

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

ONGOING BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARINGS 2010–11

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
MONDAY, 18 OCTOBER 2010**

**SESSION ONE
WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION**

Members

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

Hearing commenced at 1.08 pm

FARAGHER, HON DONNA

Minister for Environment representing the Minister for Tourism, sworn and examined:

BELFORD, MS DERRYN

Acting Manager, Executive and Strategic Services, Tourism WA, sworn and examined:

KEALLEY, MR PETER

Chief Financial Officer, Western Australian Tourism Commission, sworn and examined:

BUCKLAND, MS STEPHANIE

Acting Chief Executive Officer, Tourism WA, sworn and examined:

VAN OORAN, MR DAVID

Executive Director, Eventscorp, sworn and examined:

LOWE, MR DAVID

Executive Director, Corporate and Business Services, Western Australian Tourism Commission, sworn and examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to the meeting this afternoon. Before we begin, I am required to administer either an oath or an affirmation. If you would like to take the oath, there is a copy of the Bible on the table there in front of you. The question to all witnesses is: do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you give is the truth and nothing but the truth under contempt of Parliament and penalty of false evidence?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: You will have all signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood this document?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: The proceedings this afternoon are being reported 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 that you might refer to during the course of the hearing, and please be aware of the microphones and try to have them pointing directly at you. 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 this afternoon's proceedings, you should request 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 Please note that the uncorrected transcript should not be published or disclosed.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 the hearing. Government agencies and departments have an important role and duty in assisting Parliament to scrutinise budget papers on behalf of the people of Western Australia, and we value your assistance this afternoon. Members, if you could please preface your questions by

reference to a budget volume, page number, item or program and amount, that would be most useful.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Through you minister, I wonder whether we could just turn to page 396 of the budget papers. Specifically, I am looking at the appropriations, expenses and cash assets and the total appropriations provided to deliver the services. We see in 2010–11 that \$61.7 million has been appropriated. When we look at the forward estimates at 2011–12, we see that that is reduced to \$52.6 million and then for 2012–13, it further is reduced to \$48.7 million, and in 2013–14, we see it is up slightly to \$49.3 million. I am assuming that the reductions in part are because of the \$31 million that has been taken out over the forward estimates as a part of the new direction of Tourism WA and shifted across to marketing. Through you, minister, I wonder whether we could have a response from Ms Buckland in relation to that.

Ms Buckland: Sure. The actual reduction is a result, if you subtract the transitional funding, which is \$12.4 million over three years, from the appropriation during that period of time, the difference is it goes from \$56.9 million in 2009–10 to \$53.2 million in 2010–11, \$49.3 million in 2011–12, \$48.3 million in 2012–13 and \$49.5 million in 2013–14. All that I have simply done there is I have subtracted, if you look at the bottom where it says “A Better Future for Tourism in Western Australia” \$8.5 million, \$3.3 million and \$500 000 across the three years. If you subtract those —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: No; hang on. Can you just tell me which page you are on, Ms Buckland?

Ms Buckland: I am on page 396.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes; okay.

Ms Buckland: At the bottom of page 396, there is major spending changes, “A Better Future for Tourism in Western Australia”. That is what we refer to as our transitional funding, and that is the funding we have been appropriated by government to effect the transition from the previous structure to the new structure. So, that is the primary reason why the budget goes down in the out years. That is number one. The second reason is, if you look right underneath that, you will see the reinstatement of media, marketing and advertising savings. That is \$1.3 million that we have in our budget this year that we do not have in our budget in future years, and that is something that we have received a dispensation from both last year and this year. Then, finally, the other reason why the budget goes down and why the forward estimates go down is that the events funding is less in 2012–13 and 2013–14 than it is this year and next year. That is primarily because of the additional moneys that we have been given for the ISAF Sailing World Championships, which happen in December next year.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Ms Buckland, you would be aware of some industry concerns about the future directions of Tourism WA, and you might be aware that some people in industry are of the view that the level of support provided to them under the new arrangements, as opposed to the previous arrangements, may in fact lead to fewer support services for them generally. Are you aware of that?

Ms Buckland: I am aware that some members of industry have some concerns about the restructure, yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay. Given that you are aware of industry concerns about the restructure, in terms of your understanding of their concerns, can you advise the committee what your understanding of their concerns is?

Ms Buckland: My understanding of some of the concerns that have been raised by industry is it is primarily concerns that have been raised by smaller tourism operators who are concerned about Tourism WA not providing some of the one-to-one business support services that we have in the past. What we have done to counter that or to work with industry on that is we have been working

with the Small Business Development Corporation to transition some of those support services from Tourism WA to the Small Business Development Corporation.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What are you doing about those concerns, can I ask?

Ms Buckland: As I have just explained, we have been working with the Small Business Development Corporation to transition some of those business support services from Tourism WA to the Small Business Development Corporation, who has 25 offices around the state.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Can you give us some practical examples of that? Exactly what has been transitioned to SBDC?

Ms Buckland: Yes. There have been three staff members that have been transitioned from Tourism WA to the Small Business Development Corporation. They are in the Aboriginal tourism area but they have general tourism knowledge and experience, and they are augmenting SBDC's existing tourism expertise. They actually did already have people on staff with tourism experience. We have also transitioned some funding to SBDC so that they can work to train their 25 regional offices to provide tourism support services. We also have several tools which we have transitioned to SBDC, one being the tourism e-kit, which is an extensive manual on how to become literate in how to promote your business online, and that is a tool that we have made available to the Small Business Development Corporation for their training. The other piece of literature or training that we have transitioned to the Small Business Development Corporation is a tool called the jumpstart kit, which explains to aspiring tourism operators what it means to be in the tourism industry, what sort of commitment you have to make and how to go about becoming a tourism operator.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I just take the opportunity to read to you something I received from one of your operators only about an hour ago which would indicate, I think, the sense of frustration with small tourism operators out there who do not seem to have any understanding that perhaps they should be now communicating with the Small Business Development Corporation? I guess that is a concern, and certainly it is causing frustration. It says, first of all, such and such —

... I fully understand that you are only doing your job.

We, like many small operators, are as mad as hell and wish to communicate to Tourism WA that we have no faith whatsoever in the competency of the Board and CEO to promote our business effectively and efficiently to the local, interstate or international markets.

[1.19 pm]

With respect to advertising and WA Tourism publications, as long as Tourism WA continually promotes specific operators for free, we are not interested in spending our hard earned dollars in your mediums. It begs the question — why are these operators given preferential treatment?

I wonder if you could give me a response. That is just one of a number of indicators of people being dissatisfied with the position they now find themselves in as a result of this new direction that the agency is now taking.

Ms Buckland: Sorry—but what is the question?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What are you doing to address this level of anger and concern by some of the small business operators who are doing it tough, and, seemingly, are not getting any support or response from Tourism WA?

Ms Buckland: I have certainly not received a letter from that operator that I am aware of, and I have certainly not received any indication from any operator that they are, as you said, “mad as hell”. What I can say is that the Tourism Council of Western Australia has been very supportive of the transition that Tourism WA is making. I believe that they have hundreds of members around the state, many of whom are small businesses, and they would have canvassed the views of those businesses before they would have weighed in in support of the restructure.

The other thing that I can say is that we have established, just this year, as has been published in our *Talking Tourism* newsletter for the past three weeks, a regional cooperative marketing fund for small business operators. That has been as a consequence of some of the feedback that the chairman and myself received when we toured around Western Australia extensively between the months of June and August to talk about the restructure. That is a cooperative marketing fund whereby at least three tourism operators would band together and they were put forward a proposal and Tourism WA would then put forward some money to match their funding. The details of that are available on the Tourism WA website.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In terms of the real, direct support to industry, never mind the \$31 million that you have transferred across from marketing over the next few years, in terms of real industry support, can you advise me whether you are in fact looking at new funding options, new means by which you might fund, I suppose, industry support for the tourism industry?

Ms Buckland: What types of industry support?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Things like an accommodation bed tax or a table tax or indeed any other tax structures that maybe have been looked or are possibly under current consideration by —

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: I think that is a policy matter for government, is it not?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Madam Chair, I think that Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich is straying somewhat from the budget papers. She is asking for information with respect to initiatives that, to my mind, are not listed in the budget papers, so I would ask for your direction in relation to that.

The CHAIR: Yes. I think that question is a matter of policy, unless there are specific —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: From my point of view, here we have got a huge gap. We have got \$31 million that has been taken out of the budget and I think that is fair enough to ask whether some alternative funding models are being looked at by the agency as to —

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: But that is a matter for policy for the government to discuss in relation to funding models. not for the —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I am sorry. honourable member, but I do not think so.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Well, I do.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The bottom line is that we have an agency that is going to lose 85 staff and virtually half of its budget, and we have got an industry that is doing it tough and is seeking some support from the government. It is a fair enough question to ask: whether, in fact, the government is looking at alternative revenue streams so as to provide the funding to support the industry to the extent that it desires and no doubt warrants.

The CHAIR: I put that question to the minister.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Madam Chair, again, I just put it to the member. I appreciate the questions that she is seeking. However, we have the budget papers in front of us, and this is the reason why we are here. Requesting speculation on a range of matters that are beyond the scope of this is beyond, in my view, what we are here to deal with.

The CHAIR: I can understand that as an acting minister, you would not be able to answer that question. I am not quite sure that the question is totally out of order; it is a question about a shift in priority. Hon Ken Travers has a question.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe if I can ask the question: has Tourism WA been asked to develop any proposals for alternative sources of funding for their budget? I am not going into policy —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Are you talking about the budget for this year?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No, we are talking about their budget papers, which include —

The CHAIR: Forward estimates.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: — the estimates for the four years of forward estimates, and I am asking whether or not Tourism WA has been asked to prepare any options or alternative sources of funding to supplement their budget over the next four years.

The CHAIR: I think that is a fair question. The budget goes forward to 2014; it is not just this current year.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And it is just a straight statement. I am not asking for merits, which are the policy questions.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I appreciate that we do list the forward estimates; however, these are matters of policy for government. I am the acting minister, so I hope you appreciate that, but I do think it is —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: There must be a big event to be launched then!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Now, now! However, matters surrounding the budget and the like do have certain elements of confidentiality and the like. I question the appropriateness for the officers to be able to respond to that.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Madam Chair, with all due respect, minister, your response would indicate that there is some policy announcement that may not be too far away, because, quite clearly, it is a straightforward question to ask. We are not asking a level 9 policy officer. We are asking—are you the acting CEO or the CEO?

Ms Buckland: The acting CEO.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Well, your video actually is different on the internet, but anyway. We are, in fact, asking the person charged with the responsibility for this organisation —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am aware as to what you are asking.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But, also, we are entitled to know whether or not the resources of the agency are being used to develop new models of funding sources for the agency. That is what I am asking—whether any of the current resources of the agency are being applied to that process—and I think it is quite reasonable to ask it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Have consultants been hired?

The CHAIR: I consider it a fair question.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can we please get a response?

