

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

**ONGOING BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARINGS 2010–11  
(IN RELATION TO A MATTER ARISING FROM 18 OCTOBER HEARING)**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
MONDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2010**

**SESSION TWO  
TOURISM WA**

**Members**

**Hon Philip Gardiner (Chair)  
Hon Liz Behjat  
Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich**

---

**Hearing commenced at 2.05 pm**

**LAMONT, MS KATE**  
**Chairman, Tourism Western Australia,**  
**GPO Box X2261,**  
**Perth 6847, sworn and examined:**

**MAZITELLI, MR DAVID**  
**Deputy Chair, Tourism Western Australia,**  
**GPO Box X2261,**  
**Perth 6847, sworn and examined:**

**BUCKLAND, MRS STEPHANIE**  
**Acting Chief Executive Officer, Tourism Western Australia,**  
**GPO Box X2261,**  
**Perth 6847, sworn and examined:**

**LOWE, MR DAVID**  
**Executive Director, Corporate and Business Services,**  
**Tourism Western Australia,**  
**2 Mill Street,**  
**Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**VAN OORAN, MR DAVID**  
**Executive Director, Eventscorp,**  
**Level 8, 2 Mill Street,**  
**Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**BELFORD, MS DERRYN**  
**Acting Manager, Executive, Strategic Services,**  
**Tourism Western Australia,**  
**GPO Box X2261,**  
**Perth 6847, sworn and examined:**

**KEALLEY, MR PETER**  
**Chief Financial Officer, Tourism Western Australia,**  
**Level 9, 2 Mill Street,**  
**Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**The CHAIR:** Welcome. Thank you for coming this afternoon to this meeting. Before we begin I must administer the oath or affirmation. If you prefer to take the oath, please place your hand on the bible in front of you.

[Witnesses took the oath or affirmation.]

**The CHAIR:** Thank you. You have signed a document entitled “Information for Witnesses”. Have you read and understood that document?

**The Witnesses:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. Please be aware of the microphones and try to talk into them. Ensure that you do not cover them with papers or make noise near them and please try to speak in turn. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that the uncorrected transcript should not be published or disclosed. This prohibition does not, however, prevent you from discussing your public evidence generally once you leave this hearing. Government agencies and departments, as you would know, have an important role and duty in assisting Parliament to scrutinise the budget papers on behalf of the people of Western Australia, and the committee values that assistance. Members, it would greatly assist Hansard if, when referring to the budget statements, volumes or the consolidated revenue fund estimates, you please give the page, item, program amount and so on in preface to your questions.

It is not usual for us to invite an agency back so quickly after you have given evidence earlier. The reason that we have done this is the concerns about the answers to the supplementary questions that were asked and the answers that were provided back to the committee. We felt in a number of instances they did not answer the nature of the question or the detail for which we were seeking in that question appropriately. And the other thing is that, in taking questions on notice, if it is that there is a reason for confidentiality you cannot give the information, we would have expected that you would have appreciated that at the time of the hearing. Now, we expect all officers of agencies to be well informed. When you have detail, we fully understand that there has to be information retrieved after you go away and retrieve it and send it to us. But what we do expect is that where there are reasons that you would be unable to give that answer, you would have known that at the time of the hearing and we would have expected that to have been stated at the hearing. So, we have asked you to come back and there are a number of committee members who do have questions about the answers you gave. So that will come out. Questions?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** In view of what the Chairman has just stated, we are keen to find out some follow-on information from the responses that you provided in response to the questions that the committee sought information on. I want to follow up a question, which was question A5 the last time you were here. It is in relation to the return on investment calculations for the Holiday at Home campaign in 2009 and also for the Extraordinary Taxi Ride. I do not know whether you have got the response that you provided to the committee, but in terms of the return on investment calculation in response to question on notice A5, it states that "Booked a holiday in WA and seen advertising" 15 per cent of the people that took a holiday—I am assuming in WA—had seen an advertisement and booked a holiday in WA and only seven per cent had booked a holiday in WA and had not seen an advertisement. Now, I have to say that I am fairly curious as to how you in fact calculate the return on investment. I am also keen to find out what assumptions are made, if any, in relation to the model that is used for the calculation of return on investment. Just as a starting point, can Tourism WA outline the process for determining return on investment for advertising spend that is directly attributable to its advertising?

**The CHAIR:** I know that there are a number of elements in that question. Maybe you would just deal with the first one first in relation to the 15 per cent and seven per cent. Did you want that clarified from that table?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Yes, I think that would be a good start.

**Ms Belford:** If I could provide just a little bit of context before we go into the actual detail, to give you an idea of how we go about this. The traditional measure for measuring whether marketing and advertising work is to ask questions of consumers. We ask questions such as awareness, message-

take, “You have seen the ad, what is the message that you got from the advertising? How does advertising make you feel?” Those are traditional measures of campaign awareness. We use those traditional measures in our brand tracking. We do brand tracking in Perth, Sydney and Melbourne; we are interviewing every week and we have a very large sample of almost 10 000 people over the year who we are asking questions like that. But, like all forward-thinking organisations, we want to know return on investment. People are putting money in and we want to know what sort of money is coming out the back end, I guess, of that campaign. Unfortunately, return on investment is the holy grail of the marketing industry; it is the one thing that everybody in marketing, and in tourism, and would like to be to find out. Unfortunately, there is no one way of doing it. Lots of organisations in many industries are attempting to work out the best way of working out their return on investment. We are very keen to do that as well and we are looking at ways of doing that. We are using the information that we have available and we are making assumptions, and as I mentioned to you previously, those assumptions are laid out and transparent. But like all businesses, we cannot stand at the border and tick off everyone who comes, and we have very large surveys through Tourism Research Australia that try to estimate visitor numbers and visitor spend from domestic and international, but those are still estimates based on surveys. They make assumptions and we are making assumptions. What we have done is to start a process of working out return on investment and we are treating it as an iterative process. The first time we did it was for this Holiday at Home campaign and we used the data we had available from the tracking study and also from population statistics. Then, we have actually revised and reviewed our processes as we go through the campaigns, because obviously we learn as we go. But, I can talk you through the document that we actually provided for you if you like.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Sorry, just before you do, can you provide me or the committee with the assumptions that you speak about? What are the assumptions?

**Ms Belford:** I will talk about them as they go through the document?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Okay, yes.

**Ms Belford:** If you go to the centre of the document where you see the “Booked a holiday in WA and seen advertising”, this information comes out of our tracking study, so we asked two questions: Have people seen advertising? Did they book a holiday in Western Australia? What we found was that 15 per cent of the sample actually had “have both seen and booked”, but we also found that seven per cent had booked but not seen the advertising. So, you cannot possibly say that all 15 per cent of the market are actually booking, because they have seen a good portion of booking regardless. In this instance is what we did is take the seven from the 15 and we are looking at the incremental. We are making the assumption there that the difference between that group of people who have seen and booked and the people who have booked and not seen is the incremental growth—those people have seen the advertising and booked as a result. So, that is an assumption.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Hang on; can I just stop you there? Just because they have seen it does not mean that they have booked directly as a result of seeing it, surely.

**Ms Belford:** Well, that is one of the assumptions that we have had to make here, based on the information that we have had available. As I mentioned, when we go to the next study, which is for the Extraordinary Taxi Ride, we learned some lessons from this research and we have taken that to the next stage and made a different batch of assumptions. It is an iterative process—we do not have a full suite of information, we are learning as we go along.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can I just get something clear? We on this committee are the estimates and financial operations committee, so we have a responsibility to ensure that moneys are appropriately appropriated, that taxpayers’ moneys are not wasted, that the money can be accounted for, so on and so forth. Whilst we recognise that this is not an exact science, we would, at the end of your presentation, like to have some confidence about the way the agency actually formulates these calculations. And I have to say that what you have said so far is fairly concerning, because it just

seems to be a whole lot of learning experiences for the agency; that is what it looks like at this point in time.

**The CHAIR:** Let us get the remainder of the answer.

**Ms Belford:** Until I joined Tourism Western Australia two years ago, and I am bringing 20 years' worth of research experience and qualifications to this, Tourism Western Australia, like most organisations, was not doing anything around trying to work out return on investment. Everybody was looking at awareness, and all the really good measures, but they are not dollar related. So, what we are doing is trying to actually get to the bottom and understand or estimate how much return we are getting from it. And while I appreciate that they are assumptions, these are the assumptions that we have had to make based on the information we have and each time we are able to refine those assumptions, and that is how normal business practice works in terms of having to work out what gaps you have in knowledge and make assumptions. And then experimentation is the same—you make assumptions and test those assumptions; that is what we are doing here. We use information that we have available to us, so we have population statistics—this was based in Perth, the research—so we know the population of Perth in our target market and we also have National Visitors Survey information, which gives us an idea of an average spend. Now as I mentioned, the National Visitors Survey is a very large survey conducted by Tourism Research Australia. It is about 120 000 interviews done each year and, based on that information, they too make assumptions around waiting and the things that they do. They extrapolate up from the survey to get an estimate of how many people are travelling, how many people are travelling around the state, into the state and also for each of the other states. That information is pulled together and we get an average estimated spend. So, what we have looked at here is a conservative estimate of, based on the information we have, the difference between those who have seen and booked and those who have not seen and booked; we have extrapolated up to the population multiplied out by average spent. As a result we get that difference of \$12 million that you can see. So, that is what we believe, based on the information we have available, our incremental spend, and then we know we put in \$884 000 and if you calculate that out, it gives us 1 to 13.6 or 1 to 14 return. That is a conservative estimate based on the best information we have available for that particular campaign.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can I just ask you, in terms of other states and territories, do they calculate return on investment?

