STATE DEVELOPMENT AND REGIONAL INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE

Members present:
Mr CG Whiting MP—Chair
Mr JJ McDonald MP
Mr MJ Hart MP
Mr RI Katter MP
Mr JE Madden MP
Mr TJ Smith MP

Staff present:
Ms M Telford—Acting Committee Secretary
Dr Kit Kowol—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE QUEENSLAND CLIMATE TRANSITION BILL 2023

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, 22 May 2023

Brisbane

MONDAY, 22 MAY 2023

The committee met at 10.34 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Queensland Climate Transition Bill 2023. My name is Chris Whiting. I am the member for Bancroft and the chair of the committee. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay respects to elders past and present. We are very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, whose lands, winds and waters we all share.

With me today are: Mr Jim McDonald, the member for Lockyer and deputy chair; Mr Jim Madden, the member for Ipswich; Mr Michael Hart, the member for Burleigh; Mr Tom Smith, the member for Bundaberg; and Mr Robbie Katter, the member for Traeger. The committee also granted leave for Michael Berkman, the member for Maiwar, under standing order 209 of the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly, to participate in the public briefing today, but I believe he has sent his apologies.

This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. Members of the public are reminded that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee. I remind committee members that officers are here to provide factual or technical information. Any questions seeking an opinion about policy should be directed to the member for Maiwar or left to debate on the floor of the House.

These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and my direction at all times. You may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or on social media pages. Finally, please turn your mobiles phones off or to silent mode.

In today's briefing, we will be speaking with representatives from: Queensland Treasury; the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning; and the Department of Resources. I now welcome witnesses from Queensland Treasury.

DEWAN, Mr Edwin, Director, Economics, Queensland Treasury

MOLLOY, Mr Dennis, Deputy Under Treasurer, Fiscal and Economics, Queensland Treasury

CHAIR: I invite you to make some introductory remarks. After that we will move to questions from committee members.

Mr Molloy: I would also like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we gather here today. I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to appear here. I have some opening remarks that are hopefully of use in a broader context and then I am happy to take some questions.

As the committee would be aware, the Queensland government has committed to a 30 per cent emissions reduction target by 2030 from 2005 levels and to net zero emissions by 2050. Queensland has made solid progress against that target. Indeed, the latest data from the Commonwealth Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water shows that emissions in Queensland dropped to around 29 per cent below the 2005 target in 2021. That is also, as I said, in the context of a target of a 30 per cent reduction by 2030.

If we have a look at that in carbon dioxide equivalent terms, we see that carbon dioxide equivalents have declined from 196 million tonnes in 2005 to 140 million tonnes in 2021. Based on the latest emissions data, the electricity sector accounts for around 34 per cent of total emissions. Other stationary energy, primarily a result of manufacturing and mining activities, accounts for around 18 per cent of total emissions, and fugitive emissions from Queensland mines accounted for around

15 per cent of total emissions. There were also significant contributions from the transport sector, industrial processes and the agriculture sector. The land sector emissions have fallen and are now acting effectively as a carbon sink.

Queensland has been able to reduce emissions while experiencing very strong population and economic growth. Queensland's resident population has increased from 3.9 million persons in 2005 to 5.2 million persons in 2021. Also over the period the state economy has grown by more than 50 per cent in real terms. This really highlights significant improvements in energy efficiency across all sectors of the economy. Interestingly, the amount of carbon dioxide produced per million dollars of real gross state product has more than halved over this period, from 821 tonnes of carbon dioxide per million dollars of real GSP in 2005 to 379 tonnes on the same basis in 2021.

Looking at the bill, we have also been asked to identify the potential consequences. In doing that, we will provide some statistics on the economic contribution, particularly of the mining sector and also the coal and gas sectors. As the committee would be aware, Queensland has a very well developed resources sector, and it has undergone rapid expansion and transformation into a major international export sector. In 2021-22 the mining sector directly accounted for around 18 per cent of the Queensland economy, or over $74 billion in gross value-added terms. That is particularly due to exceptionally high commodity prices in 2021-22. We can see that from looking at the share, while still significant, it was eight per cent the previous year. Coalmining accounts for over half of that and gas and the LNG sector around another quarter. As of March 2023, the mining sector directly employs almost 75,000 persons and the coalmining and oil and gas extraction sectors employ almost 32,000.

As we know, the resource sector is an important source of economic prosperity and employment opportunities across Queensland's regional economies. In the resource orientated regions of Mackay and Central Queensland, which includes Gladstone, the mining sector directly accounts for 40 to 60 per cent of economic output and significant direct impacts through the supply chain such as manufacturing, transport and port activities as well as business services. In the Darling Downs-Maranoa region, the resource sector directly accounts for more than a third of its gross state product, predominantly through gas for LNG and domestic use. Regions such as Townsville and Cairns are also reliant on the resources sector through supply chain linkages and flows of workers from these regions to mines.

The vast majority of resources produced in Queensland are used overseas or in other Australian states. In the 12 months to March 2023, Queensland exported 192 million tonnes of coal of which 71 per cent was metallurgical coal, which remains an essential ingredient to the steelmaking process. Steel demand is inexorably linked to ongoing industrialisation and urbanisation across many developing and emerging countries, and increasingly we are seeing that Indian demand for coking coal. Over the same period, Queensland exported around 22 million tonnes of LNG. In value terms, the overseas export of metallurgical and thermal coal and LNG in the 12 months to 2023 was more than $103 billion. This accounted for 76 per cent of Queensland's international merchandise exports.

In terms of the budget, royalties are a significant contributor to Queensland's own-source revenue. In 2021-22 Queensland received over $8.4 billion in royalties from coal and petroleum, which includes LNG. This is around 30 per cent of the state's total taxation and royalty revenue. For the benefit of the committee, on page 38 of the 2022-23 budget update there is a table which identifies the royalty and tax revenue. As well as those figures I gave, which are actuals, it includes forecasts over the forward estimates. Royalties of that amount are obviously a very significant contributor to the budget and are helping as a funding source to provide services in many communities across the state. Royalty revenues are also providing capacity to fund the Energy and Jobs Plan, which is also a very significant contributor to positioning Queensland as a less carbon-intense economy. That funding source, as I said, is very important for helping to support those initiatives which were identified and announced by the government last year.