Ms Buckland: Sorry, there have been a number of questions that have been asked —

The CHAIR: Would you like Mr Travers to repeat the question?

Ms Buckland: Could you please repeat it?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I will go to my final question: are any resources of the agency, over the current financial year, expected to be used to examine alternative sources of funding for the agency?

Ms Buckland: No. I have not been asked to examine alternative sources of funding for the agency.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Have you had any work done, or commissioned any work, in relation to an accommodation bed tax, table tax or a combination of any of those?

Ms Buckland: I have not commissioned any work, but I think you would be aware that when the board did their strategic analysis, they commissioned some work from the marketing centre. I believe that that document has been tabled in Parliament or provided to you in response to an FOI request. That is some work that was done by the marketing centre where they looked at a range of different destinations around the world and how those different destinations fund their tourism-destination marketing.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And you are doing no further work on examining the options that were included in that report?

Ms Buckland: No.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Could you advise when that work was completed?

Ms Buckland: Honestly, I cannot recall when that piece of work was completed.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: And I have to say I do not remember seeing it as part of an FOI.

The CHAIR: Perhaps if you could take that on notice it might be —

Ms Buckland: We can supply the document; we can table it if that is a request.

The CHAIR: Okay; thanks. I will ascribe that a number. It will be A1 if you provide that as a supplementary bit of information, thank you.

[Supplementary Information No A1.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Just going back to the restructure and the decision to restructure the agency, which was, I think, breathtaking to say the least, because nobody had expected the magnitude of the changes. What did we have? Some 85 jobs gone over the next few years, a substantial \$31 million taken out of the budget, the accommodation side went over to planning, and there are lots of people who were on the infrastructure side of the tourism industry and they have now had their plans thrown all over the place. I think to say that it was much bigger than anybody had anticipated in terms of —

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Is this a question or an opposition statement?

[1.30 pm]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It is a statement, but I am getting to that point, honourable member, and I ask you to be as patient with me as I am with you. What I am interested in is the basis on which such a huge change was made. I understand that the chair of the board made a special announcement in August 2009 seeking industry feedback. I also understand that people could respond to a very broad proposal as it was back then, in one of two ways: they can send back a written submission or, alternatively, they could reply in person by calling a Vicki Brett on such and such a number, and provide the information through that form. My questions are: how many written submissions were received; how many verbal submissions were received; and what happened to those submissions? Were the submissions collected and analysed, and then the department wrote a report based on that information which then provided you with the future direction and something for the minister to tick off on, or did it happen in another way?

Ms Buckland: I cannot recall exactly how many written and verbal submissions were received. We would be happy to take that question on notice and provide the details.

[Supplementary Information No A2.]

Ms Buckland: In answer to the second part of that question, which was how those responses were collated and reported on, I can say that there was a report prepared by Mills Wilson on behalf of the board. Again, I believe that that has either been tabled in Parliament, or has been provided to the member in response to an FOI request.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I do not have a recollection of having received that.

Ms Buckland: It has not been received? Sorry; it has been provided in an FOI, but not to the member. My apologies. We would be happy to table that information.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You would be happy to provide the committee with a copy of that report?

Ms Buckland: Yes, absolutely.

[*Supplementary Information No A3.*]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I ask who directly instructed the consultants, the Marketing Centre and Mills Wilson Communication Consultants?

Ms Buckland: The chairman.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The chairman? Did you have any role to play in that?

Ms Buckland: I did not.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: To the best of your knowledge, did the minister have any role to play in that?

Ms Buckland: To the best of my knowledge, no, but I do not know. I do not believe so.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay. Was there a brief provided to Mills Wilson and the Marketing Centre from the agency?

Mr Lowe: Yes, a brief was provided.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Could the committee please have a copy of that brief?

[*Supplementary Information No A4.*]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: There was one report completed—is that correct?

Ms Buckland: One report completed by Mills Wilson, and two reports completed by the Marketing Centre.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: All right. In respect of the earlier question that I asked—that you provide the reports—it was my understanding that there was only one, so could the committee please have all three reports?

Ms Buckland: Certainly. If I may just clarify, the member was asking specifically about looking at different funding models; there was one report that was prepared by the Marketing Centre on that matter, and there was another report that the Marketing Centre actually did not complete, but we have it in draft format on another topic, which was related to how much money is being spent in Western Australia by the tourism industry to promote Western Australia, so it was a totally different topic.

The CHAIR: Before we proceed, I just want to be clear that therefore supplementary information number A3 will contain three reports.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Two of those reports were completed and one was not completed. I wonder whether the CEO could advise the committee why the incomplete report was not completed?

Ms Buckland: Again, I was not involved in the discussions with the Marketing Centre, but as I understand it, there was a discussion between the board and the Marketing Centre on the progress it was making on that particular analysis, and the board suggested that it not complete it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Ms Buckland, do you not find it a bit weird that you have no involvement in any of this, and you are the acting CEO? Is that a bit strange?

Ms Buckland: I think that is probably not a very fair question. The strategic analysis of Tourism WA was conducted by the board of Tourism WA, and when it completed its analysis, it then briefed the executive team on the strategic direction, and then we got involved in the operational matters.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay, just going to that point, who were the human resources and organisational structure consultants engaged to provide advice on the new structure?

Ms Buckland: There were not any.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: There were not any?

Ms Buckland: No, we consulted with the Public Sector Commission on the new structure and we discussed it amongst ourselves as an executive team.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: How did you actually get to the logical conclusion of where you are today, in terms of that massive restructure? Did you just have a bit of a chat over a cup of coffee at morning tea time? It is a fair question, because that is what it sounds like.

The CHAIR: The member might like to phrase that slightly differently.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I think that is a somewhat ridiculous statement.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Once the agency had arrived at the new organisational structure, did it then feed it into the board to make the final decisions?

Mr Lowe: The board provided a direction for the executive; the executive consulted with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Public Sector Commission in regard to advancing that strategy within an organisational framework of restructure, and there were then subsequent discussions with the board in regard to whether that structure met its particular strategic directions.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Would it be fair to say that the agency actually did not play a part in the overall restructure?

Ms Buckland: No.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It would not be fair to say that?

Ms Buckland: It would not be fair to say that. It would be fair to say the agency did not play a huge part in the setting of the new strategic direction, but I do not think it would be fair to say that the agency did not play a big part in the actual restructure.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Would be fair to say the agency went to Treasury and asked for additional moneys, and was told by Treasury or the ERC that it cannot —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I will let the member finish the question.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Well, hang on —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Questions in relation to the ERC and budget in confidence matters are obviously not matters that the CEO would respond to. That is not appropriate.

The CHAIR: Shall we hear the question first?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I did apologise; I said I was happy to leave it until the end.

The CHAIR: That is okay; we will hear the question and see where we go.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What I would really like to ascertain is whether this restructure was driven by the need to find \$31 million to fund a marketing campaign; or, indeed, was it driven by a proper analysis of the needs of the agency? In other words, were you told to find the savings?

Ms Buckland: No. It was driven by an analysis of the agency that was led by the board. May I just clarify the \$31 million? I think the member earlier referred to that as a budget cut, and that is not in fact the case. The \$31 million —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You referred to it as new moneys, and that is not the case either.

Ms Buckland: It is \$31 million; I do not think I ever referred to it as new money. It is \$31 million that is being spent on marketing, that would not have been spent on marketing if we had not done the restructure.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But it comes at a huge cost. Would you not agree that the Holiday at Home marketing campaign was not particularly successful, because the numbers continued to trend downwards? Would you not also agree that the Extraordinary Taxi Ride was probably not

very successful because we continue to trend downwards? After two unsuccessful campaigns, what makes you think that the next advertising or marketing campaign will be any more successful?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: You will be blaming Tourism WA for the parity of the Australian dollar next.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I might get there, but let me go in a roundabout way.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Ms Buckland has outlined clearly the reasons for why there has been a refocus with regard to Tourism WA in terms of marketing, developing and attracting events and the like, infrastructure, and all those sorts of things. The comments that the member made in respect of the Extraordinaire Taxi Ride, for example, saying that it was a dismal failure, we obviously do not agree with. That is her view, but it is not something that we would agree with. I think that putting those sorts of questions to Ms Buckland is really not appropriate. The fact is that there are a number of campaigns underway and Ms Buckland has outlined the reasons for why there has been refocus, and that is it. We are here talking about the budget and I think Ms Buckland has answered the questions.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: With all due respect, we are talking about the budget because \$31 million has been transferred from other areas to make up the \$31 million that is going to be put into the next marketing campaign. I notice that the minister launched the Extraordinary Taxi Ride because the real minister could not be there on that occasion; we will hop over that, but I do not understand how the minister cannot think that there is a connectivity between the questions I ask and this budget paper.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: And Ms Buckland has answered the member's questions.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: She obviously has not answered them well enough, because I am still unsatisfied, and I will have to continue probing.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: The member's perspective in relation to the Extraordinary Taxi Ride is her perception.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I ask Ms Buckland: there must have been some analysis of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride; is there an analysis of the outcomes of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The actual outcomes?

Ms Buckland: Yes. Would the member like me to share some of them with her now?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: No, because I would like that report.

Ms Buckland: I am happy to share that information now.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: I would like to hear about it.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I think that would be good to hear, given that the member has asked the question.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That can be the member's next question. What is the name of the document that shows the actual outcomes of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride?

Ms Buckland: There is not an actual document that shows the actual outcomes of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride. We have done a range of different analyses which we have shared with the minister, the board and other interested parties in the industry with respect to the outcomes, so there is not one seminal document that outlines the results of the campaign.

The CHAIR: It might be useful in terms of continuity to take the question from Hon Liz Behjat. Could Ms Buckland give us those outcomes as she has then, and then we will move forward? Would you like to answer that question?

Ms Buckland: Absolutely, if I could just outline some of the results of the campaign. Firstly, the campaign reached an estimated 90 million people worldwide with the message about Western Australia. That was primarily through our public relations. We had an estimated public relations value generated through the campaign of \$5.5 million. In addition, the return on investment for the campaign was \$13 generated for every dollar invested in the campaign. That is verified through market research that was done by Synovate. Finally, there were a number of different campaign partners in the campaign, travel tourism operators, and each and every one of those wholesale partners reported double digit or, in one case, triple digit increases in their bookings to Western Australia as a direct consequence of their participation in the campaign.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Did you compare it to the outcomes for any of your previous campaigns?

Ms Buckland: Yes. We calculated a return on investment for the previous Holiday at Home campaign of \$12 for every dollar invested in the campaign.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Some pretty positive outcomes there.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The thing that would really add up for me is if you could tell me how many more people were booking into our hotels, travelling in our taxis, eating in our restaurants, and how our bed nights have quadrupled, given this \$13 return on every dollar invested.

