

**ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY
STANDING COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY INTO TECHNOLOGICAL AND SERVICE INNOVATION
IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 6 APRIL 2016**

SESSION THREE

Members

**Mr I.C. Blayney (Chair)
Mr F.M. Logan (Deputy Chair)
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr J. Norberger
Mr T.K. Waldron**

Hearing commenced at 11.10 am**Mr MARK WEBB****Acting Director General, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia, examined:****Ms CATHERINE LYONS****Acting Director, Strategy and Governance, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia, examined:****Dr BRUCE MULLAN****Director, Sheep Industry Development, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia, examined:**

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee, I would like to thank you for your appearance before us here today. The purpose of this hearing is to assist the committee in gathering evidence for its inquiry into technological and service innovation in Western Australia. You have been provided with a copy of the committee's terms of reference. At this stage I would like to introduce myself and the other members of the committee here today. I am the chair, Ian Blayney. With me is the deputy chair, Hon Fran Logan, and our other committee members, Jan Norberger and Peter Tinley. The Economics and Industry Standing Committee is a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. This hearing is a formal procedure of the Parliament and therefore commands the same respect as is given to proceedings in the house itself. Even though the committee is not asking witnesses to provide evidence on oath or affirmation, it is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of the committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. This is a public hearing and Hansard is making a transcript of the proceedings for the public record. If you refer to any documents during your evidence, it would assist Hansard if you would provide the full title for the record.

Before we proceed to the inquiry-specific questions that we have for you today, I need to ask you the following: have you completed the "Details of Witness" form?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you understand the notes at the bottom of the form about giving evidence to a parliamentary committee?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Did you receive and read the information for witnesses briefing sheet provided with the "Details of Witness" form?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you have any questions in relation to being a witness at today's hearing?

The Witnesses: No.

The CHAIR: Would you please state your full name and the capacity in which you appear before the committee today?

Mr Webb: My name is Mark Webb. For six days I have been the acting director general of the Department of Agriculture and Food WA. In recognition of the fact that there may be questions that I do not have the answer to, I have asked Dr Bruce Mullan, who is the acting executive director of grains and livestock, and Dr Catherine Lyons, who is the director of governance and strategy.

The CHAIR: How long has Dr Lyons been in her position.

Ms Lyons: I am not a doctor. It has been since October 2015.

Dr Mullan: My main role is director of sheep industry development and I look after some other livestock as well, but I am the acting executive director at the moment because Peter Metcalfe is on leave. I have been at the department for 30 years.

The CHAIR: We have not crossed paths before. Before we ask you any questions, do you have an opening statement?

Mr Webb: I do not. I have read and have an understanding of the written response that Rob Delane, the former director general, has provided to the committee.

The CHAIR: Quite often, companies will bring a formal opening statement, but sometimes they do not; sometimes they try to use it to take up the whole session, so we have to shut them down after about 10 minutes. Who wants to lead off with the questions? Fran?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: In terms of your submission, this relates to the Seizing the Opportunity program that you refer to and the \$300 million of royalties for regions. Can you tell us a little bit more about that program, particularly the two that you have referred to—boosting business skills, and going for growth? What are those projects? Are they projects that mean that DAFWA could do things in a different way or could lead to innovation or change?

Mr Webb: I have an awareness and understanding of the issues broadly, but I would defer, if it is okay, to Cath, who has some detail, to provide a brief comment.

Ms Lyons: Boosting business skills of agrifood businesses was one of the 14 Seizing the Opportunity business cases to be written out of the 2013 election commitments initiative known as Seizing the Opportunity. It is one of those that has been written as a royalties for regions business case but has not been approved by cabinet yet.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What does it actually entail?

Ms Lyons: The intent—the last version was in 2014—was to boost the business skills of any agrifood businesses along the value chain that would contribute towards an export growth focus and would contribute to doubling the value of the agrifood sector by 2025. It was a \$20 million business case. I am sorry that I do not have all of the detail about all of the components, but it was almost at that advanced level of business skills development—what was needed to break into export markets to actually raise the growth and potential of our businesses.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: So is it fair to say it was a funding program more than DAFWA coming up with technical advice for the companies?