[2.20 pm]

**Ms Belford:** At our tourism research committee meeting in November we were discussing just this issue. Tourism Queensland has started looking at it and I know that the commonwealth department is looking at it as well. Each of us, potentially, is coming at it from different directions, but we have a commitment amongst the state and territory tourism organisations that will be talking, as we get information, to try to learn from each other. Tourism is probably one of the first places where this is really getting together to try to understand how to get a return on investment.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Does everyone base their analyses on the same assumptions?

**Ms Belford:** They will base their analyses on things like the average spend information because the work that is done by Tourism Research Australia is considered the authoritative source of tourism information. There are some ups and downs with some of the parts of it and there are some issues. If you look at our tourism quarterly snapshot, which goes on our website every quarter, you will know that we have a concern about one element of it, but it is the most authoritative source, given that it is not a census and no-one can actually know everything about what is happening. It is considered to be authoritative. It is also the information used in the tourism satellite account, which the federal government uses for all the work it does nationally and also for the tourism satellite accounts for each of the states.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** You mentioned earlier that you are improving this process all the time and that you have learned things from the Holiday at Home campaign after you went through that process so that you applied some of those things that you had learnt to the Extraordinary Taxi Ride campaign. Can you just walk us through what you learnt from this process and what is different from the methodology here compared with the methodology you used in the Extraordinary Taxi Ride campaign?

**Ms Belford:** With the Holiday at Home campaign we were looking at the incremental difference between the booked and not booked. If you look at the diagram that we gave you, which is attachment 6 from A5, here we started from scratch and said, “Let’s look at all the people who say they have booked”, and we used that as a proxy for visitation. Then we have done the same thing and have actually tried to divide that group into two groups: those who have booked and seen and those who have booked and not seen. In this diagram you can see that the Extraordinary Taxi Ride was not just in Western Australia; it was a national campaign. Here the two columns relate to just looking at the people who have booked and seen. You can see that on the left-hand side we look at the intrastate. We found that 10 per cent of the sample population had booked and seen. Over on the right-hand side is the interstate market, and that is three per cent. We have then gone to the next stage and said, like you mentioned, you cannot assume that just because you have seen advertising you have booked. How can we attribute the number having seen and the booking behaviour to that advertising? We have actually gone back to the same information that we used with the previous campaign; that is, looking at the difference between those who have booked and seen and those who have booked and not seen. What is that proportion like? What we have found in the intrastate market is that 25 per cent would appear to be booking as a result of the advertising, and in the interstate market that would be 75 per cent. We have used the same information but we have used it slightly differently because we have a bit more extra information to start with. We know the population based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics information and we have said, “Okay, we’re going to extrapolate that down.” You can see in those boxes that in the intrastate market that is equivalent to just over 21 000 people, and for the interstate market, it is about 65 000 people. Then we have gone to the next step and said, “We’ll take the information we know from Tourism Research Australia’s national visitor survey.” We know what the average spend is and we multiply that to get an idea of the direct impact. Again, we are working our way through the process to come up with a figure. Knowing how much we have put into the campaign, we can divide those two figures together and we get a return on investment of one to 13. We are using the same sorts of information. We are using bookings and whether they have seen the advertising, but we have combined it slightly differently here because we had the time and the information from the start of the campaign to actually work our way through the process. From what we have learnt from the previous campaign, this is where we have got to. The bit we are refining is around the attributing of the booking to the advertising, so we are looking at a number of different ways, with the information we have, to see if we can refine that further.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Is there any empirical evidence from other areas that looks at the correlation—because it must be something that is part of marketing generally—between the connectivity between booked and seen? This whole model is predicated on some assumptions based on someone having seen something so they have gone off to book or they have seen something and have not gone off to book. Has work been done in other disciplines that you are aware of in terms of the connectivity between seen and booked rather than booked and seen?

**Ms Belford:** We are working on looking at all these areas. Tourism is very different from most other things. A lot of the work that is done is in FMCG fast-moving consumer goods, so a lot of the work on the return of investment is about toothpaste, for example. If the toothpaste is in the shop and you have seen it on the shelf, you might be inclined to buy it. They are very different markets from tourism. With tourism, we have a really interesting situation at the moment. We already know from our work that people have a really high level of aspiration to come to Western Australia.

Within the Western Australian population we know that the community wants to travel in Western Australia, but what we are experiencing are really huge barriers. We have a very high dollar value, which is encouraging Western Australians to go outbound and discouraging people to come inbound, and we have really cheap overseas flights. The information and the proportions of how booking and buying something relate are not really relevant from FMCG work to tourism. That is why the tourism research committee is working at this, but each of us has to start somewhere. We are all working at it and we all, as I say, have a commitment to take forward what we have learnt together and to develop it from there. We are still using traditional measures as well. We know that the campaigns are increasing the proportion of people who think of Western Australia as offering extraordinary experiences. One of our objectives is to try to encourage people to know what to do when they get here, so we are measuring things like their knowledge of places to go, and those sorts of things are going up as well.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can I just ask, Ms Buckland, given what we have heard about the assumptions that this model is built on, would you agree that these figures that are the end point of this process are rubbery, to say the least?

**Ms Buckland:** No.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Why not?

**Ms Buckland:** Because I think that the research process that we have gone through has been a rigorous research processes. As Ms Belford mentioned, there were more than 10 000 people in our sample and 120 000 people in Tourism Research Australia's sample. Yes, there were assumptions that were made in the calculation of the return on investment, but I would definitely not agree that the figures are rubbery.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** But we do not have an established connectivity between two key elements of this model— that is, the booked and seen or the seen and booked. There are huge assumptions associated around whether one travels because one has seen an advertisement or whether indeed one travels because it was the intent of one to travel in any event.

**Ms Buckland:** I think that is the reason why we have discounted all the people who booked and had not seen the ad. That is why we have taken the incremental difference between the two.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** But you discounted by half or —

**Ms Belford:** By 75 per cent in the local market and by 25 per cent in the international market.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** How did you pull those figures?

**Ms Belford:** Because we have information that shows the difference between the proportion who have booked and seen and the proportion who have booked and not seen. We have divided one into the other and worked out that that looks like the attributable percentage. That is the best information that is available at this time. Based on other work that I have done in other industries, there is a huge difference from the east to the west coast in terms of Western Australia. We would generally find that people are more—70 or 80 per cent of people in Western Australia want to travel in Western Australia. So we would not, therefore, assume that just because they have seen the advertising, they are definitely going to book; and that is why we have discounted it by 75 per cent. So we are only really taking an attributable element of 25 per cent.

[2.30 pm]

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** But there is no science to this. I guess that is the point I am getting to. This is just a—the figure is done on a hunch.

**Ms Belford:** I would —

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Let me put it to you this way. Does the board have any evidence, surveys or anything to that effect, to support the view that the reason that people booked the holiday

was due to the advertisement; that is, what number of visitors booked a holiday on the basis of the advertising?

**Ms Belford:** One of the questions we have in the survey—this is part of the way we are talking about this iterative process—is that we have a question after the advertising that talks about, “What have you done as a result of seeing the campaign?”, and “I have gone to the website, or I have talked to my friends, or I have spoken about it, and I have booked.” But we are talking about small numbers of people who have done any of those things. This is people talking about what they have done after they have seen the campaign. There are margins of error with all survey material. So we are using that information to compare as we work through the process.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am interested, because from a common events point of view, Tourism WA and tourism-like bodies around the country have been doing return on investment surveys as far as I believe. So why can you not use that same methodology to determine whether your advertising campaign is having the same impact?

**Ms Belford:** The way that events works is that we actually have an event in one particular time situation, and we do surveys around that, trying to ascertain the incidence of international and national people who have come. We do the same sort of exercise and we extrapolate up to the population, and then we multiply it out by spend. So the calculation is very similar. All we are doing is we are not able to just go out—

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But —

**Ms Belford:** Well, we are doing the same thing. We are asking surveys of people whether they have booked a holiday in Western Australia.

**Ms Buckland:** I think it is much different to look at a group of people at Subiaco Oval, for example, and measure an event over a discrete period of time; it might be just a few hours, or a day. It is much different surveying that sort of captive audience, and the margins of error would probably be a bit less when you can look at an event. But as Miss Belford has said, the methodology or the approach, and the structure and the rigour to calculating the return on investment, is very similar.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But you have got the branding advertisements, and you have got the strategic advertisements, which are aimed at trying to get people to go and book a product. I would have thought that for those where people are actually booking a product, you do have a defined time, because the life of that advertisement and the impact that it is going to have on people is fairly short-lived, and if you are doing it with industry partners, you should be able to get to a point where you can have access to the people who have booked and you can immediately directly relate it back to whether that advertising has had an impact.