On 18 November last year Queensland Treasury published a detailed paper on Queensland's coal industry and long-term demand. This is looking out over a number of decades. It had the benefit of drawing on work that had been done by the International Energy Agency, the latest World Energy Outlook, for its long-term future. That does point to still a very strong future for coal, particularly metallurgical coal. That report may be of interest to the committee as a source document. It certainly identifies that we are expecting that metallurgical coal demand in particular will remain very strong in the decades ahead. Queensland's coal industry is relatively well placed over the long term, given our geographic location in the Asia-Pacific region and the quality of our metallurgical coal.

I thought I would also reference here today the Commonwealth Safeguard Mechanism. That is an important part of the broader context around the industry. Of around 215 facilities nationally that are within the scope of the Commonwealth Safeguard Mechanism, 63 Queensland facilities are captured. These reforms require facilities covered by the Safeguard Mechanism to contribute a proportional share of Australia's 43 per cent emissions reduction target by 2030. There are a number of Queensland coal, oil and gas facilities that are captured by the Safeguard Mechanism—around 45 on our reckoning. Combined, these facilities account for around 28 million tonnes of emissions, or 20 per cent of Queensland's emissions. Overall, these facilities will need to comply with a reduction in emissions baseline of an annual 4.9 per cent, or 43 per cent in cumulative terms, by 2030 from 1 July 2023.

That is something which I know the miners themselves have been very engaged with. They will no doubt be looking to access some of the support which is available on that but helping to allow the continued prosperity of those industries whilst still looking to achieve reductions—and very significant reductions—in emissions. Those reductions, though, and the level of production that I referenced are obviously not zero. To refer to the bill, there are a couple of clauses there—clauses 7 and 8—which reflect on the emissions target, and clause 10 identifies that there would be no coal, gas or oil for export after 31 December 2030. Hopefully, the context that I have provided the committee will help in its deliberation.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. You have provided context about the size of this sector. Bearing in mind there is a sector that has a value of $103 billion, or 76 per cent of our merchandise export, and it delivers $8.4 billion in royalties, which is 30 per cent of the revenue, if you had to provide a regulatory impact statement on something that may remove some or none or all of, say, 6,000 mining resource authorities, how could you (a) model something across such a broad range and (b) model the impact of that, because it would be an enormous exercise for your department?

Mr Molloy: As with all modelling, it also depends on the baseline. The figures that I outlined are effectively the baseline you would be comparing it to. It is then a matter of having a look at what the impact of any proposal would be on a variation of that baseline. There are issues as to what level of detail you would go to on that. If you are in a situation where there would be no further export from a certain date, that at least in a fairly general sense allows you to get a pretty good feel for what the consequence would be if that was not there anymore.

CHAIR: Certainly the loss of $8.4 billion worth of potential revenue would have an enormous impact on your future figures.

Mr Molloy: Absolutely. From a fiscal perspective, if we just focus on the budget impact, that would be a very significant reduction in revenue. Royalties are a source of revenue which can only apply to certain things. It obviously applies to the resources of the Queensland people. If you were to have a reduction like that, governments would be obviously faced with considerations as to how they would need to respond to that. When you see something of that magnitude, that is a very significant adjustment.

Mr McDONALD: Renewable energy is important for our community and so are affordability and reliability. The preliminary costs of the Energy and Jobs Plan were about $62 billion. What impact would this bill have on the economy of Queensland in terms of cost? Have you had a chance to model that?

Mr Molloy: No, we have not modelled the impact of this bill. As I said, I thought perhaps a reasonable sense of it was given by some of that context I provided. I would also mention that the revenue from royalties does provide the state with the capacity to help fund that Energy and Jobs Plan and that transition. Obviously these types of adjustments are adjustments that you like to occur in a planned way and a gradual way. Having funding sources to support that is very important for our economic transition for exporters, who would obviously like to be demonstrating in the broader economy their own climate credentials by drawing more on renewable power. However, to actually facilitate that you need to have the ability to fund it.

Mr McDONALD: Have there been updated costings done for the Energy and Jobs Plan?

Mr Molloy: The government released those costings last year and no doubt they will evolve over time. I am certainly not aware of any revisions at this stage to that overall figure.

Mr McDONALD: Did Treasury provide that modelling for the costing of the Energy and Jobs Plan?

Mr Molloy: Treasury was involved in that. It was led by Energy and Public Works, but obviously it was a collaborative effort across government and Treasury had some input.

Mr McDONALD: With this bill I understand there will be an impact on revenue. Would there be a greater cost to Queenslanders or a lesser cost if this bill were passed?

Mr Molloy: Obviously, what I have said has identified that there would be a cost and it is a significant cost. I think you can see that from the figures I quoted.

Mr McDONALD: This committee is conducting another inquiry with regard to climate variability. One of the challenges we have been advised about is the adaptation of these sorts of innovations. Do you have any sense of how this bill might be able to be achieved? Is it realistic?

CHAIR: That is a—

Mr SMITH: That is probably unfair.

CHAIR: We do stray into opinion, but that is a big one.

Mr McDONALD: It is a very valuable opinion.

CHAIR: I know. I think we have the gist of where you want to go.

Mr MADDEN: I want a clarification of something you said in your presentation. You talked about the land sector. I presume you mean farming and grazing when you talk about the land sector?

Mr Molloy: And also forestry.

Mr MADDEN: My apologies. You said that the land sector effectively is operating now as a carbon sink. Are you saying that because we have come out of drought and we are growing more crops and we are grazing more cattle it is a carbon sink? That is all I wanted to clarify.

Mr Molloy: I would probably exclude the grazing of cattle from that because that is in the agriculture sector. What we are saying there is that the growth of vegetation, which is normally taken more to be trees and grass and other types of vegetation, is obviously pulling carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. Whereas you have other sectors which have positive emissions, if you like, that acts as a negative emission. That is why it is known colloquially as a carbon sink.

Mr MADDEN: By way of comment, this is something that is not spoken about much—the fact that growing crops and growing sugarcane is actually absorbing carbon.