Ms Lyons: Yes, that would be correct.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What about the going for growth?

Ms Lyons: The going for growth initiative was not a part of Seizing the Opportunity; it was an initiative that the Department of Agriculture and Food was undertaking last year, in partnership with 22 different industry groups, about what they might need to do their next phase of growth and contribute towards doubling the value of the sector.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: And that, in turn, was a funding program as opposed to —

Ms Lyons: It was absolutely a funding program. It was written in partnership with those industries, that the funds would be, in a way, given to those industry groups that demonstrated that they had the intent and the willingness to grow.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: How many agribusinesses are there in Western Australia?

Dr Mullan: As an estimate, there are about 5 500 sheep producers, for example, but some of those would be grain producers as well. So, at a guess, we are probably talking about 7 000 or 8 000.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: That is producers, but through the supply chain?

Ms Lyons: We do not have that information. The last I heard, I thought there were 11 000 producers in the state, but that is not, as you said, all parts of the supply chain.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Some of these programs that you are talking about are about capacity building and innovation through the supply chain, which is entirely understandable. What has the take-up been on the expenditure of, say —

The CHAIR: It is not through cabinet.

Ms Lyons: No; we have not had it yet.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: What is the anticipated take-up, do you think, because you would obviously be talking to industry, would you not? This has come from industry in a sense.

Ms Lyons: Yes. We worked with the industry representative or leadership groups, and we challenged them, quite hard, “Is this something that your constituents want?”, because we were not prepared to go ahead unless they actually committed to it, and their commitment was almost in the form of, “We really need this. Our industry members have said we really need this.”

Mr P.C. TINLEY: So that defined the ask, did it?

Ms Lyons: The ask was defined in terms of what are the opportunities for your industry, what are the challenges, and then what are the activities that you would do specifically to address those challenges where it is the role of government.

[11.20 am]

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Can I just ask, following up what Peter said, has there ever been a mapping exercise done on the whole of the agricultural industry—that is, you know how many growers are there, but then further up the value chain, how many processors there are, how many exporters there are, of food products et cetera? Has there ever been a complete mapping exercise?

Dr Mullan: I have never seen a document that has all that detail in one. We could find that information out but, as far as I know, we do not have one record of all of that.

Mr Webb: But it would be true that, industry by industry sector, that information would be known, and we could provide it.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Is it a big exercise to pull that together?

Mr Webb: I do not know.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: If it is existing information, but vicariously held —

Dr Mullan: It probably is. I mean, in my industry, the meat industry, for example, we would know how many abattoirs there are, for example, and how many export companies there are—live exporters—transport companies and so on. We are actually doing some work in the sheep industry now to work out how many people are actually employed in the industry—not just farmers, but throughout the supply chain.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Yes—indirectly.

Dr Mullan: It can be done; it is not likely perfect, but it will give us an indication.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I would like to see if we can get consensus to get that as supplementary information, the reason being that it is fundamentally important as one of the indicators of success, so take-up of the money, those programs and their expenditure, but there is the base of our industry, if it is about jobs growth—maybe it is, maybe it is not—I imagine at some point it is about jobs growth —

Ms Lyons: And better jobs.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: — up the skills spectrum, we are talking about better managers, better marketers, and a whole bunch of things. Then if you cannot measure how to map that —

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It is about establishing KPIs, if you are going to get money out of it.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Defining success. If that is something you can pull together, it would be very helpful for the inquiry.

Mr Webb: Can I just asked for clarity around the question?

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Sure.

Mr Webb: I think what Cathy is referring to is specific industries, not the whole industry. Your question, I thought, referred to the whole agricultural sector.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Correct.

Mr Webb: It probably is true that there are a number of businesses within the whole agricultural sector that would not participate in the program that Cathy just talked about.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Sorry; okay; delink from the programs. Impacting in the agribusiness sector, which is the common vernacular now—you know, everything from Milne AgriGroup to CBH—how many enterprises might be a better term, because you have got a meat producer that does grain in the alternate season, or in a season, you would not want to double count them. How many enterprises are in agribusiness?

