



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

2023-24-25-26

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

No. 712

THURSDAY 2 APRIL 2026

(The Questions and Answers Paper published on Monday to Friday of each week will contain, by number and title, all questions to which answers have been received the previous day and any new questions asked that day. Consequently, the full text of any question will be printed only twice: when notice is given; and, when answered.)

Notice given on date shown.

Publication of Questions	Answer to be lodged by
Q & A No. 697 (Including Question Nos 5080 to 5092)	2 April 2026
Q & A No. 698 (Including Question Nos 5093 to 5094)	7 April 2026
Q & A No. 699 (Including Question Nos 5095 to 5096)	8 April 2026
Q & A No. 700 (Including Question Nos 5097 to 5100)	9 April 2026
Q & A No. 701 (Including Question Nos 5103 to 5104)	10 April 2026
Q & A No. 702 (Including Question Nos 5105 to 5160)	13 April 2026
Q & A No. 703 (Including Question Nos 5161 to 5174)	14 April 2026
Q & A No. 704 (Including Question Nos 5175 to 5175)	15 April 2026
Q & A No. 705 (Questions—Nil)	-
Q & A No. 706 (Including Question Nos 5176 to 5179)	17 April 2026
Q & A No. 707 (Including Question Nos 5180 to 5181)	20 April 2026
Q & A No. 708 (Including Question Nos 5182 to 5192)	21 April 2026
Q & A No. 709 (Including Question Nos 5193 to 5193)	22 April 2026
Q & A No. 710 (Including Question Nos 5194 to 5194)	23 April 2026
Q & A No. 711 (Including Question Nos 5195 to 5195)	24 April 2026
Q & A No. 712 (Including Question Nos 5196 to 5233)	27 April 2026

12 MARCH 2026

(Paper No. 697)

* 5080 AGRICULTURE—NSW FOOD AUTHORITY INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT—Ms Abigail Boyd to ask the Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales—

- (1) On pages 14 and 15 of the NSW Food Authority Annual Report 2024-25, there is reference to a targeted illegal slaughter investigation conducted by compliance officers involving investigations at 24 properties across seven Local Land Services regions. Can you please provide any further information about the investigation, the properties and operators involved and the offences detected under the Food Act 2003, Biosecurity Act 2015 and/or Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979 as part of the investigation?
- (2) In relation to the "over 1,100 kg of processed meat and animal carcasses" seized as part of the investigation, can you please confirm the exact total amount of processed meat and animal carcasses seized?
 - (a) Can you break this down into the number of seizures, the type of animal/s involved, the nature of the offence, whether the premises had a history of unlicensed activity, whether the operator was a repeat offender and whether any seized product is suspected to have entered the retail, wholesale, direct-to-consumer markets or food service supply chain before detection?
- (3) Did the Food Authority seize any vehicles, equipment, labelling materials or advertising materials as part of the investigation?
 - (a) If so, can you please provide details of what was seized, the nature of the offence, whether the premises had a history of unlicensed activity, whether the operator was a repeat offender, the grounds on which the items were seized and whether any further enforcement action was taken alongside the seizure?
- (4) In relation to the two prohibition orders issued to mitigate serious public health risks relating to food for human consumption, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) What was the scope of each prohibition order?
 - (b) Which alleged offences were each of the prohibition orders in relation to?
 - (i) Can you please provide a description of the nature and circumstances of each alleged offence, including the short title of the offence?
 - (c) On what date did each of the alleged offences occur?
 - (d) Which provisions of the Food Standards Code were specified in each prohibition order?
 - (e) What action was taken by the offender/s to ensure compliance with the relevant provisions of the Food Standards Code?
 - (f) On what date were each of the prohibition orders served?
 - (g) What is the status of each prohibition notice?
 - (h) Are the prohibition orders currently published on the Food Authority's public register?
 - (i) If so, what is the notice number and trade name for each?
 - (ii) If not, why?
 - (i) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports as a result of either of the prohibition orders?
 - (i) If so, what was the nature of any follow-up action, and how long after the orders were issued did the follow-up action occur?
- (5) In relation to the four penalty notices issued, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Which alleged offences were each of the penalty notices in relation to?