Mr Molloy: If you have a look at those other crops there is an element of that, obviously. That tends to get picked up in the agriculture sector, though, and the agricultural emissions will count towards that. If we look at agriculture, recognising this is a broader measure, we have beef, which is obviously a significant emitter. Then we have the other crops that you talk about. Overall, across the economy in 2021 agriculture was contributing 3.1 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. That is a figure that includes many sectors within agriculture. However, in comparison, when we talk about the carbon sink and land use, that is negative 4.5 million tonnes.

Mr HART: You were talking about $8.4 billion worth of revenue. Does that take into account the so-called progressive coal royalties?

Mr Molloy: The figure I quoted was the 2021-22 actual, so that was before the implementation of that measure. With that measure—at least for a time—we can see through the budget update that that contributes additional revenue, particularly when prices are very high of course. When prices normalise you will see that that additional revenue is actually very modest. For the time when those prices are higher, that amount would be higher. For the benefit of the committee, if you look at table 14 of the 2022-23 budget update on page 38 you can see the benefit of the actual and the revenue projections, which incorporate the progressive coal royalties.

Mr HART: What is that figure, based on Treasury projections?

Mr Molloy: Again, if we have a look at the budget update, that figure for 2022-23 for coal was approaching $10.7 billion.

Mr HART: Do you have any breakdown between thermal and metallurgical coal on those figures?

Mr Molloy: Not that we have published. Again, predominantly, most of our volumes are coking coal, and the price for coking coal had been very high. Obviously, thermal had been high as well but only really particular types of thermal. The majority of that is coking coal.

Mr HART: I get what you were saying about the changes if this bill comes in, that it would take away everything so that is a set figure. You mentioned baseline before. Has Treasury done any shifting of the baseline because of the Energy and Jobs Plan, because I imagine it is going to have some sort of impact on this figure as well?

CHAIR: Member for Burleigh—

Mr HART: Treasury mentioned the baseline. I want to see if the baseline has moved.

CHAIR: Indeed, but we are looking at the effect of this particular bill in front of us. We are not examining the Energy and Jobs Plan

Mr HART: The baseline has shifted and I want to see—

CHAIR: You are asking about the baseline that we are starting off in terms of this bill. I will allow the Deputy Under Treasurer to answer that one.

Mr Molloy: The best way I can respond to that is that your royalties are driven by exports—that is what is really driving that—whereas, obviously, the Energy and Jobs Plan is focused on domestic generation. Of course, that will have indirect benefits going forward to the broader economy and the transition to lower emissions, but that is not having a direct impact on royalties.

Mr HART: Do our domestic coalmines pay royalties?

Mr Molloy: They do but, as I said, it is predominantly export—by far the great majority.

Mr HART: Do you know what the figure is for domestic?

Mr Molloy: The domestic tonnages are primarily thermal, of course. I have some figures here, if you bear with me for a moment. Of the total tonnages of coal, if I take the 2022-23 figures, at the time of the budget update we were expecting to export 185 million tonnes of coal. The domestic coal volume is a little over 20 million tonnes, recognising that coking is predominantly what is driving royalties. I do not have the figures for the percentage of revenue that is domestic, but it would be relatively small.

Mr HART: It would be less than $1 billion in royalties?

Mr Molloy: I do not have those figures to hand, but I would expect that that is the case.

CHAIR: If you like, we can get the figures later.

Mr HART: Can you provide those figures to the committee?

Mr Molloy: As I said, I would expect that it is less than $1 billion. If it is not, I will come back.

Mr KATTER: I will pre-empt a comment from you, Mr Chair, as I am making reference to the Energy and Jobs Plan but I think it still relates to this bill. Coming from a counterpoint to the sentiment of this bill, I am interested in how this sort of stuff impacts power bills. I know there is not a direct relationship, from the advice you have given, with what goes into those. Was there any modelling done on the potential impact of this bill, based on advice you might give, say, on the Energy and Jobs Plan? Is there a multiplier you can give? To me there is still a lot of uncertainty around the cost of rolling out renewables versus what we have now on the base load. Do you use any multiplier or metrics to provide advice on this bill, based on the advice you have already given?

Mr Molloy: Obviously, in terms of this bill, we have not looked at that aspect. I have focused very much on the export implications and the royalties implications. Those questions would probably best be directed to Energy and Public Works. The only thing I would note, though, is that the government's strategy on the Energy and Jobs Plan is very considered about the transition time line, so anything that would impact on that would obviously have some consequences for the energy system. Exactly what those are is not something that we looked at.

Mr KATTER: You would acknowledge that the potentially significant impact on business going forward is something to keep in mind?

Mr Molloy: As I said, our focus has been on the export implications, given our closer feel and knowledge of that. To the extent you had questions in detail on that—and the Department of Energy and Public Works have made a written submission, which I think I have seen, to the inquiry.

Mr HART: Before we finish, can I ask that Treasury provide that figure on domestic coal royalties?

CHAIR: What we have is that if it more than $1 billion they will get back to us.

Mr HART: No, I would prefer to have the figure, if I could, please.

CHAIR: I think we have that commitment there.

Mr HART: No, the commitment was that if it was over $1 billion they would let us know. I would prefer to have that figure, if I could.

CHAIR: I think you have the commitment, member. It is around about $1 billion and if it is any more then, for a more precise figure, they will get back to us.

Mr HART: I prefer a precise figure.

CHAIR: That would be nice, but I think we have what we needed to get. If your questions are on the Energy and Jobs Plan then this is not the forum to do that.

Mr HART: If you could provide the figure then that would be great.

CHAIR: You will have the direction from the committee. The time for this session has expired. We will now move on to the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.

ASTON, Mr Christopher, Executive Director, Policy and Statutory Planning, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

BAUER, Ms Michele, Deputy Director-General, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

ELLEM, Ms Danielle, Director, Industry Strategy, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

KOHUT, Ms Kelly, Acting Director, Infrastructure Innovation, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

ROWELL, Ms Judith, Executive Director, Strategic Policy and Insights, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

SMELTZER, Ms Kerry, Assistant Coordinator-General, Project Evaluation and Facilitation, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

CHAIR: I now welcome representatives from the department. I invite you to make some introductory remarks, after which we will move to questions from committee members.