Mr Webb: Maybe we could do it in two parts, if I can be clear. The first part is what we understand to be the total number of businesses that we can identify across the agrifood sector, but the second question might relate to the industries that we believe, or the number of industries that we are working with as part of these potential programs.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: That would be great.

The CHAIR: The other figure that is almost impossible—I have not been able to find it—is the number of people employed. It may be that there is somewhere you can find that, but I cannot find it. We keep hearing that there are a lot of people employed in agriculture and its downstream parts, but if you actually try and put your finger on the number, it seems very hard to find.

Ms Lyons: I think our economists have done some work in the past in finding that information. That information obviously comes from external sources like ABARES, where our clients are expected to provide the data, so it is never going to be a perfect source of information.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: It is going to give you a trend.

The CHAIR: It is quite interesting that it is a pretty significant industry in terms of the number of people it employs, and it is touted as being potentially a growth industry, and nobody seems to how many people are employed in it, so what else do they not know—known unknowns, and unknown unknowns.

Mr Webb: Chair, we will seek to provide that information through the sources we have available.

The CHAIR: There has been this issue of the ongoing review of the department, can you tell us anything about that?

Mr Webb: I can tell you, from my limited understanding, that Minister Baston, about a year ago announced there would be a stocktake and future reform review of DAFWA. For reasons that I am not clear about, that has not occurred until just recently. It started two weeks ago, and there is now a group of three independent reviewers, myself and someone from Treasury, going through each of the programs and projects within DAFWA to understand what does it cost, can we measure what it delivers and what would be the implications of changes to that program on the people that currently receive the benefit of it. It will not be concluded until probably—a preliminary report from that review is expected by the end of April, with a final report probably not until May or into June.

The CHAIR: You said there is a third person.

Mr Webb: There are three industry members. It is chaired by Peter Cook, who is a consultant; Kevin Goss, who is also a consultant, but on the WA Biosecurity Council, is also a member; and Peter Nixon, who is a farmer from, I think, the Moora area—they are the three external industry members. For each day of the hearings, an industry representative who is an area specialist, say, in horticulture or livestock, came in just for that day. They were also an external consultant, but they were not part of the—they did not meet for the full period that the panel met.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: How many programs are there that you are looking at in that review?

Ms Lyons: The way it is described in the department is that each of the directorates has a series of programs. I think there are about 30 programs, but each of those programs had various numbers of projects within that, so there were probably about 30 presentations.

Mr Webb: Yes, and there would have been between one and nine projects within the program, varying from quite small to quite large.

Mr J. NORBERGER: In February, Dr Sweetingham advised the committee of a need for a gradual pathway for transitioning to GrainsWest and, quoting him, he basically said that DAFWA was in discussions with the GRDC and the grains industry in this state at the moment, so basically, in February those discussions were underway. You are probably aware that recently in *The West Australian* the GRDC chairman, Mr Clark, made comments about not being convinced about becoming a partner in GrainsWest. Can we assume that there are now problems with these discussions, or can you give us an update on where you are at with those discussions, given that Mr Clark is probably casting doubt on whether that partnership will go ahead?

Mr Webb: I have not had those conversations myself with Mr Clark, but I have had them with the GRDC Western panel chair. We are moving in understanding GRDC's concerns, and how we might address those concerns, but I do not have a conclusion yet on those conversations.

Mr J. NORBERGER: I am glad you raised that, because I think in that same article—it came from an interview, or something—Mr Clark was referred to as saying that DAFWA had not met its undertakings in relation to the AEGIC. Are you aware of what he means by DAFWA not meeting its undertakings?

Dr Mullan: Yes, I can answer that. When AEGIC was first set up, there was an undertaking by the government to build an office facility. DAFWA was also going to be building a new office at the South Perth site, and a component of that was going to be an office for AEGIC. I believe that is the undertaking that was given at the time, but it has never been delivered; AEGIC is still located within the South Perth Department of Agriculture and Food buildings.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: So it is just facilities that is the issue?

