments could work together in a coordinated way and consult widely with key stakeholders.

The South Australian response was released on 31 July 2024 in line with the commonwealth government and other states and territories.

15. The Changing Places initiative is funded over four tranches with the final number of facilities dependent on the number of local councils who express an interest, and are able to meet commonwealth criteria including different financial contributions linked to whether an area already has one or more Changing Places.

16. Additional Changing Places facilities are dependent on local government authorities choosing to participate in the initiative, identifying a suitable location, being able to meet the criteria for the initiative (including funding requirements, minimum building specifications and timeframes), and accepting the ongoing operational and maintenance costs for facilities.

17. There is no specific budget associated with the development of disability access and inclusion plans (DAIPs) although DHS offers support to councils in developing DAIPs and the Act provides councils – but not state government departments—the ability to develop joint DAIPs.

The state reform team within the DHS strategic policy and reform directorate works flexibly to deliver a broad state disability reform agenda. This includes the coordination and implementation of the state disability inclusion plan and DAIPs across all state authorities, and the provision of associated guidelines and resources to support all State authorities in developing new DAIPs in line with the state disability inclusion plan.

18. Yes.

19. Six. The Minister for Human Services attended five and was an apology for one.

20. These have been, and continue to be, publicly available on the DHS website.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

378 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Human Services advise:

1. Does the Department of Human Services have a savings target for FY2024-25 and/or years beyond?

2. Why did the commonwealth sourced revenues decrease from a budgeted \$95 million for FY2023-24 to \$42 million?

3. Why is the department now only budgeting for \$23 million in commonwealth sourced revenue?

4. Regarding non-current assets, why does the department have nil listings of investment properties, land, plant, and equipment?

5. As part of grants administered under DHS, why has the budgeted outflow for Charitable and Social Welfare Fund, Concessions, Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund, and Personal Alert SA, all had a budget decrease from FY2023-24 to FY2024-25?

6. Why was only \$127 million of the budgeted \$190 million for the energy bill relief plan in FY2023-24 spent, what caused the underspend, did eligible businesses and households miss out on the plan, and was the plan adequately marketed considering the underspend?

7. How will the \$25 million budgeted for the energy bill relief plan FY2024-25 align with the commonwealth energy relief?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Human Services has advised:

1. DHS is subject to existing savings measures from the 1 per cent efficiency dividend on salaries and wages and 1 per cent efficiency dividend on net cost of services which are across government savings policies that are applied each year and increase the savings requirement across the forward estimates.

2. Administered Items for DHS reported a net decrease in the commonwealth sourced revenues of \$42.3 million from 2023-24 original budget (\$95.4 million) to (\$53.2 million) recognising lower than originally budgeted levels of activity under the jointly funded National Energy Bill Relief Plan.

3. Commonwealth sourced revenues in the administered items for DHS are specifically related to the jointly funded National Energy Bill Relief Plan (NEBR). Reimbursements under the scheme are anticipated to conclude during the first half of 2024-25.

4. In relation to its administered non-current assets, a sale process was conducted by Renewal SA for the land and facilities, on behalf of the Minister for Human Services as trustee for the Home for Incurables Trust. Following the sale of Highgate Park there are no further non-current assets held for the administered items for DHS from 2023-24 onwards.

In relation to its controlled non-current assets the Department of Human Services reported a total non-current assets of \$116.7 million in the 2024-25 budget, from land and improvements (\$92.9 million), plant and equipment (\$22.7 million) and intangible assets (\$1.0 million).

5.

- Concessions—decrease is largely due to the impact of the once-off additional COLC payment in 2023-24.
- Charitable Social Welfare Fund—primarily due to expenditure in 2023-24 of underspends from previous years.
- Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund—primarily due to expenditure in 2023-24 of underspends from previous years.
- Personal Alert SA—primarily due to additional funding in 2023-24 for the Personal AlertSA 4G Transition Strategy.

6.