Ms Bauer: I, too, would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we gather today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. Thank you to the committee for inviting us here today.

The Queensland government has committed to targets of 70 per cent renewable energy by 2032 and net zero emissions by 2050. The Queensland New Industry Development Strategy, which was released on Friday, 19 May 2023, sets out the industry development framework for managing the risks and opportunities associated with the transition to net zero. I thought this new strategy may be of interest to the committee given the context of the proposed bill.

The strategy focuses on growing six key areas that, through their products and technologies, will enable industry to fast-track and meet its decarbonisation ambitions. The six key areas that the strategy focuses on are: renewable energy manufacturing and infrastructure development; critical minerals; high-value battery industry development; green hydrogen; the circular economy including resource recovery and recycling; and the bioeconomy including biofuels and sustainable aviation fuel.

The strategy also sets out the levers available to support the industrial transition. These include: legislation and regulation, such as the powers of the Coordinator-General; policy and strategy, such as the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan; increased opportunities for local businesses by implementing the Queensland Charter for Local Content; infrastructure delivery including common-user infrastructure funding and integrated planning; facilitation including integrated case management across government to support navigation of approvals; skills development including significant ongoing investment in education, infrastructure and training programs; land use certainty through the delivery of statutory land use plans and regional infrastructure plans across our state; and contributing to social licence by building the public consensus for change. A critical part of the strategy will be working with industry and regional communities to ensure that local opportunities presented by the shift to a decarbonised economy can be realised.

There are four major initiatives that are being deployed under this new strategy. The Queensland Jobs Fund is a $5.84 billion fund that currently is in operation and is designed to increase industry growth and employment across industry sectors. The fund brings together a range of industry development and investment programs to expand existing Queensland businesses and attract new investors to the state.

The second initiative is a new initiative: deployment of the statewide Local Economic Opportunities network, which will work with our local communities to identify opportunities for economic diversification. We will be taking a place-based approach that will be used to design and deliver responsible economic development and build livable economies. The LEO network, as we are referring to it, consists of regionally-based officers, through our State Development regional office network, who will be a key contact point in each of the regions. The LEO officers will make sure that our local communities are consulted and involved in co-designing initiatives and will keep the community informed on the transformation in their region. The network will also make sure we identify local opportunities and distribute information on government programs and services, and that includes federal government programs. The LEO network was co-designed in a workshop held early in February with the Local Government Association of Queensland and eight councils from resources regions. A second meeting was subsequently held to focus on the social licence issues. The discussions were really useful and it was then agreed to set up transformation working groups to guide the efforts of the LEO network. It will include relevant Queensland government agencies, the LGAQ and councils nominated by the LGAQ.

The third initiative being deployed under the Queensland New Industry Development Strategy is the $200 million Regional Economic Futures Fund, the REFF. It will deliver initiatives to drive economic transformation in those communities at the heart of the renewables development. They are the North West Minerals Province, including the economic corridor through Townsville, along with the Greater Whitsunday, Central Queensland, Darling Downs, South-West and South Burnett regions. Those regions are the focus as they are most at risk due to the transformation of major industries like mining or they have significant opportunities associated with our emerging sustainable industries such as hydrogen and biofutures, for example. Stakeholder advisory committees will be formed in each region and those groups also have input into the development of regional transformation strategies. As each region is unique, each region's strategy will be tailored to the strengths and opportunities in that region to ensure sustainable economic growth and employment.

Funding is likely to be directed towards the following types of activities: projects that create new jobs; expansion of existing industries or investment attraction; activities that strengthen existing regional supply chains; specific activities that support decarbonisation and the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan—the funding for this program sits within the Energy and Jobs Plan; specific activities that build on or identify a region's strengths such as research and business cases; and specific precinct developments to support a diverse economy. This could include facilitation activities such as feasibility studies for diversification projects and sustainability initiatives; small-scale common-user infrastructure in traditional industries, for example tourism and agriculture; funding for agricultural trials; and funding for mine waste reprocessing. Policy design and implementation such as local economic planning, housing action plans and regional marketing campaigns could be considered. Skills development such as digital capability programs for small business, industry training packages for Indigenous people, workforce planning studies and 'meet the buyer' events are the types of projects that we envisage could be included.

The last initiative I would like to talk to that is being deployed under the new strategy is an accelerated coordinated program of integrated land use and infrastructure planning across all of the regions. These integrated plans complement the regional transformation strategies that I mentioned earlier. While the department has been developing the strategy, we have also been in regular contact with the Australian government regarding the implementation of federal initiatives. We look forward to participating in consultation with the federal government on the implementation of the Australian government's Net Zero Authority, which has recently been announced under the federal budget.

CHAIR: There are a couple of things I want to chat about, particularly the transition structures that you are setting up and those projects that are occurring under that. Under the bill that we are examining today, that would mean a really rapid escalation of those projects, putting those communities at risk, and therefore those transformation strategies would need to be remarkably altered or perhaps redrawn or redone altogether. Is that something that you would have to consider if this bill were passed?

Ms Bauer: In relation to the regional transformation strategies, we are starting that work now. Under the Regional Economic Futures Fund we do have an ambition to have those transformation strategies for government to consider by the end of this year. We do want to really expedite that work to understand the local aspirations. We want to prepare with the communities some initial datasets and agree on regional narratives and priorities, but then we do have to go back to government on those to understand how that $200 million may be allocated to projects to assist in that transformation.

CHAIR: Certainly in terms of those communities in Central Queensland that we heard about, if 40 per cent of the economic output in Central Queensland is altered by 2030, that drastically alters that whole approach.

Ms Bauer: Yes. While under the Regional Economic Futures Fund there is a focus on those regions impacted through the Energy and Jobs Plan, we also understand there are opportunities there. Also under the Local Economic Opportunities network, we are going to take a statewide approach. We will be wanting to work across all of the regions to understand the opportunities that come with a decarbonised economy. We are really focusing on the economic opportunities that are there in the various regions across the state but acknowledging that there are those regions that I mentioned which we are prioritising.

CHAIR: If this bill is passed, it would assume the production of green hydrogen by 2030. What is our time line for green hydrogen? It takes a while to create such an industry. What are your time lines with regard to that?