Dr Mullan: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Not ongoing R&D funding?

Dr Mullan: No, it is the facility that he would have been referring to.

The CHAIR: I think there was a budget issue as well, but that is just in the background.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I thought it was a co-investment. There might have been co-investment around facilities.

Dr Mullan: Yes, it is a co-investment. We are certainly co-investing in it, but I thought the issue was around undertaking to build offices and labs specifically for AGIC.

The CHAIR: To follow on from that, are you able to offer any insight into the possible future plans for the Baron Hay Court premises, in view of its proximity to both Curtin University and

Technology Park? Do you have any collaborative links between the department and those precincts, and do you think there is potential there for stronger cooperation in the future?

[11.30 am]

Mr Webb: I might answer the second part and then Cathy might like to answer the first part. One of the things I have been impressed with in my very short time at DAFWA is the degree of collaboration that occurs between DAFWA and a range of other agencies, including Curtin University, Murdoch University and UWA. They are active and willing participants in the activities at DAFWA. Part of the conversation with them has been around, for a future DAFWA building, how do we make sure that we remain connected with each of those different parties, recognising that each brings strengths to DAFWA's program? In relation to building, I have some understanding, but Cath, I think you would have a better understanding.

Ms Lyons: The department is in the process of developing a business case. We will be able to get you more information on that, and I think it is in partnership with either the Department of Finance or the Department of Commerce; you will have to excuse me, I am not quite sure of the details. That is on track going into cabinet for the proposals for the building sites for the physical location of DAFWA, but I think it is something we might have to give you more information on.

Mr Webb: I understand it is a work in progress, so there are options that are being considered and it is going to cabinet for a decision.

Ms Lyons: The Premier did make some commentary in the media this week about the building.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Reading your submission and reading the popular press, it appears to me that DAFWA is changing its model significantly from an in-house R&D pure science deliverer to a more privately funded one where industry is taking the lead in some areas. Is that a fair generalisation of what is happening at DAFWA?

Mr Webb: Maybe I can start. DAFWA has responsibilities in three key areas. One is delivering biosecurity and its legislative outcomes. It is around what are the government priorities for DAFWA and it is also about delivering the management of external contracts. They are the things that DAFWA has to do. Then under that sits the things that DAFWA does do, and includes R&D. I have been sitting through the review process and it has been my observation that science is embedded across what DAFWA does. There are something like 172 staff with PhD or masters degrees, who deliver a range of really positive outcomes across the board. My understanding of your comment is that there has been a conversation in the media and within industry about DAFWA getting out of some industries and the speed with which DAFWA has got out of those industries. My observation would be that in some instances, if you consider the role of R&D as around either delivering activity where there is market failure—we can talk about that, if you like—or where industry is not prepared to or unable to commit to funding to the extent that the government believes is appropriate, or if there are systemic failures in the delivery of messages, that is where DAFWA plays in the R&D space, so DAFWA very much is still an applied, on-farm deliverer of services, but now it is going to be a different model. In some instances it may be with industry; in other instances it may still be on its own and in other instances it may be as a facilitator of other people doing that work.

Dr Mullan: I think, as Mark has indicated, every industry is different and some are more mature than others. My background is in the pork industry, for example, and we are transitioning R&D to the pork industry right at the moment. That is an industry that does a lot of its own research anyway, and one of the benefits of that model is that you can do RD&E—research, development and extension—but it does not guarantee adoption, and unless you get adoption, R&D is a waste of time. One of the benefits I am seeing through closer links with industry is that you are much more guaranteed that the adoption will be taken up, and the pork industry is a very good example; dairy is

another one. They are more, if I can use the word, mature, but more concentrated industries. They have some advantages, but that is certainly a model.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: So, Bruce, those industries, any one of those sectors, is made up of a bunch of enterprises that are, at various points in the supply chain, competitors. So if we are taking what was done by the public purse for the benefit of the entire economy, not just those enterprises, and shifting that to the private sector, what is the likelihood that there is going to be, first, blue-sky research, if you like, and second, just go straight profit-driven research and then collaboration between competitors?