- DHS supported the delivery of the state and commonwealth-funded 2023-24 Energy Bill Relief Fund (ERBF) rebate for households and small businesses. This rebate was applied to eligible clients paid in quarterly instalments directly on electricity bills relating to their 2023-24 electricity usage by electricity retailers. DHS reimburses electricity retailers for rebates applied to eligible customers electricity bills. Expenditure on the EBRF in financial year 2023-24 was lower than budgeted due to lower than anticipated demand and the timing of reimbursement claims received from electricity retailers.
- DHS directly advised electricity retailers of eligible state energy concession recipients to ensure that they received the 2023-24 ERBF on 2023-24 electricity bills.
- The state government expanded the EBRF eligibility to include small businesses on an embedded network.

7. Under the 2023-24 ERBF, electricity retailers apply rebates to eligible customers accounts and then seek reimbursement from DHS for the value of rebates provided to eligible customers. The \$25 million budgeted in financial year 2024-25 reflects the expected timing of reimbursement claims from electricity retailers for 2023-24 ERBF rebates.

The commonwealth is separately funding energy bill relief on 2024-25 electricity bills under an extension of the ERBF for households and eligible small businesses. The amounts included in the 2024-25 budget do not reflect payments related to electricity bill relief under the 2024-25 ERBF.

COMPULSORY THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE

379 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 August 2024). Can the Treasurer advise—

1. How many clients does CTP insurance have? FY2022-23, FY2023-24 and expect for FY2024-25? How much revenue did CTP Regulator generate in FY2023-24?
2. What is the budgeted revenue for FY2024-25?
3. For CTP regulator why were general insurance and CTP premiums higher than expected?
4. How many consultants did CTP engage in FY2023-24? Who, when and \$ actual payment, and why?
5. How many consultants will be engaged by CTP in FY2024-25? For what purpose?
6. How many contractors did CTP engage in FY2023-24? Who, when, \$ actual payment, why?
7. How many contractors will be engaged in FY2024-25? For what purpose?
8. How does CTP support Lifetime Support Authority and ReturntoWorkSA to improve outcomes for injured people?
9. What is the head count (actual and FTE) for CTP Regulator?
10. What savings target did CTP get given for FY25?
11. How many fines did the Fine Enforcement and Recovery Unit collect in 2023-24? How many outstanding fines are there currently? What is the dollar amount?
12. How much civil debt did the Fine Enforcement and Recovery Unit collected in FY2023-24?
13. How much outstanding civil debt is there currently?
14. Regarding the replacement cloud-based telephony system in the Fine Enforcement and Recovery Unit, how much did this entire project cost?

15. What non-financial resolution opportunities for vulnerable clients were identified by the Fine Enforcement Recovery Unit? How many non-financial resolutions have occurred in FY2023-24? How many are expected in FY2024-25? Are you trying to increase nonfinancial resolutions?

16. What savings targets did the Fine Enforcement and Recovery Unit get given for the coming FY?

17. What advice has been provided to the Treasurer or Treasury relating to the National Disability Insurance Scheme and health reforms? What financial impact will the advice have? Will there be any significant cost that will arise from the advice should it be considered and implemented?

18. How has Lifetime Support Authority performed in this financial year compared to its KPI metrics? Broken down by KPI's.

19. What is the current number of participants in the Lifetime Support Authority? How does this compare to previous years? Forecast number of participants for future budgeted years?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Treasurer has advised:

1. The CTP Regulator does not have clients. The CTP Regulator regulates five private CTP insurers who manage claims for the CTP scheme.

The regulator collected \$116.6 million in FY2023-24 made up of \$70.7 million CTP premium 'administration fees' collections, \$41.6 million stamp duties on CTP premiums (administered item), \$2.1 million interest earnings and \$2.1 million other cost recoveries.

2. The regulator's budgeted revenue for FY2024-25 is \$114.2 million which consists of \$70.7 million CTP premium 'administration fees' collections and \$43.5 million stamp duties on CTP premiums (administered item).

3. The CTP Regulator does not regulate general insurance and cannot comment. For CTP premiums most policy holders (99.9 per cent of projected registered vehicles for 2024-25) were offered a lower premium from 1 July 2024 compared to 1 July 2023, including:

- private passenger vehicles by \$16.13 (6 per cent) metro and \$9.31 (5 per cent) non-metro;
- goods carrying light vehicles by \$16.25 (5 per cent) metro and \$10.77 (6 per cent) non-metro;
- taxis metropolitan by \$170.33 (6 per cent) and country by \$18.00 (4 per cent); and
- rideshare metropolitan by \$77.08 (8 per cent) and country by \$19.20 (4 per cent).