[1.45 pm]

I tell you what I will be really interested in, and that is the modelling used by Synovate because all too often in tourism this is what we hear; we hear that there is a multiplier effect of X number of dollars for every one dollar in investment—you get X return. But really, when you have a look at what is practically happening on the ground, something does not seem to be adding up here. And so if you could provide us with the modelling or the report that was completed by Synovate on both the holiday at home, or holiday in WA, campaign and also the Synovate report in relation to the Extraordinary Taxi Ride, that would be appreciated. And then we can have a look at the modelling. I am assuming that it does contain modelling.

Ms Buckland: There is a model. May I ask Derryn Belford to talk about that model?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I would be happy to take it on notice.

The CHAIR: No; let us take it now.

Ms Belford: Tourism Western Australia conducts tracking research in Perth, Sydney and Melbourne on an ongoing basis. We ask a whole series of questions about people's behaviour in terms of their consideration, intention to travel and booking behaviour. We also ask questions about whether they have seen the campaign and what they thought of the campaign. We use those two bits of information about people saying they have booked as a proxy for booking or for visitors. And we also know how many people have seen the campaign and we work out through the questioning how many of the people who have booked, booked because of the actual campaign. On the other hand we also have information from the national visitor survey that tells us how long on average most interstate and intrastate trips are. We also know how much people spend per day. So we use that information to funnel down and to actually work out the direct impact of the campaign, and then we can work out how much money we spend on the campaign, and between that piece of information we get the return on investment.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I just say it all seems to be a bit esoteric; you know, it is a bit all up here. Now, you know, I am full of good intentions, but I do not always follow through—because no-one does; my good self included.

The CHAIR: We are shocked!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But I am sure that you are very similar and I am sure that all the people —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I find that hard to believe about you, Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yeah; I know. I have to say that all the people out there—you know, you are saying that this is the sort of great outcome you get because you there is some correlation between people's intention and what they actually do, and you combine it to a whole lot of other data —

Ms Belford: We actually ask people if they have booked. So it is themselves saying that they have physically booked a trip; not their intention, but that they have actually booked. So we only use the booked date as part of the model—the percentage of people who have said that they have booked, as part of the model.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yeah, but the 13 to one —

Ms Buckland: Is based on people who have booked.

Ms Belford: Is based on people who have booked.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yeah, that is right, but that is the spend; that is the return on every dollar that you invest as an agency. You are saying that for every dollar you spend as an agency, \$13 will be returned to the Western Australian economy.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Surely that is a good thing.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Well, of course it is a good thing. It has got to be a —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am glad we agree.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So long as it is not in negative territory, the multiplier is a very, very good thing, Hon Donna Faragher. But the point is that it might well be, if it was a really great thing, a ratio of one to 30; it would not be one to 13. But all I am saying is that the way that I am understanding the modelling, there are a lot of assumptions built into the model.

Ms Belford: That is true, and the assumptions are all transparent; we can actually see what all the assumptions are. One work that has previously been done by Access Economics on the return on investment for marketing spend generally shows about a one in \$12 return; so our one in 13 is really pretty much on the ball of what we would expect to see.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay.

Madam Chair, I wonder whether, through the minister, the committee can have access to those to Synovate reports? There is nothing confidential in them.

[Supplementary Information No A5.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Madam Chair I really wanted to get on to Oprah but other people way well have some questions.

The CHAIR: Did you say Oprah? I thought you did.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: She is in our budget too!

The CHAIR: I will just check that no-one else is waiting to ask questions.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Not at this stage.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I might just have a couple of follow ups on some of the stuff that we have had from Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich before we move on.

You mentioned earlier that a number of functions have been transferred over to the SBDC. I cannot find anywhere in the budget or last year's midyear review any indication that there was funding transferred from Tourism WA to the SBDC. Can you point to me where it is in the budget papers, either for your own agency or the SBDC?

Ms Buckland: In the budget papers on page 396 at the bottom of the page where it says “A Better Future for Tourism in Western Australia”.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes.

Ms Buckland: That totals \$12.4 million over three years and some of that funding is being used to transition functions to other agencies. So the budget transfer occurred after the budget was issued. So the funding was verified to Tourism WA through the budget process and then after the budget was issued we then transferred, in some cases staff and in some cases staff and moneys, to other government organisations—the Small Business Development Corporation and the Department of Planning.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe if you could then give us a breakdown of that “A Better Future for Tourism”—that \$8.5 million in this financial year. How does that breakdown then?

Ms Buckland: Do you have that detail, David?

Mr Lowe: Yes.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: We may take that on notice.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: When you got that 8.5, was that allocated to specific purposes or —

Ms Buckland: We make some assumptions about how the money would be allocated.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Right.

Ms Buckland: Because we had not announced any of the changes to our staff until the budget was handed down, we were not at liberty to negotiate and have all those discussions with the other agencies until after the budget was handed down by the Treasurer.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: All right. So if you can break down that 8.55 —

Mr Lowe: If we can, we will take that as a question on notice.

The CHAIR: Yes—sure.

Mr Lowe: I can say that we have been in regular liaison with the Department of Treasury and Finance in regards to the make-up and the expense of that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can you tell me how much you are transferring over to the SBDC?

Mr Lowe: It is in the vicinity of approximately half a million dollars for this financial year relating to staff and activities, but in terms of specific details, we will have to say that is a question on notice.

[Supplementary Information No A6.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And then in the out years, once this money runs out, will there be an ongoing \$500 000 in, say, 2012–13 and 2013–14 that is taken out of your budget to supplement the SBDC budget?

Ms Buckland: No.

Mr Lowe: No.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In that case, maybe the minister can advise us whether or not the intention of the government is to increase the SBDC budget by an amount of \$500 000 per annum to cover the costs of the new functions that have been transitioned over to them. Or are they expected to do that from within existing resources?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am sorry. I cannot answer that question. I am not the minister. But —

The CHAIR: Would you be able to take it on notice?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Yeah, I think in part, in terms of what has already been requested as part of a question on notice. I think that could all be covered off in that respect.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: All right. So then, is any of that 8.55 for redundancies?

Mr Lowe: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: How much of it is for redundancies?

Mr Lowe: In fact, we can take that as a question on notice in terms of the actual redundancies because we have not got the figure directly to hand because it involves both redundancy payments and leave provisions in there. Sorry.

Mr Kealley: Sorry; the amount of \$1.1 million was in the initial calculation of redundancies, but the redundancies are dependent on staff making an offer. It was very much an estimate at the time, and that budget will vary as the redundancies are being offered and accepted.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can I then maybe ask it another way: is any of that money for additional marketing or is it all for internal —

Ms Buckland: That is just for the transition.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So it is all about redundancy and moving people—none of it is actually for additional marketing.

Ms Buckland: That \$12.4 million over three years is not for additional marketing. That transitional funding has allowed us to move funding out of traditional activities and staff that were sitting in other areas of the organisation and move that money into marketing.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But the end result is that the total amount of money that the state government is going to be spending on tourism at the end of this process is less than it was spending before it commenced this process.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: No.

Ms Buckland: No.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is what it says here; in 2008–09 you spend \$54 million and in 2013–14 and 2012–13 you are going to be spending \$48 million.

Ms Buckland: Yes, and as I explained earlier, that primarily has to do with funding for events. So if you look at the breakdown of the budget on page 397, you can see that the “Event Tourism” budget decreases in 2012–13 and 2013–14. It is page 397, “Service Summary”.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: All right. Do you mind if I ask more questions.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: By all means, just keep going.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: One of the things that I know about events is that there is a fairly long lead time for them to lock them in. Have we got events scheduled to come in over and above what are funded for that the agency will be going back for supplementary funding, or are we expecting that the money allocated there will be the only events that we have in 2012–13 and 2013–14?

Ms Buckland: No; we are actively working on a number of different event concepts that we would seek funding for.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Right.

Ms Buckland: May I ask David van Ooran to detail some of those concepts?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes.

Mr van Ooran: Some of them will not be of any surprise to you, but I cannot elaborate clearly because of, you know, issues of competitiveness against interstate competitors, if you like. But we have been working on the next big major golf tournament, for example. We have been looking at

the next tranche of rugby test matches and opportunities with rugby generally, and the next big art blockbuster exhibition.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What was the last one?

Mr van Ooran: What was the last blockbuster art exhibition?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes.

Mr van Ooran: It is on right now.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: The Guggenheim.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Oh yeah; I went there on Saturday or Sunday.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Was it a good exhibition?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Well, it was very small. But keep going.

The CHAIR: But was it good?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Why should I be so negative!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It is the gene in me! It is the negative gene!

Mr van Ooran: There is a couple of others; for example, a sailing event. What is the next major international sailing event beyond the world championships next year? They are the events that we are looking on in terms of major —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But with all due respect, certainly in the past you would have had a list of events that were coming up that you were in the process of bidding for and it is common knowledge. There is the Australian Surf Life Saving Championships, which I note, and we can come to that little bit later. There was the bidding for that, and the fact that Western Australia was bidding for it was known more than two years prior to that event coming to Western Australia.

Ms Buckland: And we are in discussions with them now.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What I am asking for is: what are those events that we are currently in the race for that will fill in the 2012–13 and 2013–14 events calendar?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Again, I think —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If you were bidding for the Commonwealth Games, everyone would know.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Hang on; we just need to be clear that obviously Tourism WA and Eventscorp are somewhat bound in part with respect to those issues surrounding confidentiality and —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Not at —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Hang on! Hang on! Just give us a second! Just calm down! I think obviously there are some where we can advise, but there are obviously some that might be going through a process that it is not appropriate at this point in time to actually state specifically the specific event given the exact reasons that Mr van Ooran has already outlined. But some general aspects—I am sure that —

The CHAIR: Just one minute.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Minister, I just want to be clear. Obviously the minister did not understand my question.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: No; I understood your question.

The CHAIR: Just one minute, before you proceed.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No; you did not.

The CHAIR: Hang on! If there is a concern about confidentiality, minister you have the option of asking for the information to be provided in private session. I am just reminding people that either a member can request that or the minister herself can. We will have the question again.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I understand those events that require or have confidentiality attached to them. I also understand the range of events where there is no confidentiality attached to them because the organisations are out there in the market seeking bids from different parts of the world and in many cases you need to be bidding two or three years out. I gave the surf-life saving championships as an example. The world sailing championships goes back to, you may recall, well before your government was even elected. These events have long lead times and I am asking which events are we in the marketplace bidding for that will fill in the 2012–13 and 2013–14 calendars, where it is a public bidding process.

[2.00 pm]

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: That is okay, but I am just saying that if you are wanting beyond that, that might be —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is what my question was. I was very clear about my question. I understand the ones where we develop concepts and they often take a lot longer to develop into anything meaningful.

The CHAIR: I think the question has been clarified. It is in relation to those matters that are known in the public realm because there is a bidding process.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mike Rees and his partner used to run with about 20 of them at any one time.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: They were the good old days.