**Ms Buckland:** You are quite correct that there are two different types of advertising that we participate in—our brand advertising, and also our cooperative advertising, which is usually appearing at the same time as the brand advertising, and we do that in partnership with an airline or a travel agent or a travel wholesaler. We do receive from those operators that we partner with their estimates of the number of people who travel as a result of that specific cooperative advertising that we do with them. So we can calculate return in that way, and we do; we look at that. But the other thing we do is on a much broader scale. The purpose of this research is to look at the net effect or the combined effect of all that cooperative advertising and the brand advertising. For an individual cooperative ad that we might run with an airline or a travel wholesaler, the offer runs for a discrete period of time and generates a certain number of pax—500, 1 000, 750, what have you. But, generally speaking, there may be people who have seen that ad or one of our brand ads who are also booking a holiday and might be booking it through a different channel. So this approach is, I guess, a much more comprehensive approach. But at the same time, when we look at all of our campaigns, we also do look at what our partners are saying their results are. So, for example, if Virgin were to

have been a partner in this campaign, they would have provided us with the number of packages that they sold to Western Australia as a direct consequence of their participation in the campaign.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So in terms of trying to measure a campaign, would you not be better off actually separately measuring the two elements—those where you know for sure that the campaign has had an impact, whether it is through a cooperative marketing campaign which has had a direct offer of a product, and you record that and you can measure that, and then on top of that you may have a broader brand awareness campaign going, so you record what impacts you have in terms of brand awareness, and then it would be appropriate to make some assumptions about whether that has had a return on investment in terms of the likelihood down the track of people coming to travel, rather than trying to meld all of that into one figure, which is a return on investment?

**Ms Buckland:** I do not think we are melding it all into one figure. I think we do exactly what you are suggesting. We do the analysis with each of our campaign partners about the return on investment generated as a result of the cooperative advertising; and additionally, we do this type of research, which shows us the overall broad effect of doing all the types of advertising that we do, whether it is cooperative or brand advertising. So I think we are doing exactly as you suggest.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So where is that other information recorded—the more specific information?

**Ms Buckland:** Well, it is not. We have not included it in the answer to the question. With all of our campaign partners, the information that they provide us in terms of the number of sales that they get as a result of our campaign participation with them is treated as commercial-in-confidence. So we record that, and we keep that, but we do treat that information as commercial-in-confidence.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** On what basis?

**Ms Buckland:** On the basis that if we were to share sales data from Virgin Blue into the general public domain, that would be accessible by Qantas; or if were to share something from Discover West Holidays, that would be accessible by Australian Outback Travel, which is a direct competitor. So the reason we keep that information confidential is to protect those companies that we deal with from each other.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I can understand that in getting down into the specifics about how many bookings were taken. But in terms of the return on investment as a result of your investment in a campaign, I cannot see why that would need to be confidential. In fact, if anything it also provides confidence when you make future investment decisions that you are investing your money with the industry partners that get you the best return on investment.

**The CHAIR:** I think what you are suggesting, Hon Ken Travers, is the way you have packaged the reporting of the data, so that it does not identify the particular commercial partner that you are working with but it does represent the capturing of the market that you are doing for the state.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But also it is the detail to which you take down the information that is commercially confidential to the industry partner, not the outcomes of the overall campaign.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** As a follow-up question, what was the total cost of the “Holiday at Home” campaign?

**Ms Buckland:** I believe it was \$884 000, but that would exclude what tourism industry partners may have contributed to that campaign.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Could you provide the committee with all the costs of the campaign; that is, the contribution of the industry partners, plus the \$850 000—any costs that form part of the total cost of that campaign? As a committee of the Parliament, we will seek that information; and if you believe there is some confidentiality, you might advise the committee when you provide the information, and the committee will look at that and make the determination as to whether it is confidential or not.

[2.40 pm]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Maybe I misunderstood it, but you said there might be industry partner contributions on top of that \$850 000.

**Ms Buckland:** Given that campaign was in early 2009—well over a year ago—I cannot recall what the industry contributions to the campaign may have been.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Right, but there would have been industry contributions.

**Ms Buckland:** Generally, there are industry contributions when we run a campaign, yes.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Ms Buckland, when did you take up your appointment as the acting CEO?

**Ms Buckland:** In January 2010.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** So that was just before your time, okay. Also, do you have the total cost of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride with you?

**Ms Buckland:** Can we supply that to you separately as well, please?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Yes, you can in terms of contributions by government, contributions by industry partners and contributions by anybody else.

**The CHAIR:** First, supplementary information A1, for Hansard, is the expenditure by government and commercial partners and in total for the Holiday at Home campaign.

*[Supplementary Information No A1.]*

**The CHAIR:** Supplementary information A2 is the same information for the Extraordinary Taxi Ride.

*[Supplementary Information No A2.]*

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** In the last set of questions taken on notice, question A8 talked about one of my favourite subjects, Mr Van Ooran, the One Movement for Music Festival. Hon Ken Travers' asked for a list of the One Movement for Music Festival events, tickets sold, attendance figures and how many free tickets and to whom. The answer that came back, which you had to take on notice, was —

Tourism Western Australia advises that attendance documents contain commercial information sensitive to third parties from the public and private sectors, and that the public release of such information would provide rival host cities with an unfair advantage over Perth. This would have a significant adverse effect on the agency's business, professional, commercial and financial affairs, as well as those of associated third parties. The Committee is respectfully requested to reconsider its request in light of these additional facts.

My first question is: if that was to be your answer, why did you not give us that answer at the hearing?

**Mr Van Ooran:** I am trying to recollect what the answer was at the hearing. We were going to provide it as supplementary, were we not?

**The CHAIR:** I think it probably was, because that was —

**Mr Van Ooran:** Take that on notice.

**The CHAIR:** You must have taken it on notice and then the answer that you gave was as Hon Liz Behjat read. I do not know what the transcript of evidence would have recorded as a preliminary to you offering that supplementary information.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** It was “I don't have the information on hand” or something like that and “we'll get it for you”.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You gave a fairly long answer. At one point you said, “I do not have the final figures at the moment.” You also said —

The gate records and reports of the ticket sales are still coming through, but the early indications suggest a significant increase in ticket sales and revenue. I do not have the final figures at the moment. Attendances are around 12 000 or 13 000 over three days. We are relatively pleased with that. That is the festival side of things.

Then you went on to talk about the workshops and that is when we then got back in to asking if you could give us the details about the list of events, the number of tickets that were sold and the number of people who attended. Then I said, “I suspect there is a difference between the two”, and the Chair then said, “I assume you do not have that to hand.” Then we moved on to the next area.

**Mr Van Ooran:** There are a couple of parts here. I think generally we are happy to provide public attendance results for major events, but for breakdowns and the like there is a policy—which is pretty much standard across whether it be an art and culture event or a sporting event—to break it down and expose the full commercial detail, we do not do that in this state, neither do our competitors. They just do not disclose because it does allow competitors an unfair advantage to know exactly what an event delivers in terms of economic impact and visitation to the state. But we do have the breakdowns of the various events and the overall attendance figures that I think the minister might have provided through a parliamentary question in another forum. We are happy to provide those. They do break down the various events and the total attendance levels.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** The minister might provide something in another forum, but this is a committee of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia and we do not recognise anything that goes on in another forum. If we ask for information, we do expect that we will get that sort of information and this committee itself will make those decisions. You can provide information to us with a request that it remain confidential but that is then a decision that is made by this committee. We do not ask these questions lightly for any reason that we are just nosy about what is going on; we are doing it because we are the estimates and financial operations committee of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia. So, we are going to ask you again to provide the information that we have asked in our first questions with relation to that festival. We would like that information and if you want to request that it remain commercially in confidence, then we as a committee will make that decision.

**The CHAIR:** That is the procedure, I think, which is outlined there. If the question we ask is one that you might consider confidential, that is fine. The procedure is that the information is given because we are an instrument of the Parliament and you would request confidentiality stating the reasons. At the end I read that out. When you offer answers to questions, you can request confidentiality and give the reasons, and then we as a committee make the decision in the interests of the public of Western Australia whether that should be public or not. That is the procedure.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Did you just say that you have provided to another forum of the Parliament or through a parliamentary question the list of events and the attendance at each of them?

**Mr Van Ooran:** That is my understanding, yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So you have provided it to another part of the Parliament but you are not prepared to provide it to us because it is commercially confidential. What part of the request that we made is commercially sensitive, then, if you have given the list of events? Is it who you gave free tickets to?

**Mr Van Ooran:** No, we have provided a list of the events and the actual sales and complimentary and total amounts.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So if you have already given it in answer to a question, why was it not able to be provided to us?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Confer internally.

**Ms Buckland:** I do not know the answer to that question. You know that part of the process is also that all the data, all the answers to all the questions, go through our minister's office and they are reviewed by our minister. I am not familiar with that information that Mr Van Ooran has just cited, but if he says that that has been provided in a different forum, perhaps it has, and certainly we will come back to the committee and provide the information requested. I think you have clearly outlined the procedure and I understand it.

*[Supplementary Information No A3.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do we not have the information with us?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes, I have some information here.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Maybe we can get it now rather than take it on notice.

**The CHAIR:** Even better, thank you, Hon Ken Travers. If we can have that then, Mr Van Ooran. So I think the question was: for the One Movement for Music Festival events, tickets sold, attendance figures, and how many free tickets and to whom? Was that the question, Hon Liz Behjat?

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Yes.