Dr Mullan: The big organisations will do their own research anyway, but what we are talking about here is research that is funded largely through the research corporations, and it is matched by federal government funding. That then has to be available to everybody; you cannot get money and say, “You can do it yourself and don’t tell us about it.” If it is funded by any government funds, either state or federal, then it has to be available for everyone, and that is the case.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Mark, you identified 172 postgrads in the department currently.

Mr Webb: I had this number somewhere, yes.

Ms Lyons: Only those that acknowledge that. There are many other people who are employed in the department who might have different roles.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: What I am trying to get at —

Ms Lyons: We still have those —

Mr Webb: I have a breakdown somewhere here of the number of PhDs and masters.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: That is fine; I just want to unpack their role. So, 172 postgrads—let us call them masters or PhDs—working in R&D; is that the right way to define it?

Mr Webb: RD&E, and I can give you the breakdown.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: No, that is fine. I would like to see it by submission, but that is currently. Where was it last year, the year before and the year before that?

Mr Webb: I cannot tell you that.

Dr Mullan: I would not have the numbers. It is not something that we have tracked. There will be some of those people who are doing policy work or other parts of the business, which is still very important.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: It is still innovation.

Dr Mullan: It is still innovation, so they might be in biosecurity and not doing R &D, but using their skills.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: My point is that you know now there are 172; it is interesting that you know the precise number now but you do not know for previous years. Is it available?

Mr Webb: I am sure it would be available. Cath’s point is relevant. Maybe the question is more about staff engagement in RD&E itself, irrespective of their qualification.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Okay; that would be even better. Can we get that?

Mr Webb: I am sure we can provide that information.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: For, say, the last five years.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Can I just ask about R&D itself? Has DAFWA any patents over breakthroughs that they might have had in R&D? Has DAFWA ever spun out any of those breakthroughs or any of those patents to either make it available for companies to establish as a new start-up company or has DAFWA ever done it themselves?

Mr Webb: I can speak about two that are not breakthrough patents, but they are patents that are held and they are in the apple industry. They were releasing a new apple variety, so DAFWA holds the patent to that variety. It is being released through an industry group. Sorry, I have forgotten the name of the industry group. I can get you the name of that group, but those are the only ones that I have knowledge about. In the case of those, DAFWA actively manages that IP. I am not aware of any others.

Ms Lyons: We do have a register of things that we have IP for. I would not be able to give you that information now, but if you give us a question, we will be able to address it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Is that IP commercialised? I mean, does DAFWA get a return on it?

Mr Webb: In the case of Bravo, absolutely. Fresh West is the name of the company, so in the case of the Pink Lady, there is a strong record of past IP returns for investment in that variety, and in the case of Bravo, it is the same.

Mr J. NORBERGER: Is Fresh West an industry body? Do you guys control that? Who owns that brand?

Ms Lyons: Fresh West? Fruit West.

Mr Webb: Fruit West, my apologies.

Mr J. NORBERGER: But are you going to register Fresh West!

That actually leads in to a question I am hoping to ask. The importance of R&D as part of what DAFWA does is obviously recognised, but, certainly, recently, there is a lot of talk about how ideally we are placed within the Asian region to export or continue to export our goods. Do you see a role for the department in assisting WA agrifood businesses to market their products in Asia? Look at New Zealand, and that is a country, not a state, but they have got their 100 per cent pure brand. Should you guys be involved in providing an umbrella or an overarching brand to represent a multitude of agribusinesses? Is there a role for the department to help, possibly with some of the smaller businesses, but not the entire, you know, grains industry, but smaller boutique and whatnot to get their products into Asia?

[11.40 am]

Mr Webb: If I can just break that question down. The first one is that this document was just released last week. Its title is “Target Market Opportunities in Asia for Western Australian Premium Products”.

Mr J. NORBERGER: There you go, so I just gave a dorothy dixer, did I not?