4. As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2023-2024 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

5. Taylor Fry and Scyne Advisory have been contracted to provide scheme actuary and internal audit services in 2024-25 at this stage. The regulator's 2024-25 budget includes a provision for additional consultants should a business need arise.

6. As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2023-2024 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

7. The regulator's 2024-25 budget provides for the continuation of services from the following contractors: Biz Hub Australia; Dr Beata M Byok, Haymakr, Healthcare Australia Pty Ltd and Dr Michael Epstein.

8. The CTP Regulator, Lifetime Support Authority and ReturntoWorkSA are separate statutory authorities with specific functions and powers defined under relevant legislation.

Establishing and maintaining productive relationships is important to improve outcomes for injured people, regardless of which scheme they are receiving support through. Sharing scheme experience, learnings, and trends within the personal injury industry in South Australia helps to identify opportunities for collaboration to address barriers to recovery injured people may face and improve health outcomes.

In some circumstances an injured person may find themselves having to navigate multiple schemes at the same time or transition from one scheme to another. This is where collaboration between the schemes serves to support streamlined processes, where possible, so that the injured person can focus on their recovery.

9. The FTE count for each agency at 30 June 2024 will be published in the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's Workforce Information Report later in 2024.

10. The regulator is not subject to savings targets as its function is funded from the CTP scheme collections.

11. As at 30 June 2024, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit collected a total of \$117.6 million court-imposed fines and expiations during FY2023-24.

While this amount collected was allocated across approximately 285k fines, it is problematic to provide figures of actual 'outstanding' fines as at that date.

A court-imposed pecuniary sum can have a number of components to the fine, including expiations attached to one court matter, but also because clients enter into affordable payment arrangements to resolve fines debts, so not all fines are paid off during a financial year period.

As at 30 June 2024, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit had over 96,000 payment arrangements in place with over \$225 million subject to payment arrangements for outstanding fines (pecuniary sums, victims of crime and expiations), of which an average of 700 payment arrangements are established or varied each day.

12. As at 30 June 2024, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit collected a total of \$6.4 million in civil debts during the FY2023-24, which was returned to the agencies to which the debt was owed.

13. As at 30 June 2024, a total of \$106.5m of civil debts has been referred to the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit for recovery and collection.

14. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit implemented a cloud-based telephony system 'CXOne' in March 2024 to replace its outdated and unsupported on-premise telephony system.

Total project implementation costs for CXOne including training was \$114k (exc GST). CXOne provides enhanced functionality including workforce planning efficiencies, increased reporting functionality and additional benefits.

15. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit has a number of non-financial resolution options available to clients with eligible fines debt which includes community service arrangements (CSA's), approved treatment programs (ATP's) and other arrangements approved by the chief recovery officer, that are available to eligible clients.

As at 30 June 2024, a total of 942 clients voluntarily participated in either CSA's, ATP's or other approved arrangements resulting in a total reduction of eligible fines debt of over \$5.9m in the FY2023-24.

An ATP steering committee meets quarterly and is currently assessing the expansion of ATP's to include problem gambling through a pilot program with the Department of Human Service's, Office for Problem Gambling (OPG). The ATP steering committee will review the qualitative and quantitative outcomes of the pilot as well as assess any key risks to ensure that any expansion of ATP's is delivering evidence-based treatments appropriate for clients experiencing gambling harm. Because participation is voluntary and clients may not complete or substantially complete the non-financial arrangement, anticipated numbers of clients participating in any CSA, ATP or other approved arrangement is not available.

16. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit were not subject to additional savings targets in the FY2024-25 period.

17. The regulator has not provided any advice to the Treasurer or Treasury relating to the National Disability Insurance Scheme and health reforms.

The LSA has previously briefed the Treasurer in relation to the pricing decisions made by the National Disability Insurance Agency and their impact on the LSA's process of setting the rates payable to providers of attendant care services to LSS participants.

18. The LSA currently has nine KPIs under its 2022-26 Strategic Plan. Of these nine KPIs, seven were met or exceeded in 2023-24. The two which were not met related to budgeted costs, which were adversely impacted by the retrospective reallocation of project expenditure from capital to operational expenses. Without this adjustment, both KPIs were met.