Ms Bauer: I will have to check that. In terms of the Queensland Hydrogen Industry Development Strategy, I will get an answer back before the end of our time today. The strategy does have in its vision statement a target around the rollout of that strategy. If you could bear with me, I will get that and I will be able to reply.

Mr McDONALD: Thanks very much for the briefing and the outline of many different proposals that the government is undertaking at the moment particularly around this bill. If this bill is passed, what impact would it have on the department?

Ms Bauer: In terms of the approach that we are taking with the current Queensland New Industry Development Strategy, which is what I can speak to, the focus really is on that Local Economic Opportunity engagement, so a really place-based approach. Our conversation with the LGAQ was around making sure we can have one point of contact with local communities, we can share information consistently across communities, we can work with them on their aspirations and we can come up with a really coordinated plan. The LGAQ, in the co-design of this workshop, was very much about that local engagement, sharing of information and having one point of contact, because I think it has been quite a confused space.

In State Development we think that is our core business. We have 14 regional offices. We think this is our BAU, our business as usual. We have very much taken a process to upskill our staff so that they can understand what is industrial decarbonisation, what are the tools available, what are the emerging industries we have and how we can fast-track those. That is the approach of this policy. The intent of this policy is to have that deep engagement with our local communities and provide that coordinated effort. With the Net Zero Authority we have the federal government; we have the state government with the Local Economic Opportunity network and the New Industry Development Strategy; and we have local government at the table working together to look at what that transition could be across our whole state.

Mr SMITH: I have a series of short questions. When the government gives a direction and the department decides to undertake a strategy, task force and planning, could you provide a bit of a time line and a synopsis of that stakeholder connection and roughly how long these strategies can take before you can publish them?

Ms Bauer: Do you mean the current strategy, the New Industry Development Strategy?

Mr SMITH: That would be the one, yes.

Ms Bauer: Within industry development in our department, I think you are probably aware that we have had industry development road maps and strategies. The most recent ones, for example, are the Resource Recovery Industry Development Plan and the Hydrogen Industry Development Strategy. The time frame for that is 2019 to 2024. We will be refreshing that strategy this year under a commitment for the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. I am hoping that might help answer your question.

In terms of the development of this new industry strategy, about 18 months ago we undertook an analysis of megatrends impacting industry development globally. It was very evident through that that the decarbonisation agenda was really going to impact our emerging industries and our traditional industries in the state. Other megatrends that came through that were cybersecurity and building sovereign manufacturing capability. We took that work and looked at a refresh of our road maps and strategies to understand what we need to fast-track to enable these new industries but also how we can assist traditional industry to transition. That process to get to the release of the Queensland New Industry Development Strategy last week certainly involved a lot of engagement towards the end of last year with LGAQ in particular so we could build in that place-based approach.

Mr SMITH: It is a lengthy process built on a lot of consultation and a lot of information behind it. Underpinning that is obviously the government's key agenda—30 per cent reduction on 2005 levels by 2030 and 50 per cent renewables, and 70 per cent by 2032. This new bill provides that the new target would be 75 per cent reduction on 2005 levels by 2030, which I would imagine would mean a whole lot more planning, strategizing and consultation. Is it achievable to create a practical strategy and document that can have actionable items for industry and for local governments with a 75 per cent reduction by 2030? Are you effectively having to start everything all over again?

Ms Bauer: I think I would reflect back on my colleague Dennis Molloy's discussion on this aspect—the modelling and the evidence base that needs to go into preparing a strategy that government will consider and that is achievable. In the New Industry Development Strategy we are prioritising our work so that we can work with those regions that we believe are going to be impacted sooner or there is more opportunity. This is a measured approach with community engagement to be able to realise those opportunities. It is within the scope of, as you say, those other policy settings that government has with the Queensland Resources Industry Development Strategy, the Energy and Jobs Plan and the Queensland Climate Action Plan. It is the industry development approach to those policy settings.

Mr SMITH: In a way, it would be a seismic shift in direction from government to the department to go from 30 per cent to 75 per cent. Would that be an accurate statement?

CHAIR: You are asking for an opinion. Perhaps we can take that as a comment.

Mr SMITH: We will take that as a comment. This bill also seeks to set up a body of non-elected members who can then take away authority and override the direction given by ministers, especially the resources minister. Could you see how that would impact on the direction, especially around new industries, if an authority of unelected members were to start taking away resource authorities? Is there then an expectation that those new industries would have to fill that gap?

CHAIR: That is going to be a hard one for them to answer as well.

Mr SMITH: Does it create a greater effort for the department to plan for authorities that may be taken away unknowingly?

Ms Bauer: Chair, could I suggest that our colleagues from the Department of Resources, who would—I understand your question is about the new industries and the role that we have to fast-track those. I do not feel I can speak to the point of not allowing further approvals of mining industry that the bill speaks to. The work we are doing on fast-tracking the new industries, as I outlined here, is very much around using the levers that I talked about to focus our efforts on doing that work as quickly as we can with the private sector, with the three levels of government and with the universities. These are new industries, so there is certainly a lot of risk that goes with enabling these industries. It is very much government participating in a very collaborative approach to be able to deliver those projects.

CHAIR: We will go straight to that question in the next session. Are there any further questions?

Mr HART: Yes, I have a heap of questions. I liked the member for Bundaberg's second-last question; that was really interesting. I listened closely to the deputy director-general, who talked about the Energy and Jobs Plan and the industry development plan. What I did not hear anything about was this bill that is in front of us today. I wonder if the deputy director-general could tell us whether the department have put their minds to this bill and what impacts it may have.

Ms Bauer: The area that we put our minds to is on the community engagement and working across our industry development framework. We are looking at the bill and the impact that is suggested on communities. What we are trying to do there through the rollout of our Local Economic Opportunity network, the Regional Economic Futures Fund and the other enablers that government has at hand is work with communities in transition. The bill also talks about a transition plan. We are looking at doing this transition at a local level—developing those regional transformations—

Mr HART: What about the impact on developing the state, though? Has the department put their mind at all to what would happen if this bill is passed?

Ms Bauer: In terms of if the bill were to pass, what I can speak to is the current policy position we have where we understand we need to fast-track those emerging industries and assist traditional industries to transition.