**Ms Buckland:** Exactly as per —

**The CHAIR:** Exactly as per the question that was asked.

**Mr Van Ooran:** The breakdown to the last one “and to whom” is not available here. But I have some information that details a list of the One Movement for Music Festival events, tickets sold, attendance figures, and how many free tickets but not to whom.

**The CHAIR:** Okay, can you give us those first three then, please?

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Will you table that document you have?

[2.50 pm]

**Mr Van Ooran:** I will read them out, if you like. As I mentioned last time, there is a number of aspects to the One Movement for Music Festival. The first one deals with the MUSEXPO Asia Pacific conference and technology conference. There were 546 sales—250 complimentary; a total of 796. Festival attendance for Friday, 8 October was 884 sales and 984 complimentary, a total of 1 868. For the festival on Saturday, 9 October, there were 1 647 sales and 4 017 complimentary, a total of 5 664. For the festival on Sunday, 10 October, there were 1 228 sales and 3 322 complimentary, a total of 4 550. For the showcases—these are the evening activities—there were a total of 5 259 sales, 169 of which were gold passes, no complimentary, and the same total, 5 259. Then, of course, there was the fringe, which was the outdoor component across the city on various street corners and the like. That is basically an estimate of around 50 000 over four days from the Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. We think that is fairly conservative given the population in the city, but 50 000 has been attributed to people who have interacted with the fringe component of the festival.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** How do you define “interacted”? Have they walked past it?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Experienced it.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** How do you define “experienced”?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Look, saw, heard, noticed —

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Hang on. I drive past and I notice it; is that experiencing it?

**Mr Van Ooran:** I guess it comes down to personal definition, does it not?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Hang on. I mean, do not be cute. It is a straightforward answer to a straightforward question. This is a matter of how you define success or otherwise for the expenditure of public moneys on an initiative that the agency has funded, Eventscorp specifically. How do you define it?

**Mr Van Ooran:** As far as I can recall, people driving by were not included in this assumption. It was merely looking at the locations in the city, very broad estimates on the foot traffic throughout that period of time over those days and attributing a figure of around 50 000 people.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can you provide for us the assumptions of how you get to that figure of 50 000, because this is very, very important. It comes down to the integrity of the information that is put into the public arena based on a number of assumptions. When you say “foot traffic”, does that mean people walk past the event, people walk into the event or people were a part of the event? How do you define “foot traffic” as it interfaces with this event?

**Mr Van Ooran:** I will have to take on notice the amount of sites and the number of bands. Around 100 bands or artists performed over four days on a range of different stages or platforms across the city. I can take it on notice and break that down across the days and the hours of performance and show you how those estimations were made, but it is basically people who came into contact or experienced, looked at or saw —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** They were exposed to it.

**Mr Van Ooran:** That is right.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That was all it was. They were exposed to the festival, not that they interacted with it. They were exposed to it.

**Mr Van Ooran:** That is right.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Stick a busker in the mall and they are probably exposed to 20 000 people every lunchtime.

**The CHAIR:** Supplementary information A4 relates to the assumptions that define the fringe traffic assessment for the One Movement festival event in the City of Perth. Is it the City of Perth only or Fremantle?

**Mr Van Ooran:** The City of Perth.

*[Supplementary information A4.]*

**The CHAIR:** I think we can see the relevance of the information that the committee members are asking for.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** As part of that question, Mr Chairman, I wonder whether we can also have further information. You provided the attendance figures for each of the days. You also provided figures for the complementary tickets. For each of those days in which the attendance data was provided, could you provide the value of the complementary tickets and who those complementary tickets were given to?

**The CHAIR:** Not by person, by category?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** By category, I suppose.

**The CHAIR:** However, you are able to break that down.

**Mr Van Ooran:** I will have to take that on notice, of course. I cannot guarantee that I will be able to provide that, but I can certainly take it on notice.

**Ms Buckland:** I want to clarify that those complementary tickets were not tickets that were being handed out by Tourism WA; they would have been handed out by the event proponent. The organisation that was running the event —

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Who paid for them? At the end of the day somebody must have paid for them.

**Mr Van Ooran:** No physical cash payment is made for those tickets. Like many events, particularly concert events, a lot of complementary tickets are provided for a range of reasons, be it promotional, sponsorship, artists or VIPs or whoever that might be. There are a range of potential recipients of complementary tickets.

**Hon PHILIP GARDINER:** Please provide the breakdown of the complementary tickets by the most detailed category that you are able to.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Mr Van Ooran, on the 10th you said, if I recorded this correctly, that 1 229 people attended the concerts and there were 3 332 complementary tickets. Would complementary tickets be given out to make the attendance figures look better than they actually are?

**Mr Van Ooran:** I would have to ask the event organiser. Often they can be handed out to improve the atmosphere, energy and vibrancy of an event, but in terms of increasing attendance numbers, we do not milestone payments against the actual festival days. There is no payment related or need or incentive for anyone to do as you suggest.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Why were they? If there were 1 129 people at the concert, why were there 3 332 complementary tickets?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Again, that is a question for the organiser; you would be able to see that when they break it down. We can get some more information at that stage.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** On what do you base the success of the One Movement festival?

**Mr Van Ooran:** We tie our payments to delegate registrations to the conference and to interstate visitation and international visitation. This event must deliver certain numbers of visitors to the state to receive payment.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What is your return on investment for this event at the moment?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Again, I do not think I have that with me at the moment. We can look at our return on investment in a number of ways, be it economic, media and also outcomes for the industry et cetera. We can provide that breakdown if you like—the outcomes of the event in terms of those categories.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do you not even have a rough idea of what your return on investment for this is? It is one of your major development events.

**Mr Van Ooran:** We know that in the first year, 2009, the event delivered just under \$1.4 million in economic impact from visitation alone.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** For what sort of expenditure?

**Mr Van Ooran:** That was, again, \$550 000, which is only an estimate. Then, of course, we have the media impact for the event and the state, which has a dollar value attributed to it as well. I cannot recall that. I do not have that with me at the moment. You can combine those two. The third outcome that we consider with this event is business done and music industry outcomes. A report has been produced on that as well to show that the event is of meaning and relevance to the global or international music industry. That is the vision and that is where we are positioning it, so we look for credible reports on actual business outcomes for emerging artists. That is a third way that we can measure.

[3.00 pm]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do you have a business plan which shows that in year one you expect to get this return, in year two this return and in year five, this return?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we get a copy of that please?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes. It is a feasibility study.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is it a feasibility study or a business plan?

**Mr Van Ooran:** The feasibility study takes into account the business plan that we have provided. We have a five-year plan.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If you are not meeting the targets in that plan, do you review it after each year?

**Mr Van Ooran:** We review every event in detail.

**The CHAIR:** The business plan was asked for, but you have a feasibility plan, which encompasses the business plan.

*[Supplementary Information No A5.]*

**Mr Van Ooran:** We receive an event proposal which is not titled “business plan” but it is a proposal that is fully worked up that gives forecasting, budgets and modelling. We use that and we assess that. This is the same for all events.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Who does assess it?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Eventscorp and Tourism WA. The proposal comes from an external proponent and we spend a considerable amount of time undertaking due diligence, assessment et cetera.

**Ms Buckland:** Whilst we are providing this supplementary information, it may also be worthwhile to provide a copy of the milestone schedule just to completely answer your previous question.

**The CHAIR:** Is that against the business plan or against what you have?

**Ms Buckland:** It is the milestone schedule. It is our agreement between Eventscorp and One Movement which shows on what basis they get paid and what we are holding them accountable for.

**The CHAIR:** An additional part of supplementary information A5 is the milestone schedule associated with the One Movement Music Festival.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Who is the event organiser?

**Mr Van Ooran:** One Movement Pty Ltd.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Who are the people involved in that?

**Mr Van Ooran:** The majority shareholder is Sunset Events, a Western Australian-based company.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Given that a key criterion is how many international visitors come to this state, could you provide that information to the committee? How many overseas and interstate visitors came to the state as a result of the One Movement Music Festival?

*[Supplementary Information No A6.]*

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Who are Sunset Events?

**Mr Van Ooran:** A Western Australian-based company. I will give a brief potted history. I think it started out running Sunset Cinema in Kings Park more than 10 years ago and since then has evolved to stage and deliver significant music events. It is a promoter. It runs the Blues 'n' Roots Festival in Fremantle and the Southbound Festival in Busselton, which attracts close to 30 000 people over a couple of days. It also ran the successful event at the Perth Cultural Centre, the name of which escapes me. It is responsible for staging about eight or nine major music events per year in WA.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Can you provide me with the information that you have on Sunset Events? Who are the directors of that company et cetera?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes.

*[Supplementary Information No A7.]*

**The CHAIR:** That information will cover corporate details of Sunset Events and the events that it holds.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You are saying that those concerts that you gave us the figures for have no bearing on the investment that Tourism WA makes in the One Movement Music Festival. You are solely focused on the conference.

**Mr Van Ooran:** In terms of milestone payments, yes. However, in terms of the overall success of the event, we take all factors into account. For example, if one event is not performing or working too well, we will look to put that to the event organisers and ask for their response and see whether a remodelling needs to occur. Inaugural or new events can often take a lot of learning year in, year out and they reshape themselves year upon year. Milestone payments are not connected to sales from that festival at the Esplanade. If that is obviously not working or it is brilliant, on the other hand, of course we take that into consideration when we debrief the event organisers post the event.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is it a requirement of the contract they have with you to conduct those concerts on the foreshore?