Mr Webb: It is done by a consultant group from New Zealand called Coriolis, who also have an office here in Perth. What they have done is looked at the market pull, so what are the commodities in the Asian market that Western Australia could provide and they have listed a number of them. I will not read them all but if I could just indicate to you that what they have done is they have lifted the opportunity to increase exports in the next five to seven years. Where does that fit with WA? Is it a good fit with where we are at as a state, as an industry? Just to give you an example, in the area of milk, they are suggesting probably anywhere between \$60 million and \$110 million of increased value over the next five to seven years is possible. In apples it is \$6 million to \$15 million, in blueberries it is \$1 million to \$5 million. Now, that comes back to Mr Tinley’s question earlier about where DAFWA invests funding in both R&D and industry development. So, there has to be a judgement at some time about the degree to which DAFWA invests CA money—government money, taxpayer money—where it partners with industry sectors or where it makes a judgement that it cannot add a lot of value to that industry by the types of activity that DAFWA does.

We will answer the third and fourth parts of your question, but in the case of DAFWA, it is in the space of the work that will deliver outcomes in the next three to eight years. So, industry is often in the space of the next one or two, they can take information that is already known, including information out of this report. Universities are in the space of some of your blue-sky work, Mr Tinley, around eight years plus. DAFWA is very much in that space of what can happen in the next two to three years to the next five to seven years. Some of this will require pre-farm gate, but most of it is going to apply to post-farm gate activity, which leads back to Cath's comments earlier about some of the projects that are both underway and some that will be underway.

Ms Lyons: In terms of your brand question, if I may, the Department of State Development has a project out of Seizing the Opportunity called Brand WA and it is part of that same package of: how do we grow the value of the sector? They have been doing some research on whether there is the opportunity for an agrifood brand for WA. We have already had feedback from the clients on what they feel about that, which is not universal —

Mr P.C. TINLEY: It never is.

Ms Lyons: — and whether there is more valuable in an Australian brand and working across jurisdictions. So, DSD have that research.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: They have got the research but no recommendation yet for government? Because there are things like the ASA100 sort of stuff, those initiatives are underway.

Ms Lyons: I have not seen the product—the report.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Got it.

Dr Mullan: I think an important distinction too is I know a number of companies say government should not be involved in marketing. We are not involved in marketing; it is market development. There is a very clear distinction. I think industry needs to be reminded at times because they say, “We don't want you involved in that. That's our role to put it on our logo or whatever.”

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Catherine, you talked about the report. Is that published yet?

Ms Lyons: I have not seen it, but the Department of State Development are part of a cross-government working group that I sit on, on behalf of DAFWA, about all of the Seizing the Opportunity projects. The last time I was in a meeting I heard that the report was nearing finalisation.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Close, but not quite there.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I understand Mr Delane has left to join State Development and his role is to set up a unit to assist in the export of agriculture exports, but, I mean, that is DAFWA's role as well, to assist in the expansion of businesses and exports for agribusiness products and also the AEGIC's role is to improve export markets. What is the likelihood we are going to get duplication here between the three organisations or three units? What have you got in place to ensure that there is collaboration between those three units so there is no duplication?

Mr Webb: Mr Delane has moved from Agriculture to DSD as you have described and he heads up a unit called agribusiness expansion. The details of that are being finely worked through with DSD. But today I met with the DG of DSD and the DG of DRD to address the very issue that you have just raised to ensure that there is collaboration and not competition and that we wisely invest and we understand what we are achieving for each agency. I do not have an answer to that question yet, but that is certainly a conversation that is very current.

The CHAIR: Thank you for your evidence before the committee today. A transcript of this hearing will be forwarded to you for the correction of minor errors. Any such correction must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days from the date of the letter attached to the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be

added via these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary submission for the committee's consideration when you return your corrected transcript of evidence.

It is possible that other questions will occur to the committee. Is it okay if we write to you to answer those?

Mr Webb: Absolutely.

The CHAIR: With that, I thank you very much for your time today.

Hearing concluded at 11.46 am