Mr van Ooran: It is quite a good question. The times have changed significantly in terms of bid processes around major events. In the 1990s, when world championship events were delivering much more value and return on investment, Mike Rees and my predecessors were quite active in bidding for major world championship events. Those events that I just referred to before are not subject to bids. We have found in recent years that the return on investment and the value from world championships, which an association will have a bid process for, rarely, if ever these days, stack up in terms of delivering a satisfactory return on the investment. A good recent example is the FINA World Swimming Championships. Melbourne will acknowledge a cost of \$51 million to host that event in 2007. That is significantly elevated again with Dubai outbidding Germany for the more recent edition of those championships. We are talking about \$65 million plus for a swimming event. Similarly, a world track athletics championship will cost, in our estimation, more than \$100 million for the bid and the support. A lot of the sports bodies do have event properties that are world championships. The most recent one that you referred to—the ISAF Sailing World Championships—is one we successfully bid for because our feasibility and assessment clearly demonstrated that that would deliver a strong return. What I am saying is that we are trying to be more creative and strategic in the events and types of events that we target, such as the rugby tests, the golf events, the major art blockbusters, theatre productions, and establishing our own suite of WA-owned events that do not require a bidding process. We are in the middle of bidding for the National Short-Course Swimming Championships. That is public knowledge. Other than that, to my knowledge, there are no other events that we are in the process of bidding for.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is what I thought. That has cleared that up. I will ask you to take on notice whether you can identify an event that you have got recently that has made a return either equal to or better than the World Lacrosse Championships that we had back in the naughties. There are a lot of events. If you look at that event, you will see that we got an excellent return. It is not a high-profile sport, but its return on investment was significantly higher than the \$13 for every dollar invested for the Extraordinary Taxi Ride.

[*Supplementary Information No A7.*]

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Mr van Ooran, you may recall that last year when you appeared before the estimates committee, you and I had a conversation about the one world music festival. Is that what it is called?

Mr van Ooran: It is the One Movement for Music Festival.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Last year was the first year that it was held in Perth, and it was held here again this year. I anecdotally heard that there was a concert held on the Saturday at which Sarah McLachlan and Paul Kelly appeared and that it was very poorly attended. Friends of mine who went said that they were embarrassed for the performers. I have no firsthand knowledge of that; I am passing on what I have heard from other people. Could you talk me through that process? Did we get bang for our buck? That was the term that I used last year and I will use it again this year. Did we get bang for our buck this year?

Mr van Ooran: We are really pleased with the development of this event in year two. The inaugural year of an event is always very challenging, particularly given the GFC and a range of other factors that got year one off to a reasonable start, although it was not as fabulous as we were hoping for. I am pleased to say that in year two there have been a lot of new initiatives and developments. I had better allude to the fact that there are four key elements to this festival. The first is the public festival on the Esplanade in front of the city. That was done over three days this year. The Friday night was with Paul Kelly and Sarah McLachlan and the like. That was a twilight concert. There was also a festival on the Saturday and Sunday. There were three days in front of the city showcasing around 65 or 70 bands from around the world, including Australian bands. 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. The second key area is the conference and workshops. Again, we are very pleased with just under a doubling of the number of delegates who travelled from right around the world and registered for the event. By all accounts, we are seeing some great feedback and reports from those delegates who attended. We are very pleased with the conference side of things. Thirdly, the showcase late-evening events grew from four to seven venues this year. They were quirky, unique urban spaces in the city. Far more bands were showcased across a greater number of nights. There were very strong sales and attendances for those. That is a really important part of the whole festival. Fourthly, the fringe festival was conducted and extended by a further day. That saw Western Australian bands featured on the footpaths throughout the city over four days. Again, we have had very good reports on that. As far as we are concerned, we have not had the final reports for year two, but most areas look like they have improved. Again, this is a new concept that needs patience and time to develop and establish itself as a major music event in the Asia-Pacific region. That is the vision.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I know that it has not had particularly good write-ups in some of the magazines in terms of the attendances. I think it was reported in *The West Australian* also that the attendances were deemed to be low. It was a non-smoking event, but I know that a lot of people were smoking there. One of my colleagues went down there and actually took photos of them. I would like to know, in terms of the attendance numbers, one, whether you could supply that information once you have collated it —

Mr van Ooran: Which information?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The information in relation to attendance numbers.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I would not mind a list of events, the number of tickets that were sold and the number of people who attended, because I suspect there is a difference between the two.

The CHAIR: I assume you do not have that to hand.

[*Supplementary Information No A8.*]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: As an add-on, can we get information on the number of free tickets that were also given out and who those tickets were given to?

The CHAIR: Let us include that in supplementary information A8. Are there any further questions?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Given that so much money is being transferred—\$31 million—into marketing, and given that probably the next biggest marketing opportunity that was potentially presenting itself was the visit to Australia by Oprah, I am wondering whether you might provide us with some information about when you, as the director general, became aware that Oprah was coming to Australia?

Ms Buckland: I became aware approximately 12 hours before the announcement was made by Oprah on her television show.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Alright.

Ms Buckland: I am sorry, but I do not have that specific date to hand.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is okay.

Ms Buckland: I believe it was 13 September, but we can confirm that.

The CHAIR: Do you want that confirmed?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That would be good.

[*Supplementary Information No A9.*]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: We know that Harpo Productions made the announcement that they would not be coming to Western Australia. All the other states are going to get Oprah but we are not. I understand that you have been in recovery mode, so to speak, and have been trying to do some work behind the scenes with Harpo Productions to try to get Oprah over here or some other positive outcome for Western Australia. I wonder whether you could give us a bit of an idea of what you have been doing behind the scenes.

Ms Buckland: Yes. We have developed a pitch, or presentation, outlining a number of the things that we have on offer in Western Australia, which are unique and different from the rest of Australia. They were presented to Harpo Productions by members of our marketing and PR team on, I believe, 30 September. There were eight people from Harpo Productions who were in Tourism Australia's offices in Sydney. As I understand it, all states and territories were given the opportunity to present their ideas and concepts to Harpo Productions. The feedback was very positive. We understand that Harpo has taken away all the ideas and is doing some further analysis and research on its own and then it will make a determination about what the final itinerary will be.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I notice in a press release that you put out on 14 September that said you would be working very hard to entice Oprah herself to Western Australia while she is in the country in Sydney or Melbourne or wherever she is at that time. Have you done anything to try to entice her to Western Australia before she gets into the country? I notice that the AHA has written to her asking for Western Australia to be considered. Have you, as the peak tourism agency in Western Australia, done anything proactive about trying to entice her?

Ms Buckland: Yes, we have presented some very specific ideas that we think would appeal to Oprah herself, as part of our pitch to Harpo Productions. Our understanding is that Harpo makes a recommendation to Oprah and Oprah then makes the final decision about where she will be going and what she will be doing, but it all goes through her production company.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I just raise with you the issue of inducements?

Ms Buckland: Sorry?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Inducements. Have there been any offers of free Paspaley Pearls or other inducements to entice Oprah to Western Australia?

The CHAIR: I am not sure whether that relates to the budget.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am questioning where that may relate to the budget. I appreciate that, in terms of significant movements and the like, we talk about events and those sorts of things. General questioning in relation to the visit by Oprah is obviously appropriate in that regard. However, I think we might be straying a little bit.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: With all due respect, if we have not been able to attract —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: This relates to the budget —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: We have seen the department carved up and chopped in half so that we can fund yet another marketing campaign. The biggest marketing opportunity in the history of the state would have been attracting Oprah to WA. We have missed the boat and here we are playing catch-up. I am sure that the CEO would like to see Oprah in WA and I am sure that it would be a huge coup. I can tell you that there is talk out there that inducements have been put on the table as part of attracting Oprah to Western Australia. Either they are all fallacious and there is no substance or truth to it, or there is a grain of truth or a little bit more than a grain of truth in it. It is a fair enough question. We have seen the department carved up so that it can do marketing. Where does the marketing stop and start? That is a fair question.

The CHAIR: If there are inducements and they have a financial value, I think they relate to the budget. Maybe it is not a specific question, but I think that as a general question it is not unreasonable. I do not know enough about how marketing works, but it is an interesting question. Are inducements part of the process; and, if so, has one been asked —

Ms Buckland: As I understand it, there were products that were displayed during the pitch to demonstrate to Harpo Productions the types of products that we have available in Western Australia. We can confirm what was included in that pitch, but my recollection is that some Leeuwin wine was shown, some Paspaley Pearls were shown and some other products, which I do not know of off the top of my head. As I understand it, though, those products were not offered as inducements to visit. They were simply showcased as the types of products we have in Western Australia that cannot be found in other parts of Australia.

[2.15 pm]

The CHAIR: Thank you. For me, that is a useful clarification, because I can understand how there might be a confusion around that.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Madam Chair, can I just say this to you. If that is the case, then certainly it is better that that is on the public record and doing the rounds of the terrace than perhaps what some people are leading us to believe—if that is the case; if that is not the case, we will certainly find out in due course.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I have to argue with you, member. The biggest opportunity we missed out on was bidding for the 2018 Commonwealth Games, but anyway!

The CHAIR: Are there any further questions?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Not on Oprah! I would rather talk about Ellen DeGeneres than Oprah, but there we go! I wish we could get her here!

I refer you to page 398 of the budget papers. The first dot point talks about a strategic analysis of tourism, and the directions that we are taking towards 2020 in tourism and things like that. It goes on to say —

The Board is implementing changes to provide a sharper focus in the areas of marketing, events and significant tourism infrastructure ... thereby contributing to the sustainability of the industry and driving greater economic benefits for Western Australia.

That is something that we would all be very much behind. Is Tourism WA putting together some key plans to achieve that goal—that is, what you are planning to do year by year, and how you intend to implement it—that you are able to discuss at this stage?

Ms Buckland: We are planning to do that. We have not put a year-by-year plan together. However, we have discussed with the board the need to develop a new strategic plan, and that would then outline specifically year by year some of the actions that we will be undertaking. The other thing that we are doing right now is that you may be aware that the board has endorsed a list of 15 tourism development priorities for the state, and we have engaged Access Economics to help us evaluate the impact on gross state product of each of those particular development priorities. That will help us better prioritise those, and again help us work through the year-by-year plan.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: In putting together that strategic proposal, would it be your intention to do that in consultation with major stakeholders—that is, to say, “You are the end users out there; what do you think, and how should it be happening?”, and doing it in a collaborative way?

Ms Buckland: I am certain that would be part of the process. We have not detailed the whole process, but typically consultation is involved in that sort of process.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Okay. I refer to page 402 of the budget papers. Under the heading “Financial Statements”, it talks about increases in expenses. It goes on to state —

The increase is mainly attributable to:

...

- Event funding of 41.8 million for the ISAF Sailing World Championships, and \$0.4 million for the Red Bull Air Race ...

Now that the Red Bull Air Race is not happening, what will happen with that money that was allocated towards that event? Where will that go?

Ms Buckland: Some of the funding for the Red Bull Air Race came from our recurrent budget. We have for this year—for 2011—developed a range of different activities that we will be undertaking. I will detail those in a moment. But I need to let you know that the other part of the funding is supplementary funding that was provided to the agency specifically for the purpose of conducting the Red Bull Air Race, and we are in discussions with the Department of Treasury and Finance and the minister about the retention of those funds.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Treasury and Finance wants it back, and you say no?