**Mr Van Ooran:** In terms of milestone payments, no.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But in terms of the contract that you have with them, they could drop that event tomorrow and it will not have any impact on your agreement with them?

**Mr Van Ooran:** We would have to be comfortable that there would not be significant implications on the event model as a whole.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It is either part of the contract or it is not. If it is part of the contract, it requires them to conduct it as part of your contract, or they could drop it tomorrow and it will not affect your contract. It has to be one or the other.

**Mr Van Ooran:** I will have to review the contract in greater detail and come back to you on that.

**The CHAIR:** What is the information you want, Hon Ken Travers? The relevance of the contract to —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What requirement is in the contract to conduct the concerts for all elements of the festival? I think you have the showcases, the fringe and the concerts as well as the conference. From what you are saying, the conference is the key determinant of the milestone payments. I am assuming that is a requirement of the contract. What are the contractual requirements for those other three areas—the concerts, the showcases and the fringe festival?

*[Supplementary Information No A8.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do we have a target final rate of return out of this event that we want to get to?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Each year there are forecast estimations on economic impact returns. I do not have it off the top of my head but you will see that clearly in the information we have provided.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** For instance, if Wesfarmers goes into a new investment, it expects a minimum rate of return. Do you have a minimum rate of return that you expect out of events?

**Mr Van Ooran:** No. As I mentioned before, they have to demonstrate value for money. There has to be a strong rate of return for an event. The primary reason for supporting an event such as the Johnnie Walker Classic is not for the visitation directly attributable to that event, even though it is quite strong. The best value for that event is from the 100-plus hours of TV broadcast.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That is still a rate of return.

**Mr Van Ooran:** That is right.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** And you still measure that and end up with a final rate of return on investment.

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do you have a target level of rates of return on investment for events that you sponsor?

**Mr Van Ooran:** When we take them to the board for approval in complete totality, they work through the feasibility process and all the assessments and then make a consideration on the outcomes overall. There is a return on investment or returns on economic, media and other outcomes as well. That is taken into account alongside other factors such as whether we already have a rugby event and we want another rugby event. We take into account the time of the year, prestige and diversity in the calendar. Quite a range of factors are taken into consideration. For example, we would not have four or five ironman events per year, even though they do tend to drive some fairly reasonable visitation, but that would then be at the cost of other events. There are a range of reasons why an event might get supported. But at the end of the day, there has to be a very strong return, either economic or media.

**Ms Buckland:** In answer to your question, the feasibility study, which we will provide you a copy of, will outline our expectations of the event.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In terms of its final rate of return?

**Ms Buckland:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What protection do we have that after making that investment, the event will remain in WA?

**Ms Buckland:** I will ask David to correct me if I am wrong but I understand it is a three-year contract with options for a further 20 years.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Exercisable by whom?

**Ms Buckland:** It is at our discretion.

**Mr Van Ooran:** If it is performing and delivering, it is at our discretion.

**Ms Buckland:** If it is not performing and delivering, it is at our discretion not to continue to support it.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Basically, an event is guaranteed to stay in Western Australia for 20 years if WA wants to keep it here?

**Ms Buckland:** Yes.

[3.10 pm]

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Is it true that “One Movement for Music” promoters submitted their own attendance information in order to access \$800 000? Is that true?

**Mr Van Ooran:** No—sorry, I am not quite clear what you are saying. They received \$550 000 total.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Let us do this in two parts: first of all, do “One Movement for Music” promoters submit their own attendance information?

**Mr Van Ooran:** They compiled all the information in terms of registrations and attendances; they are then audited.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Who by?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Their auditors, but, equally, we have appointed an independent auditor ourselves to also review and audit the books as well, so to speak.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** So has this auditing all been done and your auditors and their auditors signed off on the attendance figures?

**Mr Van Ooran:** We have just got the final report through at the very end of last week and I have not quite got whether that has been completely locked away yet, but I will check that this week.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I wonder whether you can provide that information to the committee.

*[Supplementary Information No B9.]*

**The CHAIR:** B9 is the audit report given to you from your auditors of the results of the 2010, I presume, “One Movement for Music” festival.

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** You are not aware of them, at any point, submitting their own attendance information in order to access \$800 000 in government payments that were based on attendance, as I understand? For them in order to get money, they have to provide attendance figures—is that correct?

**Mr Van Ooran:** That is right.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** At any point did they provide their own attendance figures?

**Mr Van Ooran:** At some point they have to because they are the even organisers, so they definitely do because they are running the event. That is then audited—we require them to have those figures audited—and we, similarly, independently audit those figures as well.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** And you will provide that information to the committee.

**Mr Van Ooran:** Which? The audited results?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** The audited attendance figures. Who is your auditor?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Grant Thornton. Sorry, that is not Tourism’s auditor—sorry, it is Tourism’s auditors, not the event holders’ auditors.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** What about—they do not get done by an independent auditor, external to the agency.

**Ms Buckland:** Grant Thornton is an independent audit agency.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Going back, you indicated that the complimentary tickets were all given out by the events organisers, not by Tourism —

**Ms Buckland:** I did not say all of them; I just said some of those numbers were quite large, but that was based on the total number of complimentary —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So they were given out. I think you said you would go away and try to get the figures about the number of complimentaries sent out and to whom. Are you able to, within that, then give us an indication of those that were provided to the government and who those complimentary tickets were provided to?

**Ms Buckland:** I think we should be able to do that, yes.

**The CHAIR:** Can that be question B10?

*[Supplementary Information No B10.]*

**The CHAIR:** That will be those complimentary tickets given by the government, as distinct from the organisers. Is that it?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Well, yes.

My final one was, I think I remember seeing in the past that there has been some movement between the agency and the organisation running this event in terms of personnel.

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes, I think I know what you are referring to; yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I guess I am interested to know how you manage conflicts in the organisation with those sorts of things occurring.

**Ms Buckland:** That particular event—that instance that you are referring to—where an employee of Tourism WA left Tourism WA and went to go work for Sunset Events, was fully investigated by the Public Sector Commission. They made a number of recommendations to Tourism WA in terms of our policies and procedures. I would be happy to table a copy of that report, and, in addition, I would be happy to table a copy of what our actions have been against the recommendations that they made. But, generally speaking, they recommended that we finalise a draft policy on conflicts of interest, and that has been done; and they recommended that all of our staff undertake conflict of interest training, and to date I think 92 per cent of all of the staff at Tourism WA have undertaken the conflict of interest training. The remaining staff have not been able to for various reasons—parental leave, what-have-you—but we are closing in on that 100 per cent, and I, myself, have attended training on recognising and managing conflict of interest, as has the board.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can I just move to another area, and that is strategic planning and stakeholder engagement? You would be aware that there is quite a lot of industry concern about the recent changes to the agency and the closure of the regional offices and the funding being taken out of industry development and put into marketing, and so on and so forth. How would you describe your relations with the relevant industry stakeholders?

**Ms Buckland:** I think my relationships with the relevant industry stakeholders are fairly strong. Upon starting at Tourism WA a few years ago, I undertook to go out and meet individually with probably close to 100 operators and individuals who were either operators or associations, and I continue to maintain open channels of communications with those individuals. I think my relationships are pretty strong. I regularly seek feedback and input from people. I think a good example of that would be the development of the new brand, where we consulted more than 200 tourism operators as we developed that brand, and we made some quite considerable changes to the direction of the advertising, based on the feedback of operators.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Okay. I do note that you did not go to the industry Christmas party, so that is probably not a good —

**Ms Buckland:** Which one would that be?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I do not know; an industry Christmas party, I understand.

**Ms Buckland:** On Friday night? I was there; I did not see you there.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Well, I was not there, but I am assured that you were not at the industry Christmas party, but anyway.

**Ms Buckland:** I do not know what industry Christmas party you are referring to.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Okay.

The strategic plan: page 5 of the strategic plan states that you will implement a communications strategy for industry and stakeholders by 30 June 2011, yet the rest of the plan does not make any mention of this objective, or, indeed, how it will be achieved. Given the critical comments received from the stakeholders in 2009, what specific activities will Tourism WA undertake to improve its relationship with stakeholders? You might remember some of the stakeholder responses to the strategic analysis report were, basically, that Tourism WA is tired; Tourism WA has put itself at odds with many WA developers; and, Tourism WA has been called, in many circles, the “anti-tourism commission”, and so on and so forth. So given those sorts of comments, what specific activities will Tourism WA undertake to improve its relationship with the tourism sector?

**Ms Buckland:** Well, to be quite honest, I think we have already commenced that process. Not long after we announced the changes to Tourism WA, the chairman and myself undertook to visit regional centres across the state. We met with well over 100 tourism operators, local governments, and regional development commissions and talked through the changes with individuals. Generally speaking, we had, I think, a very high degree of support for the changes that we were undertaking. We have regular communications with the industry through our industry round table, which is a session we hold every two months. Some of the participants in that industry round table include the chief executive officer of TCWA, the chief executive officer of the AHA, the chief executive officers of all of the regional tourism organisations, the Caravan and Camping Institute, Qantas—not the chief executive of Qantas but the regional general manager of Qantas—and executives from Skywest, among others.