Mr HART: Are you saying that the government has a plan and that is the only plan you are going to stick with and that this bill does not mean anything?

CHAIR: Member for Burleigh, let the deputy director-general finish the answer.

Mr HART: I am puzzled, Chair. Go ahead.

Ms Bauer: There is an alignment in responsibilities around that transition planning. The work that we are going to do with the regional transformation plans with local communities across the whole state rolls up and encases our emerging and priority industries that we outlined, because we see that they are the industries, through their products, their technologies and their processes, that will actually enable the transition. They have statewide strategies and plans, and we are working very closely around that. When you have the opportunity to look at the industry development strategy, we have case studied. Where we have, from past history, been able to lead in those developments, those partnerships that the Queensland government forms with the private sector to bring those new investments in hydrogen, in critical minerals—

Mr HART: Sorry, Deputy Director-General, we are talking about this bill, not what the government has in plans.

CHAIR: Member for Burleigh, we are getting the answer here.

Mr HART: Chair, the deputy director-general said that there is a lot of work happening at the moment around the Energy and Jobs Plan and the industry development strategy. Was any work done before those bills were announced or is all that work happening post the announcement of the jobs and energy bill?

CHAIR: Member for Burleigh—

Mr HART: Chair, the deputy director-general spoke completely about the jobs and—

CHAIR: Member for Burleigh, you are talking about the Energy and Jobs Plan. You are not—

Mr HART: This is what the deputy director-general spoke about the whole time.

CHAIR: I have heard the answers to your questions here already. Answers have been provided. Do you have a specific question about the impact of this bill outside the answers you have already heard?

Mr HART: Sorry, Chair. It is going to be a waste of time asking questions because you are not going to let us ask questions about what the deputy director-general was talking about.

CHAIR: You have to have good questions.

Mr HART: I have to have good questions that you like.

CHAIR: There being no further questions, the time for this session has now expired. Thank you very much, everyone, for coming along.

CAMPBELL, Mr Kris, Manager, Assessment, Petroleum Assessment Hub, Department of Resources

FERRIS, Mr Shaun, Deputy Director-General, Department of Resources

GRUNDY, Mr Alex, Director, Coal Assessment Hub, Department of Resources

MOOR, Mr Darren, Executive Director, Georesources Delivery, Department of Resources

CHAIR: Welcome. I invite you to make some introductory remarks, after which we will move to questions.

Mr Ferris: Thank you, Chair and committee. I would also like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we gather today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. I thank the committee for the invitation to appear and present on this bill. I also take the opportunity to thank my colleagues, Mr Moor, Mr Grundy and Mr Campbell, for supporting me for today. I acknowledge that Mr Moor and Mr Grundy travelled all the way down from Rockhampton to be present for the committee.

The Department of Resources notes the Queensland Climate Transition Bill 2023 and is happy to assist in providing context around the coal, minerals, petroleum and gas projects, the current approval processes and the regulatory environment for these industries. The Department of Resources continues to be a major contributor to great outcomes for Queensland communities in which we live and work. As the deputy director-general for georesources within the department, I have the unique honour and responsibility of overseeing the regulation and management of the state's finite mineral, coal and petroleum resources.

The Queensland resources industry has been one of the cornerstones of our economy for a very long time, generating jobs, prosperity and economic growth for the state. Consistent with my colleague from Treasury Mr Molloy earlier, the industry directly employs over 74,800 people across the state, and this is especially important in the regions, which account for around two-thirds of all mining jobs. In 2021-22, the resources industry contributed more than $74 billion to the Queensland economy in gross value-added terms. This represents nearly 18 per cent of the total GSP and was the most contributed by any industry here in Queensland. In addition to this, Queensland exports of metallurgical or steelmaking coal and thermal coal and LNG totalled more than $103 billion for the 12 months to March 2023. This is an increase of $34.1 billion year on year. We have seen high prices for key commodities continue to boost earnings.

While there are obvious economic benefits from our resources sector, it is clear that economic, environmental and social forces continue to change our world, and our department remains focused on ensuring Queensland stays ahead of that pace. To achieve this, the Queensland Resources Industry Development Plan was released in the middle of 2022. This plan was the result of extensive consultation with industry, peak bodies, community, academia and the general public. The Queensland Resources Industry Development Plan sets a 30-year vision to develop a resilient, responsible and sustainable industry that grows as it transforms.

In relation to Queensland's gas, the Queensland government continues to lead the way on domestic gas policy. To respond to issues in the National Electricity Market, it is broadly recognised that unlocking more gas and supplying it to the domestic market will be critical. More than 80,000 square kilometres of land has been released for gas exploration since 2015, with almost a quarter of it guaranteed for the Australian domestic market. Gas will continue to play an important role in Queensland's energy future, as has been outlined in the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan.

In relation to coal, Queensland coal and gas has powered economic growth at home and abroad for decades. Our thermal coal and gas resources have kept the lights on in homes across the globe, and our high-quality steelmaking coal has helped produce the steel that has built important infrastructure around the world. While we have world-class, high-quality coal and gas deposits, we also must look toward the future and acknowledge and respond to the external changes that are ahead, including changing demands of patents and geopolitical pressures that are disrupting global supply chains. The Resources Industry Development Plan is responding to these external challenges by helping to reposition Queensland's resources sector by building on our competitive advantages and capitalising on sustainable growth opportunities.

As we all know, every sector will need to demonstrate how it is responding to the changing needs of the global market, including the growing trends towards decarbonisation as the world moves to address and limit the impacts of climate change. Many of Queensland's resources companies have started investing and will continue to invest to decarbonise their operations as the world moves towards net zero emissions by 2050. The Queensland Resources Industry Development Plan helps us to meet these challenges by developing decarbonisation plan policy, providing $3.5 million over five years to build capacity and skills in the environmental regulator and delivering on the support needed for the new economy minerals sector to drive this transition. While the Queensland government has signalled that by 2032 it will no longer rely on coal for its domestic energy generation, Queensland will continue to respond to global demand for coal through this transition process.