Ms Buckland: That is typically the way it works, is it not? With regard to the recurrent funding for 2011, there are a number of different things that we have put in place. Firstly, you may be aware that government has increased the funding for the Hopman Cup. That has secured that event through to 2014. For this year, there is an outstanding line-up of players as a consequence of that additional funding. Secondly, the Perth International Arts Festival, we have established a partnership with them, and we will be funding a sort of signature event, which will be happening on the Esplanade, called Pan.Optikum, which is an international performance troupe—acrobatics, pyrotechnics—quite exciting. We expect that 20 000 people will be an attendance at that event. Importantly, we think from our perspective that that will give us a lot of PR coverage and PR value which will help us broadcast that event nationally and internationally. Thirdly, we are working with the Ord Valley Muster to develop that event even further. We have provided some additional funding to them to help them secure an internationally recognised artist to perform at the Kimberley Moon concert. Then there also some smaller supporting events that we hope will extend visitors’ length of stay. David mentioned the National Short Course Swimming Championships bid. We have allocated some funding for that.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: In what year is that?

Ms Buckland: That is in 2011. Also, we will be doing some more marketing and promotion of some of the existing events, such as the V8 Super Cars event, which will be happening in May 2011.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Just while we are on the Red Bull Air Race, I am looking at your “Tourism Western Australia Annual Report 2009–2010”. On page 62, you have a note headed, “Events occurring after the end of the reporting period”. That states, in part —

On 21 July, 2010, the WATC was advised by Red Bull Air Race ... that all the remaining rounds of the Red Bull Air Race were to be cancelled. WATC has entered into a forward purchase contract via the WA Treasury Corporation for Euro 2,120,000 —

That would be about \$A4 million —

to meet the contracted event milestones.

What does that actually mean?

Ms Buckland: I will ask David Lowe to explain that.

Mr Lowe: As a risk management strategy, all government agencies are required under Treasurer’s Instructions to look at how they manage foreign currency issues. With an event where milestone payments are in Euros, it was incumbent on us to look at how we might manage that risk, with advice and assistance from WA Treasury Corporation. The risk management strategy put in place was to forward purchase—to hedge—those Euros. With the Red Bull event not occurring in 2011, there is no longer a need for that contract. We are currently in discussions with WA Treasury Corporation as to how to trade out of that separate for the purchase contract that we have for Euros.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The contract was due for settlement on 30 June 2011. Is that no longer the case?

Mr Lowe: That is coming. So effectively we have all year before we have to honour that contract.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Before you have to find the \$4 million?

Mr Lowe: To trade out of it. It is required of us to buy the Euros on 30 June 2011. It is now in a discussion with WA Treasury Corporation as to when best to trade out of that contract. We have the opportunity to trade out earlier, or go right through to 30 June 2011. The question with currency conversions is: when is the best time to trade out of that?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So this explains this loss of \$182 765. That is the currency conversion differential to trading out now?

Ms Buckland: That is at the spot rate as at 21 July 2010.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It says that —

The WA Treasury Corporation has advised that if the contract was unwound on 21 July 2010, the WATC would have incurred a loss of \$182,765, being the difference between the contract exchange rate at settlement and the spot rate for 21 July 2010.

Mr Lowe: On that one day, what are the relativities, effectively.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Sure. Okay. In view of the fact that this has cost 2.12 million Euros, or some \$A4 million, I suspect that this is no longer going to be a free event in Western Australia?

Mr Lowe: I do not understand the question.

Mr van Ooran: That money has not been paid to Red Bull Air Race.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It is just to secure the event?

Mr van Ooran: Yes. They were contractual milestones that have not yet been paid to the event, because they have not delivered or met those milestones.

Mr Lowe: They are two separate things. One is a foreign currency risk management strategy, and one is an event contract.

Ms Buckland: And the foreign currency risk management strategy gave us the right to buy—in fact, the obligation, actually—those Euros. But, as David said, we are working with WA Treasury Corporation to trade out of the contract. That does not mean we will be out 2.12 million Euros. It means that the loss at that point in time was \$182 765.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Let me put it to you another way. How much has it cost or will it cost to secure the Red Bull Air Race for Western Australia?

Ms Buckland: We do not know that the event is going to be run.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So there is still uncertainty about the running of that event? Okay.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Do I understand correctly that the obligation to buy the Euros is still subject to the Red Bull Air Race?

Mr Lowe: No. They are two separate things entirely.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The event that is related to the purchase of the Euros, does that exist now, or has that risk gone?

Ms Buckland: The event does not exist. Red Bull Air Race cancelled all their events for 2011, worldwide.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: So the underlying reason for the prospect of purchasing the Euros is now no longer in existence?

Ms Buckland: That is correct.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: So really, we are now speculating?

Mr Lowe: Well, that is the whole purpose of the current discussions with WA Treasury Corporation. We have no longer a requirement for those Euros, and what is the best time to trade out of them; and it is with their advice that we are acting. In the absence of their advice, yes, we would be speculators. But their advice is now: what are the best risk-management options for us up to and including 30 June 2011 when that contract is due?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: As a state, in my view that is speculation, and obviously deliberate speculation, because they are directing you about what to do. But as a state, once the underlying risk has gone, there is no risk. Apart from having the forward contract to buy the Euros, there is no underlying risk that is now in place; therefore, we are speculating.

Mr Lowe: No. There is a new risk, and it is that risk that we are now managing, with the best advice we can from WA Treasury Corporation,

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: What is the new risk?

Mr Lowe: The new risk is that we have got a contract in place that we need to trade out of.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: You have got a forward contract that was taken out to cover a risk—cover the exposure?

Mr Lowe: Yes, and that risk has done, but there is now a new risk to manage.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That then is a straight naked contract?

Mr Lowe: It is not a speculation issue. It is actually something that we are managing, in consultation with WA Treasury Corporation.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: In fact, probably what we ought to do—is there any correspondence about that particular issue?

Mr Lowe: It is a matter that is going through the audit and risk committee, which is a subcommittee of the board, and it will be a matter for the board.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is there any correspondence between you and Treasury on that?

Mr Lowe: We have had meetings with them. We have not had formal correspondence. We have had meetings with them and utilised their expertise in calculating out different rates and the like, but not formal correspondence per se.

[2.30 pm]

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I presumed that emails would be formal correspondence. What I am interested in, if I can say, is just the underlying philosophy governing this particular current exposure, which I view, is now a naked risk.

Mr Lowe: If I may, Chair, I am quite happy to provide the principles for managing that risk, if that helps clarify it, in terms of how we differentiate, how we would see it as a risk management issue rather than a speculative issue.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Could I get some of that correspondence? Whatever correspondence you have in relation between you and Treasury about —

Mr Lowe: I do not have correspondence per se to provide you, I am afraid.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Email? You said emails.

Mr Lowe: No, all we have is actually setting up meetings to actually discuss the matter.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: No minutes of the meetings?

Mr Lowe: No.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Have you discussed it?

Mr Lowe: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And you did not keep minutes?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I would have thought—no minutes of those meetings?

Mr Lowe: We were getting presentations from them on how best to manage it. I think the issue that you are trying to arrive at is: are we speculating with this money? What I can do is actually provide, in terms of additional information, the principles on how we are managing it.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The real thing is that I am getting to a policy position, which I know we are not meant to be talking about here, but there is a policy issue. Speculation can be in the eyes of the beholder to some extent, but having had some exposure to this in the past and to some detail, we have got a naked risk. There is no doubt based on what you have told me that we have not got a naked risk. That we are managing a naked risk, I understand that, you are right, we are managing—that is also speculating, not very much difference. I just want to know what the policy is exactly between you and Treasury.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I think it has been put that we are happy to provide the information with respect to the principles and the like. Perhaps once that information is provided, if there is further information that the committee seeks, that might be the best way to approach it, because that might —

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That is fine.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: That information, the principles to which it is determined, might satisfy Hon Philip Gardiner.

The CHAIR: I think you are correct.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I just get a clarification: I am assuming “naked risk” means totally exposed?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Yes. I knew you would not understand that, Ljil!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It has taken me ages, honourable member, I have to say to you; it has taken me ages to get that point. But having said that —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It sounds like we are getting into a niche marketing exercise, then!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But having said that, when you talk about that naked risk, are you referring to that we are exposed to the tune of \$2.12 million, or are you talking about being exposed to a loss of \$182 765? Because I would find it very concerning if we were exposed to the tune of \$4 million, and less concerning if we were exposed to \$182 000, or both, which would be even more concerning.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Let us just get the information back first. What the risk is that you currently have and what the policy is about how we are dealing with it. Then we can follow it up through, as the minister suggested, later on, if we need to.

[Supplementary Information No A10.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I just want to quickly go back to the restructure because there are some aspects that we sort of missed out bits and pieces on. The first thing I would like to ask is: does the department prepare minutes for the board meetings?

Ms Buckland: Yes; correct.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can you advise the committee how many board meetings the restructure may have been discussed at?

Ms Buckland: I cannot recall. What I can say is that in some way or another it would have been discussed at every board meeting that we have had this year.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay, and was there a board restructure subcommittee, to the best of your knowledge?

Ms Buckland: No.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: All right. The other point that I am interested in is where we are in regards to the actual restructure. The first place I would start off is in terms of the 85 job losses, FTE losses, over the next two years. I understand that all the positions were to be filled and the remaining positions were to be readvertised. I wonder whether you could advise the committee whether in fact those positions have been filled, how many of those jobs have been readvertised, and how many have been filled.

Ms Buckland: Just bear with me a minute, I might just refer to some notes. Currently, we have 110 people working at Tourism WA. There are 74 roles in the new structure; of those, 47 have been filled with permanent employees and a number of the others have been advertised. We are obviously doing that on a rolling basis because it would be nearly impossible from a resource perspective to advertise all of the roles at once and we are trying to do it rolling through the organisation at levels. Currently, we have a director of international marketing role that is being advertised, we have executive director of corporate and business services, executive director of infrastructure and investment—so a number of the senior level positions have been advertised. Director of aviation development has been advertised and filled and we are just waiting for the new employee to join us at the end of November. So there have been a number of positions that we have moved on.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is it true that there were some restrictions in terms of who could apply for what? Because what I had certainly heard was that where a person had been acting on a higher level, they could in fact not apply for a job at a higher level but rather were limited to only applying for those jobs within the organisation at the level at which they had substantively stood prior to the restructure.

Ms Buckland: That is correct. I ask David Lowe to expand on that a bit.

Mr Lowe: For the past quarter of a century, standard public sector restructuring principles have adopted that approach.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So how many people have you actually transitioned out of the organisation at this stage?

Ms Buckland: We currently have 110 employees. Our FTE cap last year was 159. I think we had a few less people than that; we maybe had about 155 people when we started the restructure. So we have gone from about 155 to about 110. Some of those people have left on their own. We had approximately 15 people accept the targeted voluntary separation offer that the government offered at the end of last financial year, so 15 people left us before the end of June.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So are those remaining 110 people currently gainfully employed with appropriate work?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So what plans or management strategies do you have in place to change over this workload as the redeployees are moved into other agency positions?