We regularly have an open exchange at those round table meetings where people provide feedback on what is happening in the industry and we provide feedback or updates on what activities Tourism WA is undertaking. We regularly seek feedback at those meetings about major strategic initiatives. So I believe that the dialogue is open and will continue in that vein.

[3.20 pm]

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I am just wondering whether you received feedback about accreditation of tourism operators; that is, whether you had received any feedback about extending the time by which to achieve full accreditation within the industry?

**Ms Buckland:** Yes, we have received some feedback about accreditation of tourism operators.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** And what was that feedback?

**Ms Buckland:** The feedback was that there were some concerns by one accreditation body—which is the Tourism Council Western Australia, which runs the ATAP accreditation scheme—that other accreditation schemes would also potentially be approved by Tourism WA as part of our overall accreditation scheme, and that would be in line with the national tourism quality accreditation scheme, which is being rolled out nationwide.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Did you consult with Tourism Council WA before writing to all the relevant stakeholders about shifting the deadline or putting it back further to 2011?

**Ms Buckland:** No. There was a small group of operators, approximately 100 in Western Australia, who had been accredited by the AAA, which is a scheme which is going to be included in the national accreditation scheme. We wrote to those 100 operators and no, I did not consult the tourism council on that.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Why not?

**Ms Buckland:** I chose not to.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Why did you choose not to?

**Ms Buckland:** There is no particular reason that I chose not to do that.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Surely you would have known that there were divergent views in the industry about the question of accreditation.

**Ms Buckland:** The primary factor is that the national accreditation scheme is going to include many types of accreditation schemes, and I certainly have not consulted all of those various accreditation schemes about what we do with the Tourism Council WA and the ATAP scheme.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Have you received a phone call from Laurie O'Meara about having made that decision?

**Ms Buckland:** No, I have not.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** You have not? Okay. Very good. Thank you.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** I have a couple of questions. In the last hearing I asked for a copy of the corporate and operational plans for 2010–11. As you are probably aware—I am assuming that you know the act fairly well—it is a requirement under the act that by 31 July each year those plans are provided to the minister. I asked for a copy of the one that you said was not ready because you had some staffing issues as to getting that, and also from the previous year. What then came back was—question A17—that I had requested a copy of the strategic plan 2008–13 and —

**Ms Buckland:** Sorry; perhaps there is some confusion. In question A14 you requested a copy of Tourism WA’s strategic plan for 2010–11.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Yes.

**Ms Buckland:** And that has been provided—strategic plan 2010–11. I believe it is on your website.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, it is. Well, it is here.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Yes, we have got it.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Is it on there now?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, A14 is here.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Okay.

**Ms Buckland:** Perhaps we misunderstood the question, but the question actually requested a copy of the previous years’ Tourism WA’s strategic plan 2008–13. That is what we have provided—the previous strategic plan, which was 2008–13.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** I do not have it.

**Ms Buckland:** Sorry, that is A17.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** That is fine. I will go onto another area.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Whilst we are on that area, maybe some of the confusion can be sorted out. You have got your strategic plan. Do you refer to your corporate plan as your strategic plan as well?

**Ms Buckland:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You have a five-year strategic plan and then you are doing an annual corporate plan and an annual operational plan.

**Ms Buckland:** We have the five-year strategic plan, which is what we refer to as our corporate plan. We have not updated our five years —

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Where is the annual plan that is required under, I think, section 16C of the act?

**Ms Buckland:** It has actually been posted to the website and —

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Each year a plan has to be done by 31 July under section 16C of the act —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Section 16B is the corporate plan and 16C is the operational plan.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Yes; each year, not once every five years.

**Ms Buckland:** That is correct. The 2010–11 strategic plan has been provided to you, and that is a one-year plan. Last year we did a one-year plan and I believe that is right at the back of the 2008–13 plan. I am sorry; it is attachment nine—A17.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** In your opinion, you are completely complying with section 16B and section 16 of the act by 31 July each year.

**Ms Buckland:** Yes; as I understand it.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** That is fine. The development commissions are taking on a role that previously Tourism Western Australia was looking after. Is there an intention that the two agencies—tourism and the development commissions—will be talking to each other in relation to

information sharing? There is a concern that if you take that role away from TWA and you give it to development, there is a lot of corporate knowledge there and there are things that happen between the department, and agencies generally do not like speaking to each other. I am just wondering whether you have a plan in place where there will be information sharing with the development commissions in those areas?

**Ms Buckland:** We have actually established a memorandum of understanding between Tourism WA and the South West Development Commission. It basically outlines how we are going to work with each other, how frequently we will meet with each other, who is going to do what and what our roles and responsibilities are. I think that is a good model for us to take forward with the other development commissions. It has been suggested to them but I really need to follow this through with them and have that conversation with each of them about a similar—it does not have to be the same—sort of relationship in which we hold one another accountable for talking to each other.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** May we please have a copy of the memorandum of understanding?

**Ms Buckland:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** That is a copy of the memorandum of understanding with the South West Development Commission.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** And TWA.

*[Supplementary Information No A11.]*

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** My last question is, I think —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Are you moving on from that area of development?

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Yeah, I am. Did you want a go now?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, if that is all right.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** I will be talking about redeployments next.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What is happening about the other development commissions—the other areas? For instance, you have five zones that you operate from a marketing perspective in regional WA. How are you intending to resolve that we do not go back to having the Great Southern Development Commission wanting to run their own branding and development and likewise for the other eight development commissions across the state? Having gone through all the hard yards to get people to focus on bigger brands—I completely concur with it; I was parliamentary secretary at the time and I remember the struggles that we went through to get to that point—the last thing that I want is to go back to a situation in which Peel wants its own brand. If I remember correctly, the research showed us that more people in WA thought Peel was a region of New South Wales than of Western Australia at the time. How are we going to manage that?

[3.30 pm]

**Ms Buckland:** I guess the first thing would be making sure that we have got strong relationships with the five regional tourism organisations who are responsible for promoting those five regions, and Tourism that WA and the five RTOs stick to our guns in terms of making sure that that is how we are doing our promotion. The relationship with the South West Development Commission, as I said, I think forms a good road map to how we can do it with other development commissions, but their responsibility is on the development site and not on the marketing and promotion side.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** So the South West Development Commission does not do marketing and promotion?

**Ms Buckland:** They would not market and promote the South West as a tourism destination. That is primarily the responsibility of Australia's South West, which is the regional tourism organisation, which is a membership-based association.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can I say, I understand that, but if you do not have a relationship organised at the same time with the Great Southern, if the development commission has decided it is not a priority or if they decide it is a priority, then the danger you run is that they will argue, “South West is all about Margaret River and it does not include Great Southern”, and there you will find, internally, pressures to create, through royalties for regions and other funding sources, promotion of the Great Southern separate to that brand of Australia’s South West. How do we resolve that and ensure that that does not happen? Because at the moment, your staff are all operating within that and your regional staff are also operating on those five regions. They might be located elsewhere, but they understood that, the development commissions may not.

**Ms Buckland:** I think they do, and certainly I have had extensive discussions with the various CEOs of the development commissions and I do not think they have any desire to become marketing agencies. I fully understand what you are saying and I think it is a situation that we will have to manage, and we can take that into consideration as we are establishing those rules of engagement.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If they are the only point of contact for the tourism industry with government, they will come under immense pressure. You can be as sure as night follows day that people will start to complain about the fact that there is not enough promotion of the Great Southern as opposed to the South West, as an example. When do we expect to have MOUs with the other eight development commissions?

**Ms Buckland:** I think you would probably be aware that the development commissions are being reviewed as well at the moment and we are awaiting the outcomes of that review. In some instances it has been difficult to get a bit of traction.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But you are pulling your resources out; surely you have a plan in place?

**Ms Buckland:** As I said, we are working towards establishing MOUs with the other eight development commissions.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So are your staff still going to remain in place until those MOUs are in place?

**Ms Buckland:** No.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Then why have we not got MOUs in place?

**Ms Buckland:** I actually do not think the memorandums of understanding are necessary in order for us to be developing and promoting tourism in this state. I think they will be useful; I think they will be helpful in collaborating across government departments, but I do not think that they were a necessary precursor, because the roles and responsibilities that the individuals in those regional offices were undertaking, as we discussed I think at the last committee meeting, are primarily one-on-one mentoring for small businesses, and that one-on-one mentoring for small businesses, and I am sure we discussed this at the last committee meeting, is being undertaken by the Small Business Development Corporation.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** They also did a range of promotional and development work and I accept that the South West Development Commission is moving into that space. In fact I think—I do not know if it is right or not—but the former tourism officer from the South West is now working for the development commission. In the other regions of the state have any of them picked up an officer to take on that development role?

**Ms Buckland:** No.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So who is going to do the development of the product?

**Ms Buckland:** That is something that they may have to do out of their existing resources. It varies from region to region, in terms of the importance of tourism to the region.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** So, in which region is tourism so unimportant that they do not have a requirement for the industry development component?

**Ms Buckland:** That is not what I said.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** No, well that is what I said. I asked you a straight question: in which region? Because by implication, from the answer you just gave before, it would indicate that there are some regions.

**Ms Buckland:** None that I am aware of.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** So they are equally important everywhere; industry development is important to all regions?

