

copy of the AMAT Materials Engineering Pty Ltd report was forwarded from the ACCC's Melbourne Office to the ACCC's Canberra Office cannot be ascertained from available records.

- (2) A copy of the AMAT Materials Engineering Pty Ltd report was received by the ACCC's Melbourne Office on 21 December 2005. A copy of the HRL Technology Compliance Assessment report was received by the ACCC's Melbourne Office on 22 November 2005. A copy of the HRL Technology Engineering Evaluation report was received by the ACCC's Melbourne Office on 1 December 2005.
- (3) The ACCC decided there was no evidence of a breach of the mandatory safety standard for pedal bicycles between 22 November and 25 November 2005. The ACCC's Melbourne Office indicated that it had decided not to pursue the matter further with the supplier in a letter dated 22 December 2005. Further consideration of whether there was any possible case for the mandatory safety standard to include design or performance requirements for bicycle suspension forks more generally was undertaken by ACCC's Canberra Office.
- (4) Advice indicating that the investigation into any breach of the mandatory standard was concluded and that Mr Groombridge should pursue his concerns privately was communicated in a letter dated 25 November 2005.
- (5) The reports were the property of another party and were provided to the ACCC on a confidential basis as part of voluntary assistance to the ACCC in its enquiries. These reports were the subject of a valid FOI request by Mr Groombridge in August 2007 and released in full to the applicant on 31 October 2007 following consultation with the third party who had no objection to the release of the reports to Mr Groombridge.
- (6) Please refer to the responses to Questions 1 and 2. It appears that copies of each of these three reports were transferred from the ACCC Melbourne Office to the ACCC Canberra Office by internal mail. Internal mail receipts are not date stamped and hence the dates of the transfers can not be ascertained from available records.
- (7) Giant Bicycle Company's letter of 21 December 2005 providing a copy of the AMAT Materials Engineering Pty Ltd report was taken as a form of response to the ACCC's letter of 29 November 2005.
- (8) Choices of words and expressions in the ACCC's letter of 29 November 2005 were matters for the author and would be based on information available to the author at the time. Any correspondence containing product safety policy advice to the Parliamentary Secretary is generally settled by the area of the ACCC with that functional responsibility. The content of such advice is based on available information and professional assessments where required.
- (9) The ACCC understands that the AMAT report was commissioned by Giant Bicycle Company. Its timing and purpose are matters for that organisation.
- (10) The ACCC advised the Commonwealth Ombudsman that it held files and documents regarding Ministerial issues in a letter dated 19 March 2009.
- (11) All files relating to the original investigation conducted by the Melbourne office of the ACCC were made available to the Commonwealth Ombudsman by the ACCC on 19 March 2009.
- (12) Yes. The ACCC understands that the two examiners were bicycle retailers in Tasmania. This information was provided by both the then Office of Consumer Affairs Tasmania and the supplier, and was accepted in good faith. Details of the specific expertise of these persons are not known.
- (13) The ACCC is unaware of any relationship between the bicycle examiners and Giant Bicycle Company.
- (14) No.
- (15) The ACCC understands that Mr Groombridge did receive copies of these assessments. This understanding is based on information received from the then Office of Consumer Affairs Tasmania in 2005.
- (16) The ACCC has not identified any record of a letter received from Mr Groombridge requesting copies of these assessments.
- (17) The ACCC has no record of a formal report from Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading Tasmania in respect of the examinations of the bicycle.
- (18) The ACCC has had representatives on the Standards Australia Technical Committee for Pedal Bicycles for many years and has staff with technical qualifications, including science and engineering.
- (19) As noted in the ACCC's response of 4 September 2009 to Mr Groombridge, parts of ACCC correspondence are selectively quoted in Mr Groombridge's document. Written material which is not in its context can be misleading.

Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership

(Question Nos 159 and 160)

Senator Milne asked the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Trade, upon notice, on 1 October 2010:

- (1) (a) How have local communities been informed about the Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership (KFCP); (b) who was informed; and (c) what feedback has been received on the proposed project.
- (2) Has there been a land tenure assessment performed on the land to be covered by the project; if so, what was the result of that assessment; if not, why not.