Ms Buckland: David.

Mr Lowe: I was just going to say it is exactly that. The long-standing practice is that jobs might disappear but employment of permanent public servants does not and the redeployment process kicks in. We have been liaising with the Public Sector Commission since early in the year with regards to redeployment processes, and we are actively case-managing people in that regard.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I think you misunderstood the question because what I am saying is: if you have 110 people gainfully employed now and you are going to reduce it to 74, if they are already currently doing the work, who is going to take on their work or are you expecting the 74 remaining to just be picking up the work of the current 110?

Ms Buckland: I think there are a number of strategies in place. I might just give one example. One example is that some of those employees are currently employed by Tourism WA in the regions and each one of those individuals has a list of activities or projects, which they are responsible for transitioning out of. In some cases that would be transitioning the work to another government agency, for example, a regional development commission or the Small Business Development Corporation, as I mentioned earlier. In some instances, those individuals might be members of committees, larger committee groups, and they might be transitioning some of that work back to those committees. In some instances, they will simply complete the projects that they have been working on, as in the projects will come to a conclusion, so that is one example. Basically, they are transitioning the work away and when that concludes, they will be looking for a new role. Some of those individuals, I daresay, are looking for new roles now or, as David mentioned, we are helping them.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: All right. Can you tell us how many staff, when you had 159, were located in regional Western Australia?

Ms Buckland: There were 12.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: How many will be located in regional Western Australia at the conclusion of the process when you are down to 74?

Ms Buckland: None.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: None.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Why is that a good thing? Why is it better for tourism? That is a fair enough question, minister.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Why is it better for regional WA is the bigger question?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Did I say anything? I was quiet!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Well, you were not quiet enough!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Oh, harsh—it is a bit harsh, come on!

The CHAIR: For the record's sake, that was said with a wry sense of humour.

Ms Buckland: So the question was: why is it a good thing for tourism that we do not have staff in regional areas? The board's decision was that the agency should be focusing on the areas that are going to have the greatest impact on driving visitor numbers to the state and those things were deemed to be significant infrastructure development—so major infrastructure projects that have the potential to attract a large number of tourists—marketing and events. A lot of the work that was being done in the regions was one-to-one business mentoring work, which undoubtedly was helpful to the individual businesses that were being mentored, but probably not doing an awful lot to lift the overall number of visitors to the state. It was a policy matter or a strategic matter that was decided by the board and I am implementing that.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Did anybody seek your opinion in respect to whether or not this was a good thing? It is a fair question. Did anybody seek your advice as the acting CEO of the agency as to whether this would be a good thing for tourism, in particular, regional tourism?

Ms Buckland: The short answer to that question is yes, my advice was sought, but I understood it to be a trade-off. The new strategic direction had some trade-offs in it and one of the trade-offs was that we were not going to be working one-on-one with tourism businesses anymore.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But do you as the CEO of tourism believe that there is any place at all for tourism industry product development?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Can I just say that this is asking an opinion of the CEO, Ms Buckland, and that is asking for a personal opinion? We have gone through the rationale for the restructure and Ms Buckland in earlier questions that were put by Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich did indicate in terms of matters surrounding movements of responsibilities and the like being transferred, for example, to the Small Business Development Corporation and the like. So there are examples of where through this transitioning process it will be moving into other areas. Whilst there might not be an office as such, a lot of those core duties will still be done through, perhaps, a different means. I think, though, asking for personal reflections and opinions of the CEO is not really within the ambit of the budget papers, appreciating that there has already been some discussion with respect to the restructure and how that is transitioning to some other departments and agencies.

The CHAIR: I think probably we need to view this as a policy change and that has been implemented. Perhaps another line of questioning might be more useful.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I just want to keep going in this area. Does the tourism commission still consider visitor satisfaction as one of its key effectiveness indicators?

Ms Buckland: We have agreed with the Office of the Auditor General that as a consequence of our restructure we will be re-looking at all of our key performance indicators, so we will be re-evaluating the appropriateness of that one. Although having said that, I am sure it will be one that we will consider.

[2.45 pm]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So it is possible that you may move visitor satisfaction as one of your key—I think you actually have a visitors' expectations either met or exceeded.

Ms Buckland: It is possible, but I cannot say definitively because we have not started that analysis yet.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I would have thought that a lot of those 12 officers that were located in regional WA, one of their roles was to ensure that they were assisting businesses to meet or exceed visitor expectations and maintain that level of visitor satisfaction. How will, under your new model, you be ensuring that we are doing that in regional Western Australia?

Ms Buckland: As the minister said, I think that some of the activities that Tourism WA undertook in regional Western Australia will be undertaken by other organisations that are based in the regions, like the Small Business Development Corporation and the regional development commissions.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But they will not have a focus on the visitor satisfaction side of it; they might have it on the business side of it.

Ms Buckland: I think part of running a business would be whether or not your customers are satisfied. Surely the Small Business Development Corporation, if they are going to be supporting small businesses, should be advising them on the importance of making sure their customers are satisfied.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But they are getting no additional resources to provide that service. We already established that earlier.

Maybe I can ask the minister whether or not the government has any policies to maintain the employment levels in regional Western Australia. Do you have any government policies about the maintenance of employment levels in regional Western Australia, because it has always been a huge issue in the past, particularly from regional members, about maintaining regional employment in regional Western Australia? Is there any government policy about maintaining —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Are you talking about the 12 staff?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No. I am talking about government policy in general.

The CHAIR: It is a pretty broad question.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is. I want to know if the government has any policies on maintaining staff in regional Western Australia. And then my next question will be: how does the removal of the 12 staff meet that policy?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is right.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The minister is the minister. I would have thought if the government has a policy, she would be aware of it.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Let us not get too cute. The thing is, Madam Chair, if we are talking about Tourism WA, we are here to talk about Tourism WA. We have talked about the issue with respect to the regional officers and in terms of the transfer of some of those duties. As I understand it, and Ms Buckland will correct me if I am wrong, in terms of those regional staff—and I am happy to talk in terms of those regional staff—in terms of either being transferred into other agencies, whether it is through the development commission or indeed others, there will be an option to transfer back to Perth if that is the case. However, this is all in process at the moment and actually being transferred into other agencies to which we have already had the discussions.

The CHAIR: I think we have established there is a policy change. I do not know that such a general question is actually easily answered by one minister.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No. They can answer it to the best of their knowledge, and the answer is that the minister is not aware of it, and that is fine.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Having said that, if there is a whole-of-government policy, Madam Chair, then this minister, like all the other 16 ministers, would know of the existence of a whole-of-government policy. And this minister, as with the Minister for Tourism, obviously has to take that consideration into account when decreasing the number of employees located in regional and rural Western Australia. So, in my view, it is a very good question. Not only is it a good question, but it is something that the Minister for Tourism, like the Minister for Education and, indeed, any other minister—it is the same minister, actually—should really know how they interface with each other. I think it is a very reasonable question, but anyway. Are you finished?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I have got more questions, but you go.

The CHAIR: Sorry; I have a couple of questions over here. I will come back. Hon Philip Gardiner.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just in relation, minister, you mentioned the core duties. Just to try and understand the effectiveness of change, of moving people out of specific tourist offices into the regional development commissions or the resource centres, what were the main core duties that your offices had prior to the change?

Ms Buckland: There were a few. On one level, core duties were to work with individual tourism operators to help them improve their businesses. That was probably about half of what our regional staff did. And then the other thing that they did was they were involved in projects that were of significance, in some instances, to a particular destination or, in other instances, to a broader region in terms of developing maybe a new tourism attraction or a walk trail or a bike trail or what have you—something a little bit broader than working with just one operator. In those instances, they would work with sort of relevant local and state government agencies and the private sector, bringing those things to fruition.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I can see how the small business units in those places could take over each one of them, which is a business mentoring issue. And the project one, I am not so sure about that. But, anyway, thank you.

Ms Buckland: There is a review of the regional development commissions which is being undertaken at the moment—reviewing the role of those commissions. And we have provided some input to that review. Obviously, I do not want to pre-empt the results, but in the meantime we are working with each of the individual regional development commissions to discuss with them how they might build some tourism expertise within the development commissions and they could undertake that role. In one instance, for example, in the south west, the person who used to work for Tourism WA has now moved to the South West Development Commission and he is undertaking sort of a similar role there.

The CHAIR: Are there any further questions on this particular topic?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I know there used to be regional events people located in Bunbury. Do you still have anyone assisting regional events based in a regional centre under this proposal?

Ms Buckland: We had one staff member in Bunbury who managed the regional events scheme. The responsibility for that role has moved to Perth, and there is still an individual who is responsible for managing the regional events scheme for the entire state.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But based in Perth.

Ms Buckland: But based in Perth.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is interesting. You talked about identifying things like walk trails and the like. Were the regional offices involved in the Naturebank program?

Ms Buckland: Yes, they had some involvement in the Naturebank program, but the responsibility for that has been transitioned to officers who are based in Perth.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can you tell us what development sites have been identified to meet the needs of visitors to regional Western Australia under that Naturebank program?

Ms Buckland: As I understand it, there are nine sites which are being evaluated which Tourism WA and the Department of Environment and Conservation are collaborating on evaluating. I would not off the top of my head be able to tell you what those sites are, but they are from the top to the bottom of the state.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So who will be providing your local advice on those sites if you do not have regional officers?

Ms Buckland: The Department of Environment and Conservation has an extensive network of regional staff. They provide some advice, and our Perth-based staff work closely with those individuals as well as the local tourism industry in those areas.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe if we can get those nine sites as supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No A11.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Have you got any idea of when they will become available for consideration for potential investors? Have you got a time line?

Ms Buckland: There is a time line for some of the sites. As you would be aware, there are a number of clearances that the sites have to go through, so in some cases those nine sites may never become available for investors, but we have a time line of ideally when we would like them to be provided. They make it through the cultural and the environmental clearances.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe if we can have that as part of the supplementary information.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: How many have had total clearances so far?

Ms Buckland: There is one that has been released in Purnululu, and the ministers jointly announced the successful proponent of that site was Intrepid Connections. That was released last year in December and the successful proponent was announced in September—I think on 1 September. I do not know any of the others. None of the others has been released yet.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So it is not really fast progress, is it—one in two years?

The CHAIR: We do not necessarily want fast progress, I have to say! The slower the better, as far as I am concerned.