**Ms Buckland:** No, I did not say that they are equally important everywhere. You said, “In which region is it not important?” and I said, “None that I am aware of”, but I would not give it an equal importance in every region in the state, because in some regions of the state there are many more tourism operators and tourism is a much more important industry to the economy of that region than in other regions of the state. For example, in the Pilbara tourism is not a very important element of the economy, or not as important as it might be in the South West region. That is not to say that tourism development is not important in the Pilbara, but I am saying that the development commission and the local people in the Pilbara region may not place as much importance on it as people in the South West might.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Is that the only one that has a lower priority?

**Ms Buckland:** That is an example.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can I just finish off in this area?

**The CHAIR:** Okay.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do you think we have got a mature tourism industry in regional WA?

**Ms Buckland:** I think aspects of our tourism industry in regional WA are mature; I think we have got a very well developed wholesale system in place, or distribution system, and there are literally thousands of tourism operators that are now online and promoting their businesses online either through a wholesaler or directly linking to online distribution systems like Wotif.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But, are there whole areas across regional WA—I am talking more about the tourism experience product—where there are holes and gaps? I know there has been a lot of work done on Indigenous tourism to try and fill some of the gaps that are missing there. In terms of your ability to market and develop a brand in Western Australia—my experience has been that there are large gaps and holes in terms of product to actually fulfil the tourists. I mean, we may have a quality hotel, but it is that experience side that we are lacking, and I would have thought that is where the development work of the officers would have been occurring, and I am interested to know who is going to be doing that work to develop the tourism product and experience. The hotels are the easy side of it; it is actually giving people something to do. Well, it is not always the easy part!

**Ms Lamont:** Glad you think so!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But relatively. It is not an easy thing—in the current climate where there is pressure on building resources and all the rest of it, it is probably very hard. But even if you build a hotel, it has still got to actually have something to give the tourists when they get to that hotel, the hotel itself will not—

**Ms Buckland:** I think that the answer to your first question, which is: are there gaps? I do not think that there are glaring holes; I think many of the experiences that people come to Western Australia to have are natural experiences, and there are literally hundreds of tourism operators around the state who have taken advantage of those natural experiences, natural phenomena, which we have in

this state and develop products around that, whether that be whale watching in the South West or whether that be swimming with the whale sharks or the dolphins or what have you, there are products all up and down from the top of the state to the bottom of the state. There is a new product that is being developed at Home Valley Station, which is a cattle drive product. I think all of those experiences are attractive to our visitors or potential visitors, but they are unique from what is on offer in other places in the state. So, I do not think that there are glaring holes and I think that there are a lot of enterprising and entrepreneurial people who are building businesses around those experiences.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Back to the script: the South West Development Commission. Are you familiar with an event that they organised or put together called “The Taste of Indulgence” that was held in Bangalore last week in India.

**Ms Buckland:** I am sorry, I am not—

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** So, Tourism WA would have had no involvement in putting together that event?

**Ms Buckland:** Not that I am aware of.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** A whole range of people from the Margaret River region, South West region went to Bangalore and showcased their products and food and wines.

**Ms Buckland:** Not that I am aware of.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Okay, that is fine.

Off that question, how many employees are waiting for redeployment from Tourism WA?

[3.40 pm]

**Ms Buckland:** I do not have those figures to hand. David, do you have that?

**Mr Lowe:** Displaced permanent employees will be 23, plus or minus one or two with severances. In terms of registered redeployees, that is a timing issue. As an example, we will have an accountant level 6 who is a displaced permanent employee —

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Sorry, can you speak up a little bit? I just got off a plane and am a bit deaf.

**Mr Lowe:** There are 23 displaced permanent employees in the new structure, which we are transitioning towards. In terms of registered redeployees, that is a timing consideration. As an example, we have an accountant role within the organisation, which is not in our new organisational structure, so that person is a displaced permanent employee but they are not actually a registered redeployee at this time because they are part of our transition over the next six months.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** How long have they been displaced? It makes them sound like refugees, calling them “displaced persons”.

**Mr Lowe:** It is a terminology around government. It is difficult to grapple with. It is a bit better than “surplus” or what have you.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** How long have they been displaced?

**Mr Lowe:** From the time of identifying the structure and populating that structure in the normal restructuring principles under the public sector rules, we would have identified those as displaced employees and then started actively managing their career prospects within the public sector. That includes at some point registering for redeployment and redeployment action, but it also includes exploring prospects within the agency as well as secondments and the like.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** How long have they been there?

**Mr Lowe:** In about July or August we would have identified people who were displaced.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** From July this year until December—six months roughly?

**Mr Lowe:** Yes. You need to bear in mind that a number of those employees are required as part of our transitioning to the new structure, so we would have already started to engage with those people in that transition and the management process.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** During that period, has the commission engaged any consultants to carry out any work on behalf of the commission?

**Mr Lowe:** Yes.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Could you provide us with information as to those consultants that have been engaged by the commission during that period of time that we have had these displaced employees; what it was that they were engaged to do; at what cost they were engaged; and, if any of the work that these consultants are undertaking could have been done by any of those displaced persons? Could you take that on notice and provide the information?

**Mr Lowe:** I cannot give you the figures now, but I can give you most of that answer.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** If you can give them now, that would be great.

**Mr Lowe:** Oars Across the Waters is the company we engaged under the common-user agreement provided by the Department of Treasury and Finance to provide career and employee counselling services. I am trying to think of the other aspects of your question.

**The CHAIR:** What they did.

**Mr Lowe:** In terms of career counselling and employee counselling, that is the standard terminology in terms of the services they provide. There is career support, chain support and employee counselling.

**The CHAIR:** And how many consultants were —

**Mr Lowe:** Oars Across the Waters is the company that we used for that particular service.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** They were consultants provided to give counselling to those displaced persons et cetera. What about the consultants who have been hired to do any tourism projects?

**Mr Lowe:** The other company that we have engaged to assist in the management of our redeployees is a company by the name of Strategic Knowledge Solutions. They provide us with a person to assist with managing redeployees; it is not an employee counsellor, but a management coordination service to assist with the placement of employees in other agencies for secondment arrangements, trial arrangements and redeployment arrangements. Again, that has similarly been resourced from the common-user agreement under the Department of Treasury and Finance.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** So the only consultants employed by the commission in the last six months have been the consultants to deal with the redeployment issues?

**Mr Lowe:** There is a specific definition regarding consultants and answering that, so I am talking about contractors that we engaged to provide services to assist with these redeployees. There is a specific definition that I understand is used in providing the answers on consultants. We provide strategic, managerial advice, as opposed to contractors providing operational type services.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** I do not know what the terminology is that you use for these various people, and it would vary from agency to agency. We cannot be across all the nuances of what every department uses. We have a number of displaced persons who do not have a job at the moment. What I want to know is have other people been given contracts, or however you want to term it, to do work for the commission that could have been carried out by these displaced persons who have no work at the moment?

**Mr Lowe:** No.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** No?

**Mr Lowe:** No. These are specialist skills issues that we are looking for for coordination. They are employee counselling, career counselling, changed management supports and management interventions that we are seeking. We are looking for skill sets that were not in those displaced employees.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I wonder whether you could provide to the committee the list of contractors and consultants engaged by the agency over the past 12 months. Can you also provide the nature of the contract work, the value of the contract work and the directors of the company, if the contractor is a company.

**Mr Lowe:** In relation to what? Is it to every single contract and consultant?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** You would not have that many. Have you got that many?

**Mr Lowe:** Are you relating to redeployees?

**The CHAIR:** No, I think your question is broader than that.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I am asking for the contractors and consultants that have been engaged by the agency in the past 12 months. Unless you are very exceptional, and you might be, and if you are, then I would expect this to run into 30, 40 or 50, otherwise it should be nine, 10 or 11.

**Mr Lowe:** I was just seeking clarification.

**The CHAIR:** That is fair enough. All we want to know is whether it is just for the redeployment —

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** No, it is broader. It is for the whole commission.

**The CHAIR:** For the whole commission; I beg your pardon.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** If you think, for example, that it is going to run into 100, you might come back to the committee and indicate that that is the case, but I would be very surprised if it did.

**The CHAIR:** This is for the period —

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Let us call it the past six months; that will do.

**The CHAIR:** Those appointed as consultants or contractors to undertake work for the commission in the last six months. Whatever that is—13 June.

*[Supplementary Information No A12.]*

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** And what they have been engaged to do.

**The CHAIR:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I want to turn to the answer that you provided to us for A15. I just want to go back to the transcript. I actually asked in the transcript, “Did you identify potential partners and write to them; and, if so, can we get a list of the potential partners that were written to and can we also get a copy of the selection criteria on which you based your selection of the partners, along with a list of the partners that you were engaging with as part of the multimedia marketing campaign.” I have a copy of the selection criteria. What we do not have is those people that you contacted and wrote to, and also those that you are actually engaging with in these cooperative campaigns.

[3.50 pm]

**Ms Buckland:** I am sorry. Unfortunately, that is not how the supplementary question came through. It just said, “Details on the selection process for cooperative partners”. But I am happy to provide that list.

**The CHAIR:** Now we are being particular about repeating the question that we are asking. So there was some ambiguity.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** We did give a summary. But it was very clear in the transcript what we were asking. I appreciate your comments.

**The CHAIR:** We have taken cognisance of that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Even though we do not have that information, was that the level of the selection criteria, or would you have had a more detailed selection criteria assessment document? They seem to be more the headings than the actual selection criteria that you have provided us with. Do you not for each of them have a weighting and more detail under that?