- (3) Has there been an attempt to gain the free, prior and informed consent of local Indigenous and forest dependent communities in relation to the project.
- (4) (a) Has the Government undertaken any contingency planning for KFCP in the event that it is not possible for country parties to agree on the inclusion of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); and (b) is it anticipated that KFCP will become part of the voluntary carbon market.
- (5) (a) Does KFCP propose plantations as reforestation and an alternative source of income for local communities; and (b) is there anything in the design of KFCP that prevents plantations from being recognised for carbon credits.
- (6) Given that in its submissions to the UNFCCC in 2008 on KFCP, the Australian Government discussed the need to restrict forest conversion within Central Kalimantan at a province-wide level, can details be provided of (a) what restrictions are currently in place in relation to forest conversion; and (b) what plans are in place for forest conversion across the province.

Senator Conroy—The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Trade have provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

- (1) (a) Australia is supporting Indonesia in its efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation, The Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership (KFCP) is a key element of the Indonesia Australia Forest Carbon Partnership which is a leading international partnership on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD+).

The KFCP was designed, and is being implemented, in close consultation with local communities and is linked with pre-existing initiatives in peatland planning and conservation in Central Kalimantan. Since mid-2009, the KFCP has worked through village facilitators (13 of whom are posted in villages which are home to the great majority of people in the project area) to explain the objectives of KFCP, gather community views about the project, understand the social and economic circumstances of the local communities, and develop options for alternative incomes for the local people (including improved management of smallholder rubber plantations in areas where agriculture is already practiced and on forest conservation activities). Key elements of the implementation will be undertaken by local NGOs (CARE and Borneo Orangutan Survival) who have long-term relationships and knowledge of the area.

(b) The KFCP was designed in partnership with Indonesian officials at national, provincial and local level. Village heads and customary leaders were also consulted in the design phase. The early implementation phase of the KFCP includes a communications component to provide further information on the objectives and approaches of the KFCP.

(c) Community representatives have been receptive to the KFCP on the basis that they retain equitable access to forest resources and to incentive-based payments.

- (2) An assessment of customary rights and other forms of local land tenure was completed in the design phase in 2009. Land tenure remains a very complex issue and further information about local land tenure and property rights will continue to be collected during the implementation phase.
- (3) The KFCP was designed in partnership with Indonesian officials at national, provincial and local level, as well as village heads and customary leaders. There has been extensive and ongoing consultation with the local communities, and facilitators have been posted in 13 villages which house the majority of people in the project area.
- (4) (a) and (b) Australia continues actively to support the inclusion of REDD+ in a future international climate change agreement. As a REDD+ demonstration activity, the priority of the KFCP is to trial how REDD+ can work in practice, and to inform the UNFCCC negotiating process on REDD+. The KFCP will test approaches to meeting possible future UNFCCC requirements for a REDD+ market mechanism. There has been significant progress on REDD+ in the UNFCCC negotiations, including recent agreement in the Copenhagen Accord on the need to immediately establish a mechanism for REDD+.
- (5) (a) and (b) The KFCP will undertake reforestation as part of efforts to rehabilitate and stabilise existing areas of degraded peat swamp forest to help prevent further forest degradation and deforestation. Reforestation will be undertaken using native species. The KFCP will also support local livelihood activities, such as improved management of smallholder rubber plantations in areas where agriculture is already practiced. The KFCP will not support industrial plantations. As part of trialling approaches to REDD+ the KFCP will estimate and monitor changes in emissions and removals of greenhouse gases.
- (6) (a) and (b) Australia will continue to work with Indonesia on these issues, however, restrictions and planning relating to forest conversion are the responsibility of the Government of Indonesia, with whom the joint UNFCCC submission on the KFCP was made, through its legislation and decision making processes.

Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organisation

(Question No. 166)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, upon notice, on 18 October 2010:

In regard to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO): For the past 18 months, what was the amount spent on entertaining by the CSIRO: (a) Chief Executive Officer; and (b) ICT Centre Director.