Ms Buckland: Sorry; it is not two years. The program has been going for 12 months.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Can I just say, I think this is obviously —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Slow.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: No. I think it is around about 12 months in actual fact. I am quite sure Madam Chair would agree with me that, in identifying potential sites, serious consideration needs to be given with respect to, particularly from an environmental perspective, obviously the appropriateness of the selection of a particular area. And there are clear processes that must be gone through. Now, that is where very much the department of environment comes into play, along with Tourism WA.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You would note —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: As I would say, if you are going to do it properly, and we intend to do it properly, you have to make sure that you go through all the processes correctly. And the fact is we have already announced one, as has been mentioned with respect to Purnululu. I think a very good process has been undertaken.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But you know that there was work being done on Naturebank whilst Hon Sheila McHale was still the minister. So this has not been a new idea by this government, and you have been in government for more than two years now and we have one. So I would say, in my view, that is slow progress, but never mind.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Far more better progress than under your government, I can assure you.

The CHAIR: Hon Liz Behjat, I think, has a question.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Page 398, and it is going to be probably about regional employment anyway. Dot point 7 —

Indigenous tourism is a unique selling point that high spending visitors are seeking. The Government commissioned the ... (WAITOC) Review to create a more focused and independent peak marketing and advocacy body for this industry sector. This review also identified the level of support required to effectively operate this organisation. Tourism WA is working with WAITOC to implement the recommendations of the review.

Was one of the recommendations of that review to transfer three staff members from Tourism with Aboriginal tourism expertise to SBDC?

Ms Buckland: No, that was not a specific recommendation of the review. The decision to move those staff members to SBDC was related to the function that those staff members performed. And Tourism WA has sort of traditionally performed a number of different roles or been involved in a number of different areas of Aboriginal tourism. There is capacity building, which I will talk to in a minute; marketing and promotion; and then, I guess, more sort of strategic oversight and working with other government agencies. As a part of the restructure of the organisation, what we have done is we will continue to be working in the marketing area very actively through our involvement with WAITOC. We are just in the final stages of establishing a contractual agreement with them very similar to the contractual agreement that we have in place with the five regional tourism organisations. We will still remain very actively involved in marketing. With regard to strategy, we are in the process of refreshing across government our Aboriginal tourism strategy, which will go from 2011 to 2015, and Tourism WA will remain as the lead agency in that regard in terms of the oversight of the implementation of the strategy, and we have got a number of other government agencies involved in that. Then, with regard to the capacity-building program, which is very similar to the sort of work that we are doing with the non-Indigenous tourism operators, that is sort of a one-to-one business mentoring program, and because the work is very similar to that which is being done with non-Indigenous operators, we thought that that was ideally placed within the Small Business Development Corporation; and, in fact, it is part of their—I might not get the name of the division right, but I believe it is the Indigenous economic development division within the Small Business Development Corporation. So it was not a recommendation of the review of WAITOC. That was very focused on WAITOC as an organisation and an assessment of the roles that that organisation should be performing and how they should be doing that. And it was really Tourism WA facilitating WAITOC reviewing itself, effectively.

[3.00 pm]

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: The document that came about from that review, is that a public document?

Ms Buckland: I think so, yes. I believe it is and we would be happy to table it to the committee.

[*Supplementary Information No A12.*]

The CHAIR: Any further questions in this area?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes; I have one.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Not in this area—I have another question in a different area.

The CHAIR: Can we just continue in this area and then we will come back to Hon Liz Behjat.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Indigenous tourism was identified, I believe by the Premier, as a priority for tourism and I wonder whether you could give us a bit of an overview of what big has happened in Indigenous tourism given that it is a government priority?

Ms Buckland: As I think I explained, I guess, what Tourism WA's role is going to be, I think probably one of the biggest things that has happened that elevates the priority of Indigenous tourism is the three years of funding provided to WAITOC—some of that, \$330 000 per annum through the royalties for regions program and \$110 000 per annum through Tourism WA; so, that is \$440 000 a year over the next three years. One of the key objectives that we will be working on with WAITOC through that period is a plan for future sustainability of the organisation and future sustainability of Indigenous tourism marketing information within the state. One of the other things that we are working on as part of our marketing strategy within our international and domestic tourism is making sure that it is part of our mainstream marketing initiatives. So, it is not something that just sort of sits outside of the norm, but it is actually something that we incorporate into all of our campaigns and projects. We are also looking at Indigenous tourism as part of our events strategy and we still have a bit of work to do in that regard, but we have got some really good concepts that we are working on. The last thing, and it is mentioned in the budget papers, is the capacity-building program, which in the first couple of years had some very good success and we are very confident that that is something that the Small Business Development Corporation will continue to see through.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: With all due respect, there does not seem to be a big thing happening here in terms of the number one priority for tourism. I mean you talk about incorporating it into the events strategy. Well, there is nothing big happening in the events strategy; in fact, it has gone from a big events strategy to a very small events calendar that we currently have. So, that is very concerning. I do, however, get the point that you are working with WAITOC to implement the recommendations of the review. I wonder whether you could provide to the committee an up-to-date progress report on each of those recommendations as per the WAITOC report —

Ms Buckland: Sure.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: — so that we can have an up-to-date position on where we are in terms of the implementations of those recommendations.

[Supplementary Information No A13.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I —

The CHAIR: If you have stopped on that area, I will come back to Hon Liz Behjat and then we will come back, just to make sure we —

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Just on the general thing, this might relate more to the annual report hearing that I am sure we will have later on when you come back to visit us at another time, or we might ask it now. Under your act is a requirement that by 30 July each year you provide to the minister a copy of your corporate plan and your operational plan. Two questions: Have you provided that to the minister this year? If so, can we have copies of those plans for the committee?

Ms Buckland: We have not provided it yet, and we would be happy to provide a copy to the committee once we have provided it to the minister.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Is there some reason why it was not provided by 30 July? My understanding is that that is when it is meant to be provided.

Ms Buckland: We just have not done it yet; we have not finished it. It has not been completed.

The CHAIR: That would be supplementary information A14 when that is available.

[Supplementary Information No A14.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I would like a better explanation as to why it has not been completed when there is an obligation to complete it.

The CHAIR: Fair enough, yes. I am just noting the document itself.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So the question, Ken?

The CHAIR: You are asking for —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Unless we can get it now, I am happy to have it taken on notice, but I would like a better explanation as to why it was not completed in the time that it was required to be completed. Just, “It wasn’t done”—I mean: Was it a lack of resources, was it a lack of staff or was it a lack of access to the minister to get her input? Why was it not done?

Ms Buckland: It was the fact that we had new staff in the area and they are coming up to speed on that particular responsibility.

The CHAIR: Okay. I just wanted to check, minister; did you finish on that one?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Ms Buckland, I quickly want to go to a point of contention. I watched your video promoting “Experience Extraordinary” on the TWA site, and on that video you said that you were the CEO of the organisation. Earlier on, I think you, in providing an answer to a question, said that you were the acting CEO. I just want to get on the public record whether you are the substantive CEO or the acting CEO of Tourism WA?

Ms Buckland: I am the acting CEO under direction by the Public Sector Commissioner.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay; so why did you say you were the CEO?

Ms Buckland: I am performing in the role of the chief executive officer.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: All right. Can you just advise me whether you know when the CEO position will be advertised?

Ms Buckland: No, I cannot.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: That actually would be a question for the Public Sector Commissioner.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay; fair enough. Quickly, I want to turn to international offices. Could you just advise how many international offices have been closed since September 2008?

Ms Buckland: None.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In terms of the work performed by international offices, what research and performance evaluation occurred to reach the decision to move to a contract model for international offices, and what exactly does that entail?

Ms Buckland: What I can say is that we have a contracted model already in place in a number of our international offices. So, in New Zealand, Singapore and Malaysia—in the USA, we employ a public relations agency—in Korea, or South Korea I should say, in all of those offices or all of those areas, we employ a marketing representation company. The marketing representation company undertakes the same types of activities that staff employed by the agency undertake. They represent Western Australia from a tourism perspective, they conduct travel agent training, they develop campaigns, they undertake public relations activities in terms of generating media coverage, they update and maintain the websites—many of those websites are in foreign languages. So they undertake a number of different duties. In Japan, China, the UK and Germany, we employ our own staff. That does present some difficulties and some risks for the agency from a continuity perspective. In two of those markets, we only have one person. So if that person goes on annual leave or long service leave or maternity leave, that leaves us exposed. In addition, those individuals are often mid-level officers working in different time zones and working independently on their

own without local senior-level strategic oversight. We found in the markets where we have employed an agency that that senior-level strategic oversight is able to be provided and that the outcomes that we get are actually quite positive, quite good.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Was there a cost–benefit analysis when you looked at the modelling and financial analysis, specifically with regards to the international offices, and before you made the decision to move to a contract model?

Ms Buckland: Based on our previous experience in the international offices, what our experience has been is that the cost of employing an agency generally ends up to be about the same as the cost of employing staff. Certainly in the case of Singapore and Malaysia, it has been virtually the same, but we have found that we have got a significantly better outcome out of the agency than we did out of our own employees.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Let me go back to the heart of the question, which was: was there a cost analysis conducted on the new structure?

Ms Buckland: The cost analysis was based on our experience in the markets where we have undertaken that model previously.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Did you do a report on it?

Ms Buckland: No.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So there was nothing documented in relation to —

Ms Buckland: We did not do a report on it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You did?

Ms Buckland: Did not.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I just have a couple of quick questions about your asset and investment program. I assume the money that you have spent in this financial year on the tourism e-marketplace was for an upgrade of your www.westernaustralia.com website?

Ms Buckland: I might ask David Lowe —

Mr Lowe: There have been big developments on it, yes. It would be programmers helping with developments and enhancements.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Right. Am I right, then, in assuming that because there is no provision over the next four years that you do not expect to do any further upgrades or development work on your website presence?

Mr Lowe: What we have provided for, and you will actually see it on page 396 of the budget, under “capital appropriations”, is that in addition to a normal minor asset replacement, we have got an increase in capital appropriations in the out years. This is to normalise the support for our tourism e-marketplace separate from any future capital development project that we might do as a major redevelopment. So what we have done is that we have come off a major development of those websites over the last four years. We have now provided for, in our minor asset replacement, the support of that, those websites, over the out years in terms of just minor asset management, and increased the money in that so that it suitably provides for those websites. But that is separate from future considerations, which would be something that we would look at as part of strategic planning and the like for a major redevelopment in the future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can you explain to me then, on page 402, how that shows up in the asset investment program listed?

Mr Lowe: Probably what you will see is under “New Works”—the chief financial officer might jump in here—you will see that \$475 000 for 2010–11 is a minor asset replacement, but then in the

out years it goes to \$525 000, \$575 000 and \$625 000, and this is to provide for that capital expenditure to maintain our infrastructure for the tourism e-marketplace.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Right, so the purchase of computer hardware is more than just the purchase of computers within the office then?

Mr Lowe: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Do you expect to see a reduction in the number of computers that you actually purchase over that period of time?

Mr Lowe: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are we able to get a reconciliation of how much you are reducing, because that does not—I assume that you have got a rolling process of replacing your computer hardware, but you are cutting staff by half, so I would have thought that there would be a reduction in at least by half of your computer hardware on the office side as opposed to the —

Mr Lowe: It would be part of our asset planning for the future in terms of matching that up with operational needs, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can we get that as a reconciliation, though, of what you were proposing just then?