Coal and gas projects in Queensland will continue to be supported as long as they stack up environmentally, socially and economically. In this context, Queensland's coal and gas companies are working to reduce their operational emissions and, in doing so, they will continue to remain competitive on the global stage. The economic impacts that the resources industry has on Queensland, as outlined by me and my colleague Mr Molloy earlier, are significant, and any change in the regulatory environment for this sector needs to be considered through that lens. Again, I thank the committee for the opportunity to appear. My colleagues and I are happy to take any questions.

Mr SMITH: Thank you, gentlemen, for being here. This bill will form a body of non-elected representatives that can override decisions of government, at least authorities granted by the executive wing of the government. What challenges are likely to be faced in planning for future resource and mineral development knowing that granted resource authorities can be cancelled at any time outside of the government's control and approved policy direction?

Mr Ferris: In answering that, I will take a step back in terms of the bill more broadly—not just the transition authority but also the impact the bill would have on existing applications that are before ourselves and any other department if they are related to fossil fuel authorities. As the committee is aware, the bill, if it were to come into legislative force, would cancel or refuse any of those applications that sat with our department and other departments. Our reading of the bill also indicates that any renewal applications which would be a new application also could not be made to us or any other regulator where they related to fossil fuel applications. It is correct that the authority would be established that could, in addition to those immediate refusals and the inability to make applications for new applications, make decisions around either amending, as we understand, or cancelling any of those tenures. I will give an example, because I think an example might help the committee to understand the potential impact of the bill.

Many of our operations, particularly in the coal space, are what I would term a bit of a mosaic or patchwork quilt of tenures in that they have varying time frames for when they would come up for renewal. For example, the main ore body may have a different period or life of tenure than, say, the processing facilities or the haul roads—those tenures that have those facilities on them. If a tenure was to come to the end of its life and then up for renewal in 2025 but the balance of the tenure where they are an ore body was to continue to 2030, there would be no ability for the holder of that resource authority to make an application to extend that tenure. If that tenure that was ending in 2025 had key infrastructure on it—processing facilities or haul roads or out-of-pit dumps or even tailings dams—then that would have the impact of putting potentially the whole operation at some commercial risk. I think the same goes for the ability of the authority to make decisions around cancelling or amending approvals. It would introduce some level of commercial risk for operators that have made fairly significant capital investments for projects that have a fairly long life.

Mr SMITH: Mr Ferris, in all of your time in the Public Service and working for departments, can you think of an example that is similar to this one where an authority is created of non-elected representatives who have power to override direction of the government? Have you ever come across an authority like that in Queensland before?

Mr Ferris: My time in the Public Service has been relatively short compared to some of my colleagues around me, but in my time as a public servant and working more broadly in the resources sector for the entirety of my career, no.

Mr SMITH: Gentlemen, if you would like to make a comment, you can. Otherwise, Chair, I am happy to move on.

CHAIR: I think everyone is on the same page with that.

Mr McDONALD: Thanks, Mr Ferris. I appreciate the practical explanation of the tenures and how they all fit together and the impact this bill will have. You mentioned, and it is well known around the world, that Queensland has very high quality coal product. If this bill was to be in place and the exports of that product were to halt, would there be sufficient market around the world of perhaps less quality standard of product that would fill those markets?

Mr Ferris: We certainly have not done any assessment of what the global impact would be of removing either petroleum and gas exports through LNG or thermal or metallurgical coal from the global markets. As the member is aware, Queensland is the largest exporter of seaborne coking coal, for example, our steelmaking coal. By removing volume from the market, whether that is thermal coal, steelmaking coal or LNG in a simple supply-and-demand sense, there would be some cascading impact to the global market. As to what that might mean for prices or even the ability for that demand to be satisfied, we have not done any of that work.

Mr McDONALD: Obviously the department is working towards a future, as you touched on in your presentation. In terms of the implementation of this bill, if it went through the parliament—bearing in mind the importance of renewable energy but also affordability and reliability of the energy sector—has the department considered the impacts of this bill on those latter two mentioned?

Mr Ferris: No, the extent to which we have considered the bill at this stage is essentially along the lines of my first answer, which is what would be the impact around new applications to be made, existing applications that could be amended or cancelled, and any applications on the books at the time the bill came into legislation and the impact that would have, but not the consequential impact that would have for other sectors.

Mr McDONALD: I appreciate your practical consideration of the bill.

Mr MADDEN: In relation to the potential for decisions made as a result of this bill and the Queensland Climate Transition Authority that may lead to a mine reducing its capacity or not meeting its contractual obligations, would the state be vulnerable for a compensation claim as a result of either the bill or decisions made by the Queensland Climate Transition Authority where a company has to curtail its operations or not meet its contractual obligations for exporting minerals?

Mr Ferris: We have not turned our mind to what the impact might be, whether that is an impact from no longer being able to make applications, existing applications that are on the books at the time the bill came into legislative force, or decisions made by the authority that the bill looks to establish, and then what that impact might be on some of the commercial arrangements. Suffice it to say, if an operation were not able to satisfy then there would be some commercial issue between the purchaser and the provider of that coal. In terms of the extent to which that exposes the state to compensation, I cannot provide advice on that.

Mr MADDEN: I am happy for you to take it on notice, but I am also aware that in the arrangements for these contracts there may be clauses whereby compensation may not be payable. I just want to clarify that issue. I am happy for you to take it on notice.

Mr Ferris: I think answering the question might be quite complex, given my understanding of the varied nature of these commercial agreements. One commercial agreement at one site may not be the same as another commercial agreement at exactly the same site, let alone across the entirety of the sector and how they deal with breach of contracts or change of legislation.

Mr MADDEN: Is it possible for you to take it on notice?

CHAIR: On that matter, member for Ipswich West, it is obvious they would need to get some legal advice, and legal advice that is created may or may not, especially if it is about commercial-in-confidence, be able to be provided. Suffice it to say, that would trigger a variety of commercial clauses that we cannot quantify at this point because there would be thousands of these things.

Mr Ferris: Indeed, there would be many hundreds, if not thousands, of commercial agreements. The ability to make or provide advice on what the impact might be on those many hundreds, if not thousands, of contracts would be, I think, beyond the scope of our department to provide advice, if I can be very transparent.

Mr MADDEN: Chair, if it is a case that the department cannot take that question on notice, I withdraw the question.