KPI	Target	Actual 2023-24	Comment
Participant survey – experience	≥ 80%	82%	Met
Current MyPlan in place for active participants	100%	100%	Met
Staff engagement – Teamgage	≥ 70%	71%	Met
Performance measurement – bi-annual reviews	100%	100%	Met
Research Education and Programs – delivery of contractual milestones	≥ 80%	95%	Met
Funding ratio	80% to 120%	89%*	Met
Investment returns since inception	≥6.25%	7.2%*	Met
Net expense ratio	≤ 12.5%	14.2%*	Not met
Costs managed against budget	Favourable variance	-\$3.6m*	Not met

* Financial KPI's are subject to the end of financial year audit by the Audit Office of SA.

19. As at 30 June 2024 the LSA had 371 active participants. This compares to 346 participants at 30 June 2023 and 300 participants as at 30 June 2022. Expectations regarding new participants are reported annually in each published annual report.

EVENT TOURISM

380 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. Can the minister provide a list of all 24 major events that were attracted and/or supported through the tourism events program in 2023-24 and identify if each event was new or existing?
2. Can the minister outline the funding amount each event received?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. List of Major Events—2023-24:

Event	New or Previously Sponsored
Frida & Diego: Love and Revolution	New
Illuminate Adelaide	Previously sponsored
FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 (Adelaide)	New
Illuminate Mannum 'River Lights'	New
The Bend Supercars	Previously sponsored
Australian Masters Games	New
Webex Player Series (PGA)	New
National Drag Racing Championships (Top Fuel – Round 1)	New
Harvest Rock	Previously sponsored
2024 ILCA Australian and Oceania Championships	New
Adelaide International Tennis	Previously sponsored
National Junior Track Series	New
Festival State—National Drag Racing Championships	New
2024 ILCA 7 World Championships (Men's Elite)	New
2024 ILCA 7 Masters World Championships*	New
Tissot UCI Track Nations Cup	New
2024 Adelaide Festival – select programming: The Nightingale and Other Fables Three Penny Opera Little Amal	New
WOMADelaide	Previously sponsored
Riverbend Nationals—National Drag Racing Championships	Previously sponsored
2024 National Athletics Championships	New
Adelaide Equestrian Festival	Previously sponsored
National Wheelchair Rugby Championships	New
CommBank Matildas vs China PR	New
Lamborghini Super Trofeo Asia	New

2. Event Funding

- The sponsorship details for these events are commercial in confidence and/or subject to contractual confidentiality restrictions, and therefore cannot be disclosed.

EVENT TOURISM

381 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. Can the minister provide a list of all 34 regional events that were attracted and/or supported through the tourism events program in 2023-24 and identify if each event was new or existing?
2. Can the minister outline the funding amount each event received?
3. Can the minister explain why she stated that only 30 regional events received funding in 2023-24 in the Budget Estimates Committee, when the Budget Papers state that 34 events received funding?
4. Can the minister identify any regional events that received funding in 2022-23 but did not receive funding in 2023-24 and explain why their funding was cut?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. List of Regional Events Receiving SATC Sponsorship in 2023-24:

Event	New or Previously Sponsored
Auburn Frenchfest	New
Clare Valley Festival of the Lamb	New
Grenache and Gourmet	New
A Celebration of Seafood @ Streaky Bay	Previously Sponsored
Ceduna Oysterfest	Previously Sponsored
Coonawarra Cabernet Celebrations	Previously Sponsored
Anlaby Spring Festival	New
Bay to Birdwood	Previously Sponsored
Riverland Rose and Garden Festival	Previously Sponsored
Feast Festival	Previously Sponsored
Handpicked Festival	Previously Sponsored
Froth and Fury	New
Bay Sheffield	Previously Sponsored
SummerVines	New
Riverland Dash 4 Cash and Dinghy Derby	Previously Sponsored
Taste the Limestone Coast Festival	Previously Sponsored
Kangaroo Island Racing Cup Carnival	Previously Sponsored
Beachport Crayfish Festival	Previously Sponsored
Dupang Pangari (Coorong Spirit)	New
A Taste of the Hills Festival	New
The Laura Fair	New
Yorke Peninsula Saltwater Classic	Previously Sponsored
SALT Festival	Previously Sponsored
Generations in Jazz	Previously Sponsored
Clare Valley Gourmet Week	Previously Sponsored
The English Ale	Previously Sponsored
FLAME Festival	New
Gutsy Kangaroo Island	New
Winter Reds	Previously Sponsored

2. Event Funding

The funding amounts for these events are commercial in confidence and thus cannot be disclosed.