**Ms Buckland:** That is the actual criteria. If I might just add, this year is the first year that Tourism WA has actually undertaken this approach to cooperative marketing. Previously, it was not done in this professional fashion. So, no, we did not have percentages that were assigned to their selection criteria. We went out to the market and asked for proposals, and then we evaluated the proposals based on those criteria. As you will appreciate when you see the list, there are airlines, there are tour operators, there are wholesalers, and there are also some retailers on there. So every business would have a different way of approaching how they want Tourism WA to partner with them. So it is very difficult to compare a proposal from an airline with a proposal from a travel wholesaler like Discover West Holidays. It is not an apples with apples comparison.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, it is not. But I would have thought that was all the more reason to have a fairly complex matrix for how you assess those—because we all know that the tourism industry can be fairly competitive against each other as well as against other states—so that they can be confident that they have or have not been successful based on some rigorous selection panel, not on the whims of the person doing the assessment.

**Ms Buckland:** I will take that feedback on board. But this is the process.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So no weighting is given to any of those?

**Ms Buckland:** Correct.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So someone could give you a fantastic return on investment, but if they do not have a spread of regional tourism product, it may not get up?

**Ms Buckland:** It would be hard to imagine how they could give us a fantastic return on investment if they did not have a representation of product in their portfolio. It would be very difficult to imagine how they could do that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Was it a requirement that the operators actually have the ability to service the areas of the state that they are promoting? For instance, we do not even know which airlines are going to be servicing parts of the state. There are lots of rumours around, but there are still no notices out there. I am interested to know how you would manage that part of the assessment in terms of, say, an industry partner that is an airline, if you do not know which airline is going to be flying to large chunks of the state. An airline may be promoting an area, which is great, but it may not end up having the right to fly to that area.

**Ms Buckland:** The proposals would have been accepted on the basis of what is actually —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** There now.

**Ms Buckland:** — there now, or at the time when they made the proposals, which was back in the April–May time frame. That is the basis on which the proposals would have been assessed, not what might happen in the future.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Because the decisions have been made, do you have detailed documents that go through the assessment of each of the proposals and the basis on which they have been determined?

**Ms Buckland:** I am not certain if that is something that we have done; but if we have it, I can provide it.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I assume you would have had some sort of assessment process that is formally documented to arrive at the decision; as you would with any other tender, I would have thought. So if we could have that as supplementary information, please.

**The CHAIR:** Can you just go through that again, Hon Ken Travers?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It is who was written to; who they are partnering with; the selection criteria—well, we have just been told there are no detailed selection criteria; and any documents that were used as part of the assessment process that was gone through for assessing each of the proposals of the industry partners.

*[Supplementary Information No A13.]*

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Miss Buckland, I just want some information in relation to the two audience members who travelled to Western Australia as part of the Oprah visit. Was there any payment by the state government, or through your agency, for those two people to visit WA? What arrangements were made?

**Ms Buckland:** There was no payment to Tourism Australia or to Harpo, which is Oprah Winfrey's production company. We did, however, make a contribution to their travel expenses.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** What happened during their time here?

**Ms Buckland:** They visited a range of different tourism attractions in Perth. They went to Cottesloe. They went to Rottnest Island. They went to Kings Park. They went to Fremantle. They also had a visit to Margaret River, which unfortunately was abbreviated because the gentleman became ill and had to have medical treatment.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Will there be some sort of assessment by Tourism WA of the net impact of them coming here?

**Ms Buckland:** Ultimately, there will be an assessment of the net impact or the impacts of them coming here. It is too early to assess that now because we do not know. A film crew accompanied them and captured footage and still images. We will not know until the actual shows are produced and aired how much Western Australian footage actually appears in those shows. So that will be one measure of the outcomes of the initiative. Then I guess another measure of the outcomes of the initiative will be that we are actually conducting a marketing campaign in the United States, with some key travel partners based on the west coast of the US, and we will have some assessment of the success of that campaign. That will be much further down the track, probably not until, I would say, May or June of next year.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** So that is the time frame to get any sort of evaluation?

**Ms Buckland:** I think that would be a reasonable time frame to get an evaluation of the impacts of the marketing campaign in the US. We should have in probably the February time frame a better idea of the media coverage that was gained or the footage that actually appeared in the show, and some quantification of that.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Thank you. Lastly from me, in terms of the tourism outlook, I keep a keen interest in the intrastate and the interstate visitor estimates, and the quarterly snapshots. You do not have to be a rocket scientist to know that intrastate and interstate visitations are considerably down and have been for quite some time, and the industry is doing it tough. What is concerning to me is that if the fly in, fly out figures are also a part of the picture that we have here, then the situation is much worse than is currently being presented. Firstly, are fly in, fly out figures included in this data? Secondly, can you extrapolate for the purposes of the committee the fly in, fly out figures out of the data so that we might see what the real situation is with the tourism industry?

**Ms Buckland:** I will ask Ms Belford to answer that.

**Ms Belford:** The information that comes from Tourism Research Australia, which is the authoritative set of data that I have mentioned before, does not include fly in, fly out. That is because of the way the survey is asked. So it is actually looking for short-term visitors, whether they be for business, visiting friends and relatives, or leisure; it is all short-term visitation. We also get figures from Westralia Airports Corporation. We used to triangulate the data. So we are looking at a number of different data sources, because, as we have said before, these are estimates, and we are looking at whether all the information actually tallies up and whether it looks as though it is telling the same story. The information that is included from the airport does include FIFO, or commercial FIFO. So if people are hopping on commercial planes, those pax, or passenger, data figures are included in there.

At this point in time it is an issue both for us and Tourism Queensland—that is, FIFO going in and out—and it is something that we are looking at, but we are not able to extrapolate out and give you an idea of FIFO. We need more information to come from the airport and at this point in time they do not have full records either, so we cannot provide that information.

[4.00 pm]

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Okay. You referred to the fact that there is one set of figures that do not include FIFO information, where can those figures be sourced and can the committee have access to those figures?

**Ms Belford:** That is Tourism Research Australia—the national visitor survey—information. That information is produced on the quarterly tourism snapshot and on the website at the moment is the QTS—quarterly tourism snapshot—for the year ending June and within the next week will be the quarterly tourism snapshot for the year ending September.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Can you provide to the committee the one that is due in a week's time? Are they definitely the ones without the FIFO figures?

**Ms Belford:** Yes, they are the estimates based on short-term visitation.

[*Supplementary Information No A14.*]

**The CHAIR:** That supplementary information is the quarterly tourism snapshot.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Regarding your answer to A7, maybe to assist you I can ask whether we can get for the past three years a list of all the events that you have provided financial support to and what has been the return on investment for each of those events.

[*Supplementary Information No A15.*]

**The CHAIR:** So that is for the past three years all the events to which funds from the tourist commission of Western Australia has gone and what was the rate of return.

**Mr Van Ooran:** Is that 2007–08, 2008–09 and 2009–10?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes. If you record it in financial years or the calendar years—I am happy with financial years—whatever is easiest. I just want to check that your rate of return measures both economic impact in terms of direct spend and the media impact. Does it not?

**Mr Van Ooran:** Yes, they are separated —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** They are separated and then added together to create a rate of return.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I wonder whether you could also provide for us the major events that you have scheduled for 2010–11 and for 2011–12 and, in fact, as far as you can in the out years.

**Mr Van Ooran:** That are scheduled?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Scheduled.

[*Supplementary Information No A16.*]

**The CHAIR:** That supplementary information is scheduled events for the future years.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Yes, and I am interested in the major events in the out years. I am not particularly interested in the cherry festival because it would be one of the local staple events—I do not see them as major events—I am talking major international events.

**The CHAIR:** So that is the last of the formal questions. Ms Kate Lamont, would you like to make any remarks or to give any overview at all?

**Ms Lamont:** No, thank you.

**The CHAIR:** Okay. Before closing, I just say that you no doubt have felt the concern that some of us have had about the answers to the previous questions. I think that this has been a very useful session because we have managed to remove some of the ambiguity. We have been able to see some of the changes that you are working towards and I think we have a little flavour of some of the different areas through the responses that you have given, and thank you for that. I think there is one issue for you David that we need to have the substantiation of the benefit of the results. It is something that I think you have a feel for, because it is very easy to put numbers in and it is a matter of the substance behind them. That is something that I think this committee has a particular concern for.

I thank each of you for coming and giving your time. If we have any further questions, they will be made to you via the minister in writing in the next couple of days, together with the transcript of evidence, which includes the questions you have taken on notice. If members have any unasked questions, I ask you to submit these to the committee clerk at the close of this hearing. Responses to these questions will be requested within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Now with Christmas coming upon us, that may not be possible, but should you be unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible prior to the due date. The advice is to include specific reasons as to why the due date cannot be met. I thank each of you for coming in and giving us the benefit of this additional information.

**Ms Buckland:** Sorry, I have a clarifying question on those last instructions because some of the information that has been requested will be quite straightforward to put together and some of it is going to take a bit more time, if we are able to provide some information but not all of the information, is —

**The CHAIR:** Anything basically reasonable.

**Hon LIZ BEHJAT:** Especially at this time of the year.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, that is fine.

**Ms Buckland:** Thanks.

**Hearing concluded at 4.05 pm**