Ms Buckland: It has not been developed yet.

Mr Lowe: It is a case of, we are in transition to a new organisation.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Going back to the operational plans and the corporate plans, have you completed them for the last financial year?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And have they been provided to the minister?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The other area that I had in terms of the overall finances is—actually, if we are going to get them in for the annual reports, I might leave until then. I want to talk about the new announcement by the minister the other day, of which I assume there is a fair degree of money getting spent on out of this year's budget for the promotion of Western Australia. I wonder how the industry partners in that joint marketing exercise were selected.

[3.15 pm]

Ms Buckland: We ran an expression of interest process in April and May of 2010 to solicit interest in cooperative marketing partnerships for 2010–11.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are we able to get copy of whatever documents you put out as part of that expression of interest process, and where it was advertised?

Mr Lowe: We can provide those.

The CHAIR: Mr Lowe, would you like to take that on notice?

Mr Lowe: We do not have the information here.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I would like detail on what was put out there and what the total process was of engaging with industry to let it know what you were doing. If it was just the website, that is fine. Did you identify potential partners and write to them? If so, can we get a list of the potential partners that were written to? Can we also get a copy of the selection criteria on which you based your selection of the partners that you are currently engaged with, along with a list of the partners that you are engaging with as part of the multimedia marketing campaign?

[*Supplementary Information No A15.*]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In reference to the email that I received and quoted from earlier about the fellow being very upset about Tourism WA, are there tourism operators who get advertising through Tourism WA for free, and why would that be the case?

Ms Buckland: We have the WA tourism network. If operators join the WA tourism network, they are eligible to promote their products on westernaustralia.com, but that is a paid membership. The cooperative marketing program that we are doing in 2010–11 is primarily with airlines and travel wholesalers. They would be required to put up their own dollars—usually it is two dollars for every dollar we invest—to be eligible for that program. I think the answer to the question is no—I do not think there is any instance in which somebody gets advertising for free with Tourism WA. If they are not a member of the network are not part of the cooperative marketing program for which they have to put up their own dollars, they do not get free advertising.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Do some of them get preferential treatment?

Ms Buckland: No. The thing we used to do in the past was that accredited operators would be listed first on westernaustralia.com if they had the tick program, but we have implemented a policy this year whereby, in order to be a member of the network, they have to be accredited, so there are no accredited operators.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: But you do not do any more accreditation, from what I am hearing.

Ms Buckland: The Tourism Council of WA accredits operators. Tourism WA never accredited operators.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: And the Tourism Council is still accrediting tour operators?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In terms of the major marketing campaigns you ran in 2009–10, the Extraordinary Taxi Ride, what efforts did the organisation make to ensure that the launch of that was on a day when the minister was available?

Ms Buckland: We actually launched the Extraordinary Taxi Ride campaign on a day when both the minister and the Premier were available, which was in February.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Sorry; I meant when it commenced.

Ms Buckland: There were a number of stages in the campaign. I cannot recall why she was not able to be at the launch that Minister Faragher attended.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe you could take the question on notice as to what efforts the agency made to try to find a date that was suitable for the minister to be at the commencement of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride. In my experience of these things, they are not organised in isolation; they are always organised by seeking a date when the minister is available, and I found it quite extraordinary that the minister was not available for your major marketing campaign, in which you invested so much money in 2009–10. I would like records of what efforts were made and what communication and correspondence occurred between the agency and the minister's office about her availability for the launch, and identifying dates on which she would be available.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is a good question.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am sure it is a good question, Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich, but I am not quite sure how trying to get information on correspondence and the like between Tourism WA and the minister in respect of diary matters is actually a matter for the budget papers. I might say that although the minister was not there for the actual send-off, I was very well represented. Having said that, she was there, obviously, for the announcement, as was the Premier, and as I understand it, she was there at the conclusion of the ride. I am just not quite sure how diary movements are actually relevant to the budget papers.

The CHAIR: Member, could you explain or tell me how it links to the budget?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It links in a number of ways. Firstly, this was the major expenditure under the destination marketing campaign of the organisation. Also, the agency would have expended resources in correspondence and communication with the minister's office. I am wanting to know the degree and extent of that communication, to give me some idea of the resources that the agency spent on that process in the lead-up to the decision of that launch.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: That is a very long bow, Hon Ken Travers.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No, it is not. Our committee has very broad terms of reference. I am trying to find out whether, for your major marketing campaign, on which you have spent an awful lot of money, there was any attempt made to make sure that the minister was there and available prior to setting the date; that is not an unreasonable question.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: The minister was there for the announcement, with the Premier.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: For the launch?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: The minister was there.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The minister remembers the event I am talking about—when the taxi broke down! Everyone remembers that. I am wondering now whether it was a bit of a stunt to get extra publicity!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: That was an interesting element to the launch, but Doug handled himself extremely well under those circumstances and probably gave a plug to the RAC, which was one of the sponsors.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Minister, do not take this personally, because I think you did a fantastic job filling in for the Minister for Tourism, and probably a better job that she could have, but that is not the point!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Hon Ken Travers will make me blush by saying such nice things! However, I do not quite see the relevance.

The CHAIR: Members, let us bring this particular matter to a conclusion. I do not think this relates to the budget; if it was a few steps here and there, it would be stretching it, so I suggest that Hon Ken Travers ask the question by way of question on notice.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: This question will definitely relate to the budget. Is it true that Doug the driver was very upset at the end because he was sick of sitting in a car for 12 hours a day and he was absolutely exhausted? Is that true?

Ms Buckland: I greeted Doug at the end of the drive, and I can assure the member that he was very happy, he was not annoyed and no, he was not tired; he was very excited and every bit as enthusiastic as the day he started the journey!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: And I think he was a fantastic advocate for Western Australia.

The CHAIR: The member got that question under my radar; I do not know that that question related to the budget, either!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I refer to the fifth dot point on page 398. It is definitely related to the budget! It is about the viability of new tourism development being negatively impacted by both local and global issues, and investment in short-stay accommodation being hampered by lower returns compared with other land uses, such as residential or commercial, regardless of demand. Of course, there is reference there to the Jones Lang LaSalle report. That was a very expensive and very comprehensive report, and it made a lot of recommendations about the future of the development side of tourism. It made some very good recommendations in terms of greater flexibility. I notice that part of the restructure is that this has just been shoved off to the Department

of Planning. It is mentioned that Tourism WA is progressing the recommendations of the accommodation report by Jones Lang LaSalle. There was another report referred to, by Access Economics. I am wondering whether it is possible for the CEO to provide the committee with an update on the implementation of the recommendations of both reports, not in a general sense, but in terms of every single recommendation and what the department has done. Is it possible for you to do that?

Ms Buckland: I can do that. I can give the member a general overview now; I am prepared to do that. Then we can follow it up with specific detail on each one. There were 20 recommendations in the Jones Lang LaSalle report; eight of them related to planning; two related to marketing and events; one related to access; and nine related to incentives. I will speak about each one of those areas.

Tourism WA is working with the Department of Planning on the eight recommendations relating to planning. The member may be aware that the Department of Planning recently issued the revised tourism planning bulletin 83. It has, at the encouragement of Tourism WA, sought input from the tourism industry on the planning bulletin, and I believe it is working through the feedback from industry on the draft planning bulletin. That covers the eight recommendations relating to planning. The two recommendations relating to marketing and events were about the need to generate demand for Western Australia as a tourism destination. As the committee will be aware, we have obviously launched a new brand and we have new emphasis on marketing. That, I think, covers the marketing aspect. For events, we are working on a new events strategy; David outlined some of the new events we are hopeful of securing in the future. One of the recommendations related to access and we have developed a priority list of new aviation access that we hope to develop. As I mentioned, we have employed a new director of aviation development. He will be joining us shortly and working on implementing that priority list. With respect to incentives, nine of the 20 recommendations were related to incentives that the government may be able to offer to induce hotel development. We have done a further study, which is still in draft form, which outlines some very specific things that the government might be able to offer to prospective tourism developers, including planning incentives, financial incentives and the like. That is something that we are working through with our board and other agencies that have provided input.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Thank you very much for that. Ms Buckland, can I request that when you provide the committee with a response to each of those recommendations, you try to make the answers fulsome so that we do not have to keep coming back to you.

[Supplementary Information No A16.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I refer to page 396 and the estimated actual expenditure for 2009–10, and the total cost of services being \$64.193 million. Did you expend any agency resources on seeking the Minister for Tourism's attendance at the commencement of the Extraordinary Taxi Ride campaign?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: We have a wide brief here!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I think we have addressed this!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No you have not! I have asked the question!

The CHAIR: I think that can be a yes or no answer.

Ms Buckland: I could not estimate how many resources were expended. I am sure there was an invitation and a discussion.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Thank you.

[3.30 pm]

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Just going back to the corporate plan and the operational plans: you have taken notice that you will provide the most current one when that is available. I cannot find on the website where the last one is. Can you provide copies of that—both of those—to the committee?

Ms Buckland: Of course.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: So then we will have the comparisons; that will be terrific. Thanks.

[Supplementary Information No A17.]

The CHAIR: Members, we are pretty close to finishing, so if there is a final question, or so.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Is WATC responsible for the KPIs for the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre?

Ms Buckland: We are not responsible for the KPIs, but we are responsible for managing the KPI committee and, I guess, oversight.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is what I mean.

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So when you say you are not responsible, who would be?

Ms Buckland: In other words we are not responsible for delivering the KPIs.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Obviously; that is for the convention and exhibition centre.

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are we able to get a copy of what those KPIs are?

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And have you done any monitoring on whether there has been any adverse impact on the rest of the convention and exhibition market in Western Australia as a result of the opening of the PCEC—as a result of that committee that you chair?

Ms Buckland: To my knowledge, we have not done any monitoring of any negative impacts on the rest of the industry, but may I take that on notice, please?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes.

The CHAIR: That is copies of the KPIs and if there is any monitoring.

[Supplementary Information No A18.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You also said earlier that you were planning on doing some marketing and promotion for the V8 Supercars.

Ms Buckland: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Has there been a formal submission put in indicating what are the expected outcomes of that marketing in terms of the tourism benefit?

Ms Buckland: There has been some work done to quantify the tourism benefit. I do not have that to memory.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are you able to tell us what your expected return on investment for every dollar spent on that will be?

Mr van Ooran: I will have to take that on notice, Hon Ken Travers.

[Supplementary Information No A19.]

The CHAIR: Honourable members, we are on time to finish. I think, unless someone has a really burning question, I might close the session with a few words.

The committee will forward any additional questions that it has to you via the minister in writing in the next couple of days, together with the transcript of evidence which includes the questions that you have taken on notice. If members have any unasked questions, I ask them 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. Should the agency be unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date. The advice is to include specific reasons as to why the due date cannot be met. Finally, on behalf of the committee, thank you all very much for your attendance this afternoon and your assistance. I close the hearing.

Hearing concluded at 3.32 pm