3. Number of Events

Over the course of the funding period, event organisers decided to not proceed with staging the event.

4. Funding of Events in 2022-23 and 2023-24

The Regional Event Fund is a competitive application-based sponsorship fund and is assessed against the Regional Event Fund criteria. In line with the Fund, some events choose to not reapply for funding and some events may have been funded as one-off events.

RIVER REVIVAL VOUCHERS

382 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. How much was spent on implementing the third round of the River Revival Vouchers?
2. How many vouchers were claimed in the third round?
3. How many vouchers were claimed for houseboats and guided tours?
4. What was the average return on investment of the third round of vouchers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. The budget for the three rounds of the River Revival Voucher Program was \$3 million—this was fully exhausted through the program.
2. As of 30 June 2024, a total of 1,413 vouchers were redeemed.
3. There were 233 vouchers redeemed for the houseboat/guided tour category and 378 vouchers redeemed in the experiences and tours category.

4. An average return on investment for round 3 of the River Revival Voucher program was 4.8:1, meaning for every dollar invested by the state government, almost an additional \$5 was returned to the regions.

EXPERIENCE NATURE TOURISM FUND

383 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. Can the minister provide a list of all 15 nature-based tourism projects which received funding in round 2 of the Experience Nature Tourism Fund, including the amounts received?

2. Can the minister provide a timeline for the third round of the Experience Nature Tourism Fund, including when applications will open and when successful recipients will be assessed and notified?

3. Can the minister outline if any changes have been made to the funding priorities or eligibility criteria from previous rounds?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. EscapeGoat Adventures, Adelaide and Adelaide Hills

Project amount: \$25,920

Grant amount: \$20,000

2. Gawler Ranges Wilderness Safaris, Eyre Peninsula

Project amount: \$18,000

Grant amount: \$14,400

3. Flinders Island Eco Escape, Eyre Peninsula

Project amount: \$25,000

Grant amount: \$20,000

4. Australian Coastal Safaris, Eyre Peninsula

Project amount: \$34,190

Grant amount: \$25,136

5. The Backyard Universe, Fleurieu Peninsula

Project amount: \$24,316

Grant amount: \$19,452

6. Camel Treks Australia, Flinders Ranges and Outback

Project amount: \$33,100

Grant amount: \$26,480

7. Research and Discovery Coastal Tours Kangaroo Island, Kangaroo Island

Project amount: \$23,157

Grant amount: \$18,525

8. Untamed Escapes, Kangaroo Island

Project amount: \$143,731

Grant amount: \$50,000

9. Walk the Limestone Coast, Limestone Coast

Project amount: \$30,490

Grant amount: \$20,000

10. See Adelaide and Beyond, Mainly operating in Limestone Coast, however tour enters multiple regions including Adelaide, Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu Peninsula, Limestone Coast, Murray River, Lakes and Coorong and Riverland.

Project amount: \$74,596

Grant amount: \$50,000

11. Ngarrindjeri Lands and Progress Aboriginal Corporation, Murray River, Lakes and Coorong
Project amount: \$58,871
Grant amount: \$47,096
 12. Mannum Aboriginal Community Association, Murray River, Lakes and Coorong
Project amount: \$30,675
Grant amount: \$24,540
 13. Canoe the Coorong, Fleurieu Peninsula and Murray River, Lakes and Coorong
Project amount: \$47,273
Grant amount: \$37,818
 14. Bayside Glamping, Yorke Peninsula
Project amount: \$143,903
Grant amount: \$50,000
 15. Australian Private Tours & Charters and SA Eco Tours, Multiple regions including, Fleurieu Peninsula, Flinders Ranges and Outback, Murray River, Lakes and Coorong, Riverland and Yorke Peninsula
Project amount: \$50,942
Grant amount: \$40,753
2. Round three of the Experience Nature Tourism Fund opened for applications on 8 July and closed on 16 August 2024. All applications are being reviewed and are expected to be notified of the outcome in November.
 3. The grant criteria remained the same.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM

384 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. Can the minister provide a breakdown of all intra-government transfers received in 2023-24, including the source and purpose of each transfer?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. This information will be contained in the financial statements of the 2023-24 annual report.