- (i) Can you please provide a description of the nature and circumstances of each alleged offence, including the short title of the offence?
 - (b) On what date were each of the penalty notices served?
 - (c) On what date did each of the alleged offences occur?
 - (d) For each penalty notice, has the penalty notice been fully or partly paid?
 - (e) For each penalty notice, was a penalty notice enforcement order under Part 3 of the Fines Act 1996 issued in respect of the penalty notice?
 - (f) For each penalty notice, is the penalty notice unresolved?
 - (g) Are the penalty notices currently published on the Food Authority's public register?
 - (i) If so, what is the notice number and trade name for each?
 - (ii) If not, why?
 - (h) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports as a result of any of the penalty notices? If so:
 - (i) what was the nature of any follow-up action?
 - (ii) how long after the notices were issued did the follow-up action occur?
- (6) In relation to the three warning letters issued, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Which alleged offences were each of the warning letters in relation to?
 - (i) Can you please provide a description of the nature and circumstances of each alleged offence, including the short title of the offence?
 - (b) On what date did each of the alleged offences occur?
 - (c) Which provisions of the Food Standards Code were specified in each warning letter?
 - (d) What action was taken by the offender/s to ensure compliance with the relevant provisions of the Food Standards Code?
 - (e) On what date were each of the warning letters served?
 - (f) What is the status of each warning letter?
 - (g) What remedial action was specified in each warning letter?
 - (h) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports as a result of any of the warning letters? If so:
 - (i) what was the nature of any follow-up action?
 - (ii) how long after the letters were issued did the follow-up action occur?
- (7) In relation to the three individual biosecurity directions issued, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Which alleged offences were each of the warning letters in relation to?
 - (i) Can you please provide a description of the nature and circumstances of each alleged offence, including the short title of the offence?
 - (b) On what date did each of the alleged offences occur?
 - (c) What actions did each direction contain, in terms of provisions that prohibit, regulate or control, or that require specific action from the business or operator?
 - (d) What action was taken by the offender/s following each direction to ensure compliance with the Biosecurity Act 2015 and/or the Food Act 2003?
 - (e) On what date were each of the directions issued?
 - (f) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports as a result of any of the directions? If so:

-
- (i) what was the nature of any follow-up action?
 - (ii) how long after the directions were issued did the follow-up action occur?
 - (8) How many fines were paid, withdrawn and subject to further proceedings as part of the investigation?
 - (9) Can you please break down which New South Wales agency issued the different enforcement actions throughout the investigation?
 - (10) Did the investigation identify any breaches or offences under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979?
 - (11) Are any of the properties or operators subject to enforcement action as part of the investigation currently conducting any licensed activity in New South Wales?
 - (a) If so, can you please provide details of the current operations?
 - (12) Did the Food Authority or another agency commence any prosecutions as part of the investigation?
 - (13) According to the NSW Food Authority Annual Report 2024-25, "due to the complexity of illegal slaughter investigations, the operation required comprehensive planning and coordination with multiple NSW agencies, including NSW Police, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSCPA), Local Land Services (LLS), the Greyhound Welfare & Integrity Commission (GWIC), Racing NSW and Local Government", what was the nature of the involvement of each New South Wales agency in the investigation?
 - (14) Were any greyhounds or horses in the remit of GWIC and Racing NSW identified as being involved in illegal activity throughout the course of the investigation?
 - (a) If so, can you please explain the nature of this involvement, the number of greyhounds or horses involved and what subsequent action was taken as part of the investigation?
 - (15) Were any registered individuals in the remit of GWIC and Racing NSW identified as being involved in illegal activity throughout the course of the investigation?
 - (a) If so, can you please explain the nature of this involvement and what subsequent action was taken as part of the investigation?
 - (16) Did the operation investigate any illegally slaughtered or processed meat intended to be sold or distributed?
 - (a) If so, where was it intended to be sold or distributed?
 - (17) Can you provide any details or information about the scale, risk or prevalence of illegal slaughter activity identified through the investigation?
 - (18) Had any of the properties or operators subject to enforcement action as part of the investigation previously been issued any prohibition orders, penalty notices, warning letters and biosecurity directions prior to the investigation?
 - (a) Can you please provide details including the nature and outcome of any prior enforcement action, the alleged offences and the date the action was issued?
 - (19) On page 45 of the NSW Food Authority Annual Report 2023-24, there is reference to the seizure of meat carcass from an unlicensed knackery and an unlicensed abattoir involving 320 kgs of horse meat, 114 kgs of pig fat and 41.24 kgs of beef mince, 157.39 kgs of lamb, 5.58 kgs sheep offal, 636 kgs meat from multiple species and 220 kgs of beef carcass, and 1.6 kgs of rabbit. On what date did each of the seizures occur, broken down into the estimated quantity that was seized from each property?
 - (a) What was the outcome of each seizure?
 - (b) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports?
 - (c) Did the Food Authority take any enforcement action against the offenders?
 - (i) If so, what was each of the offences?