CHAIR: In terms of what it would take to generate that information, suffice it to say that the impact would be unquantifiable across hundreds, if not thousands, of commercial agreements.

Mr MADDEN: As I just said, if the department cannot take that question on notice, I withdraw the question.

Mr HART: Deputy Director-General, I take your point about the different tenures in a mine. If this came in and started straightaway, how many mines would be able to continue under their existing approvals for any period of time? Are we talking 12 months? Two years? Has the department done any research into that?

Mr Ferris: We have not undertaken an analysis of what the staged impacts might be. Where the member is coming from is around this aspect of that mosaic or patchwork quilt.

Mr HART: Yes.

Mr Ferris: We have not taken a very close look at this stage in terms of what that impact might be and when it might kick in. Suffice it to say again, if, for example, a mine site had a tenure that was coming up for renewal a week after the legislation came into effect, they could not make that application, so the impact would be immediate if it was a key tenure that related to a key piece of infrastructure on the site. It would be the same if it was a key resource area that they were mining.

Mr HART: For the benefit of the committee, would it take the department long to have a look to see if that impact would be immediate or within 12 months—the top 20 per cent, 30 per cent or 50 per cent of the mines in Queensland? How many mines do we have?

Mr Ferris: We can answer that question. I think that is probably the extent to which we can provide advice, given the level of additional detail of assessment is quite significant. I will ask my executive director, Darren Moor, to provide some detail around the number of mines in Queensland that could be impacted by the bill, and that will give a sense of the scale of the potential for impact.

Mr Moor: In the coal space, we currently have 41 projects. The number of mining leases is well beyond that, but there are 41 projects that are predominantly steelmaking projects. There are 11 further that are thermal coal, and there are 19 other extension or new projects that sit pre-production. Mostly they are extensions. If you break that down a little bit further, in addition to the actual production leases there are 369 exploration permits for coal and 135 development leases, so there is a large volume there. In relation to petroleum—we are talking about petroleum as well—there are 338 petroleum leases. We do not refer to them as projects so much, rather as distinct leases.

Mr HART: In regard to the 41 present projects, how long would it take your department to have a look to see when the very first renewal of a tenure would be up? Is that a quick thing you could do?

Mr Ferris: I think it should be a relatively quick exercise to determine when the first happened.

Mr HART: Is that something you could report back to the committee on in a couple of weeks?

Mr Ferris: I am happy to write back to the committee to provide that advice as to when the next tenure is.

Mr HART: That would definitely convince me one way or the other about this bill, not that I am already.

Mr Ferris: I could probably answer it now in saying that we have renewal applications with us today.

Mr HART: For each one of those 41?

Mr Ferris: No, for a number of those 41. We would have renewal applications for some of their tenures. Again, it is that mosaic and patchwork quilt. We would have renewals that are on our books right now for consideration by the department.

Mr Moor: I do not have a number.

Mr HART: This bill would stop that. Maybe you can tell us how many applications you presently have.

Mr Ferris: Can I confirm the question, Chair?

CHAIR: I am very mindful, as I said to the member for Ipswich West, that we do not want to overburden the department with these, but I think what we are looking for is an example of one. Will that suffice?

Mr HART: Can the department tell us how many tenure applications they have presently in those 41 existing projects? If it is 10 or 20 then we know what sort of direct impact this bill would have on those 10 or 20.

Mr Ferris: I am happy to provide some detail around how many either renewals or new applications for mining leases there are.

CHAIR: We have talked about the 19 in development and we have some renewals.

Mr HART: Just those 41.

Mr Ferris: We can answer the mining lease application question now. We have 53 mining lease applications sitting with the department for consideration.

Mr HART: Do you know how many projects that impacts, though, of those 41?

Mr Ferris: I do not think I have that level of information. We can provide that.

Mr HART: If this bill stops exports of fossil fuel by 2030, has your department looked to see whether there is a way around that, as in shipping it to another state before it goes out of the country? Have you put your mind to that at all?

Mr Ferris: No. As a department we have not turned our mind how we might be able to circumvent the—

Mr HART: That is not quite—

CHAIR: We are pointing out it might be a flaw in the bill.

Mr HART: That was not what I meant. Can you go back to your statement where you said a transition plan stacks up? You gave three ways that it needs to stack up. One was socially, one was environmentally; what was the third one?

Mr Ferris: Economically.

Mr HART: Economically. Great, I am glad to hear that. Thank you.

Mr McDONALD: Sorry, Chair, I think Mr Moor has the answer to the leases and the number of projects affected.

Mr Moor: The member asked the question in relation to how many mining leases we have before us. The answer to that is 53, as my colleague said. That is split across 26 different projects, both greenfield and brownfield expansions.

Mr HART: Thank you. That is not good.

Mr KATTER: I have a particular interest in biofuels and the role they can play, probably more in combustion-driven vehicles, and I know that there is effort in the airline industry. Has that come into consideration much in deliberations of what role that plays in reducing emissions in the carbon footprint?

Mr Ferris: Not for us, in the sense that biofuel projects do not fall within our portfolio responsibility, but what I can say is that, with regard to transport emissions, I am aware of a number of companies that are looking at ways they can reduce their transport emissions from mining operations, either by displacing their diesel—so using fuels other than diesel—in what is a large fleet of vehicles typically on a mine site. Whether that is biodiesel or compressed natural gas or moving towards electrification, we are aware of a number of companies that are doing a lot of work around that.

Mr KATTER: My motivation on that was that I saw Mr Campbell's title, 'petroleum assessment', so it was a bit of a trigger for that question.

Mr Ferris: Got you.

CHAIR: The time for this session has expired. Thank you for appearing before the committee today. I believe we now have the answers to the questions we were looking for. Was there a question on notice to the department of state development?

Mr HART: Sorry, Chair, I would still like to know how many of those 41 projects—I understand you were saying greenfield and brownfield, but how many of those 41 projects are affected by those applications, if that is possible.

CHAIR: I think we have just been provided that information.

Mr Moor: I believe I answered your question in indicating that it was 26 of those projects.

Mr HART: Twenty-six of those 41? That is even worse than I thought.

CHAIR: There are no questions on notice. Thank you to the Hansard reporters and to the committee secretariat. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. I declare the briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 12.01 pm.