TOURISM GRANTS

385 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. For each grant or fund the minister is responsible for, please provide the following information for the 2023-24 financial year:

- Name of the program or fund;
- The purpose of the program or fund;
- All payments into the program or fund;
- All expenditure from the program or fund; and
- Details, including the value and beneficiary, funded from the program or fund?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

1. The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for 2023-24—controlled:

Grant program/Fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2023-24 Actual Expenditure \$000
Regional Event Fund	Develop new and innovative regional events, grow existing events and drive increased visitation and economic stimulus to the regional economy	466
Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing	Deliver cooperative marketing campaigns to raise the tourism profile and drive increased visitation and economic stimulus to the regional economy	120
Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Fund local contact officer services to support regional tourism initiatives	574
Experience Nature Tourism Fund	The Experience Nature Tourism Fund aims to spur investment in nature-based tourism experiences and make South Australia more competitive in luring domestic and international tourists.	370
Tourism Industry Development Fund	Support and stimulate private sector investment in new and improved regional accommodation and quality tourism products and experiences	3,186
Mid Murray Support Program	Grants to assist tourism businesses in the Riverland and Murray River, Lakes & Coorong regions with critical recovery projects such as marketing, infrastructure replacement, powerhead installation, landscaping, cleaning, and equipment replacement.	460

MULTICULTURAL SERVICES DIRECTORY

386 The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (28 August 2024). Can the Minister for Tourism advise:

1. Will the South Australian Multicultural Services Directory be made available in languages other than English?
2. How many languages will be supported, and which languages will be given priority?
3. How much funding will be allocated for translating the directory and what is the expected timeline for translating the directory?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I have been advised:

The Australian Refugee Association (ARA) has commenced work to translate Multicultural Services Directory listings into the following 10 additional languages other than English:

- Mandarin
- Arabic
- Vietnamese
- Cantonese
- Spanish
- Dari
- Burmese
- French
- Nepali
- Swahili

ARA has selected these as the most widely spoken languages by migrants and refugees in South Australia.

If someone visits the app and selects to view the information in a language other than English, all listings across the directory will be translated into that language. Only the 'organisation description' will remain in English, as this content is manually entered by each organisation during their registration process.

Multicultural Affairs in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet allocated \$34,000 (plus GST) to ARA in 2023-24 to upgrade the Multicultural Services Directory to support these additional languages. This work is due to be completed by 30 December 2024.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

393 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11 September 2024). Can the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development advise:

1. What grant streams were available to the community in the wake of the floods in the Riverland and Murraylands in 2022-23? Please include grant name and amount available by scheme.
2. How much has been dispersed to the community since becoming available? Please provide the amount dispersed by grant scheme.
3. How much of the grant is yet to be dispersed or distributed?
4. What grant schemes were available to local government (councils) in the wake of floods in the Riverland and Murraylands in 2022-23?
5. How much has been dispersed to the community since becoming available? Please provide the amount dispersed by grant scheme.
6. How much of the grant is yet to be dispersed or distributed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries):

I am advised:

1. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions provided three streams of flood recovery grants for primary producers since December 2022.

The SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Irrigation Infrastructure Grant program was provided to irrigators to help meet costs of relocating or re-establishing irrigation and electricity infrastructure impacted by the floods. \$3.8 million was available to this program.

The SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Recovery Grant was provided to support clean-up, relief and recovery costs for primary producers that suffered direct loss and damage from the flood. \$11.2 million was available to this program.

The River Murray Flood LMRIA Irrigation Trust Recovery Grants program is being provided to support irrigation trusts in the LMRIA region with medium-term recovery activities and long-term resilience building activities relating to their shared irrigation infrastructure. An estimated \$2.025 million will be made available to this program.

2. Under the SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Irrigation Infrastructure Grant program \$3.844 million has been expended to date.

Under the SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Recovery Grant \$10.777 million has been expended to date.

The River Murray Flood LMRIA Irrigation Trust Recovery Grants were opened in August 2024 and applications close 31 October 2024.

3. The SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Irrigation Infrastructure Grant program budget is fully expended. Eight applications for a total value of \$0.15 million are currently being finalised.

\$0.423 million remains available in the SA River Murray Flood Primary Producer Recovery Grant program budget. This grant closed to new applications on 30 June 2024. Approved applicants can make tier 2 claims within their existing six-month timeframe or approved extension period. The final uptake in this program will not be known until June 2025.

The full budget of \$2.25 million remains available in the River Murray Flood LMRIA Irrigation Trust Recovery Grants program. Successful applicants have until 30 April 2026 to complete their approved activities.

4. The following measures have been made available to support local government with the 2022-23 River Murray flood event:

- Levee works to mitigate the impact of the flood event
- Counter disaster operations assistance for a variety of flood mitigation, response and remediation activities
- Local Government Disaster Recovery Assistance Arrangements (LGDRAA) to support the repair of flood damaged council roads and other essential public assets

- Community and Recreational Asset Restoration Program to assist impacted councils remediate and restore eligible assets essential to community recovery such as open spaces, community facilities and cultural heritage sites.
5. The following amounts have been dispersed to local government for the above measures:
- \$12.140 million for levee works
 - \$3.006 million for counter disaster operations
 - \$9.001 million in advance payments under the LGDRAA
 - Nil has been dispersed under the Community and Recreational Asset Restoration Program as the program was announced on 16 July 2024 and applications were due on 4 October 2024.
6. The following is the status of the measures available to local government:
- The levee works measure has been completed
 - The counter disaster operations measure has been completed
 - The government is continuing to work with impacted councils to finalise LGDRAA claims that are based on actual expenditure incurred
 - There is \$9 million available under the Community and Recreational Asset Restoration Program with applications due on 4 October 2024.'

FERAL GOATS

395 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12 September 2024). Can the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development advise:

1. How many feral goats have been removed from private properties in the first half of 2024?
2. How many goats have been removed from pastoral leases in the first half of 2024?
3. How many feral goats have been removed from government lands including conservation parks, reserves, national parks, DEW lands and other state-owned properties in the first half of 2024?
4. Does the minister think these are sufficient numbers to control feral goat populations in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Reports show that during the first half of 2024 almost 200,000 feral goats have been removed from South Australia through mustering, ground shooting and aerial shooting, with about 12,000 of these feral goats coming from private properties, 182,000 from pastoral rangelands and 10,000 from government lands, mostly in pastoral rangelands. While a large number of goats have been removed, the high reproductive rate of goats means that these efforts on their own will not have a long-term impact on feral goat numbers in South Australia.

Feral goats present a complex management problem because they are a major agricultural and environmental pest, but also a valuable commercial resource.

I will work closely with the Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Water, who has responsibility for the Landscape SA Act, and the feral goat policy, under that act.

POLICE COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINE ACT

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (27 August 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Section 46 of the Police Complaints and Discipline Act 2016 prohibits the publication of various types of information related to procedures under the act. Publication includes by newspaper, radio, television, the internet or other electronic means of creating and sharing content with the public or participating in social networking with the public.

Under Australia's constitutional arrangements, a state parliament may legislate with extraterritorial effect provided there is a sufficient territorial connection to the state in question. Whilst I am not able to comment on the lawfulness of any particular publication, there is nothing that would generally preclude the prohibition on publishing information about South Australian police complaints and discipline matters applying to an interstate media organisation.

CORFLUTE SIGNS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (29 August 2024).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Planning has advised:

Regulation 3B and clause 8 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017 (the regulations) provides that the commencement of the display of an advertisement is development. This means that a person wanting to display an advertisement on private property would need to obtain development approval from their local council to do so.

Schedule 4 of the regulations provides some exemptions from the requirement to obtain development approval for advertising, including where (but not limited to):

- it being displayed on a building used primarily for retail, commercial, office, business or community purposes;
- it announces a local event of a religious, educational, cultural, social or recreational character;
- it is a real estate 'for sale' or 'for lease' sign; or
- it is on land on which building work is being lawfully undertaken.

The exemptions are subject to size limitations, as well as requirements that the advertising does not move, does not flash, does not reflect light and is not internally illuminated.

If the appropriate approval to display an advertisement is not sought from the relevant local council where required, the council may initiate enforcement action under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the act) for the undertaking of development contrary to the act.

It is the role of the local council to determine whether development approval is required and to take enforcement action where appropriate.

Any development, including the display of advertising, is assessed against the Planning and Design Code (the code), and approval is only issued if the development is not seriously at variance with the provisions of the code. In relation to advertisements, the code specifies that advertisements and advertising hoardings are appropriate in terms of context, being efficient and effective in communicating with the public and limited in number as to avoid clutter and not create hazards.

The assessment of advertising by the code considers appearance, the number of advertisements, content, impacts to amenity and safety.

The City of West Torrens will consider these matters when assessing advertisements that are development.

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT

In reply to **the Hon. B.R. HOOD** (10 September 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has advised:

The Independent Review of the Landscape South Australia Act 2019 outlines in its findings specific reasons where increasing powers of landscape officers authorised under the act without a warrant could be beneficial, for example, to obtain evidence such as documentation.

It does not recommend that authorised officers be given powers to 'seize, retain or act with force without a warrant', as was reported in the media (Naracoorte Community News, 23 August 2024).

As required by the legislation, the review was conducted by an independent person, the Hon. John Hill. The recommendations of the review represent his view, based on the submissions and representations provided to him, and do not represent the government's position on any proposed changes to the act or associated policies.

Currently, legal compliance actions under the act are always undertaken after more intermediary approaches aiming to educate and encourage voluntary compliance by landholders. The specific powers outlined in the review for strengthening authorised officer powers would need to be further tested for appropriateness and consultation undertaken prior to any consideration to amend the act.

FARMING CHEMICALS

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (11 September 2024).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

The APVMA's analysis of possible links between Parkinson's disease and paraquat herbicides is clearly summarised in their publicly available Paraquat Review Technical Report.

The APVMA has subsequently made a public response to the ABC *Landline* story, reaffirming their position.

Conclusions of the review conducted by APVMA, as well as the review undertaken by the US EPA, do not support the claim that there is a growing body of evidence indicating a causal link between exposure to paraquat and the development of Parkinson's disease.

CARP HARVESTING

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (11 September 2024).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) is involved in steering research priorities resulting from the National Carp Control Plan (NCCP) through membership on the Environment and Invasives Committee (EIC) Carp Task Group.

The EIC Carp Task Group includes representatives from Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and the commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF).

The EIC Carp Task Group met in 2022 and 2023 to review the NCCP and have outlined a need to better understand the outcome of three key questions—is the carp virus safe, will the carp virus effectively control carp, and would it be feasible to implement the biological control program?

The EIC Carp Task Group identified priority actions that are required to answer key questions and to inform next steps, including decision points.

The EIC, the National Biosecurity Committee, Agriculture Senior Officials Committee and Agriculture Ministers' Meeting agreed to progress further work on the carp biological program, to address the priority actions identified by the EIC Carp Task Group, to help determine if biological control using the carp virus is feasible.

Work has commenced on the second phase of research with the reforming of the NCCP Scientific Advisory Committee.

CORONER'S COURT

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (12 September 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I cannot advise on the decisions of another minister's department in relation to the release of information gained through the administration of legislation within that minister's portfolio.

However, I can advise that section 34 of the Coroners Act 2003 prohibits divulging information about a person obtained in the course of the administration of the Coroner's Act, subject to certain exceptions. Therefore, information obtained as part of a coronial investigation is confidential unless it falls within a relevant exception.

YOUTH CRIME

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (25 September 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Section 66N(3) of the Summary Offences Act 1953 provides that a declaration of a declared public precinct may be made either on the Attorney-General's own motion, or on the recommendation of the commissioner.

In practice, such declarations have been made on recommendation by the Commissioner of Police. This is particularly because such a declaration can only be made by the Attorney-General if they are satisfied of the matters set out in section 66N(2). Advice and material from South Australia Police has been important in the Attorney-General being satisfied that these criteria have been met prior to making declarations.