- (d) How many properties or operators were responsible for the unlicensed activity involving the seizures?
 - (i) How many were repeat offenders?
 - (ii) Are any of the offenders currently operating any licensed activity?
- (e) Are any of the seized products suspected to have entered the retail, wholesale, direct-to-consumer markets or food service supply chain before detection?
- (f) In relation to the 1.6 kgs rabbit, can you please provide any further information about the reasons for seizure, including whether any mislabelling was detected?
 - (i) Was the rabbit seized alongside any other meat carcass from the same premises?
- (20) On page 16 of the NSW Food Authority Annual Report 2023-24, there is reference to a foodborne illness investigation where the Food Authority detected buffalo meat had been supplied by an unlicensed meat manufacturer which was issued a prohibition order. What was the scope of the prohibition order?
 - (a) Which alleged offences was the prohibition order in relation to?
 - (i) Can you please provide a description of the nature and circumstances of each alleged offence, including the short title of the offence?
 - (b) On what date did the alleged offence/s occur?
 - (c) Which provisions of the Food Standards Code were specified in the prohibition order?
 - (d) What action was taken by the offender to ensure compliance with the relevant provisions of the Food Standards Code?
 - (e) On what date was the prohibition order served?
 - (f) What is the status of each prohibition notice?
 - (g) Is the prohibition order currently published on the Food Authority's public register?
 - (i) If so, what is the notice number and trade name?
 - (ii) If not, why?
 - (h) Did the Food Authority conduct any follow-up inspections or compliance reports as a result of the prohibition order? If so:
 - (i) what was the nature of any follow-up action?
 - (ii) how long after the order was issued did the follow-up action occur?
 - (i) The annual report also referred to a further unlicensed meat processor producing a variety of meat products, including air-dried meat. What enforcement action was taken against this operator, if any?

Answer—

I am advised:

(1)-(20)

The NSW Food Authority publishes lists of businesses that have breached or are alleged to have breached NSW food safety laws on the Name and shame register of offences [Name and shame | NSW Food Authority](#).

* 5081 EMERGENCY SERVICES—LUCKNOW RURAL FIRE SERVICE BRIGADE—The Hon. Scott Barrett to ask the Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy representing the Minister for Customer Service and Digital Government, Minister for Emergency Services, and Minister for Youth Justice—

- (1) What is the current status of the Lucknow Rural Fire Service (RFS) brigade?
- (2) How many active volunteers are there at the brigade to call upon?

- (3) If a tanker was called upon today, are there personnel available to respond?
- (4) How many resignations have there been in the past 12 months?
 - (a) What were the reasons given for these resignations?
- (5) How many dismissals have there been in the past 12 months?
 - (b) What were the reasons given for these dismissals?
- (6) What positions are currently vacant in the Lucknow brigade structure?
- (7) Have there been any callouts in the local area that Lucknow has been unable to respond to due to lack of volunteers?

Answer—

I am advised:

The Lucknow Rural Fire Brigade remains operational with 35 members, each performing a variety of roles within the brigade. In the past 12 months there have been nil dismissals and there are no current vacancies.

Due to the low number, privacy obligations restrict the provision of information regarding resignations.

* 5082 CUSTOMER SERVICE AND DIGITAL GOVERNMENT—MINISTERIAL ADVISORY GROUP—The Hon. Mark Latham to ask the Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy representing the Minister for Customer Service and Digital Government, Minister for Emergency Services, and Minister for Youth Justice—

- (1) What progress have you made in establishing the Ministerial Advisory Group (MAG) legislated in the Workers Compensation laws passed by the Parliament in November?
 - (a) Who is on the MAG?
 - (b) What are its terms of reference?
 - (c) When will it first meet?
- (2) Have expressions of interest been called for the three injured workers on the MAG?
 - (a) What has been the outcome?

Answer—

I am advised:

Preparatory work to establish the Ministerial Advisory Group is underway. The Advisory Group will be formally convened once the relevant legislative provisions commence via proclamation and the necessary appointments are finalised. Expressions of interest have not yet been sought.

* 5083 FINANCE—FORESTRY CORPORATION LOSSES IN 2025—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources—

- (1) Did you, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, receive any written or verbal advice from senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW of the likely quantum of their annual loss for the 2024-25 financial year, before the Forestry Corporation's annual report disclosed a \$32 million loss?
 - (a) If so, when and from whom in the Forestry Corporation NSW did you receive that advice?
 - (b) If so, did that advice from the Forestry Corporation NSW officers identify any actions the Forestry Corporation would take to reduce its annual losses in the subsequent year, to stabilise its financial position, and lessen its need for public funds to underwrite its operations?
 - (c) If so, will you table that advice?

- (d) If you did not receive advice on the likely quantum of the 2025 annual loss, or on actions to reduce its annual losses, why did officers of the Forestry Corporation NSW not provide such advice to you, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (2) Do you agree with the statement on the NSW Treasury website, that the role of NSW Treasury in relation to state-owned corporations includes monitoring "the performance of State-Owned Corporations (SOCs) on behalf of the Treasurer and the Minister for Finance"?
 - (a) If so, did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials following the Forestry Corporation's annual report disclosing a \$32 million loss for the financial year 2024-25, which referred to or discussed this annual loss of \$32 million?
 - (i) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (ii) Will you table that advice?
 - (iii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (iv) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the annual loss of \$32 million to you, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (3) Did NSW Treasury officials' advice on the Forestry Corporation's 2025 annual loss of \$32 million refer to:
 - (a) the need to reduce annual losses and stabilise the NSW Forestry Corporation's financial position?
 - (b) any steps or actions recommended by NSW Treasury, that needed to be taken by the Corporation to rein in its worsening losses?
 - (c) concerns that prices for hardwood timber products did not cover the cost of their production, raised by the Auditor General in 2017 and also 2021?
- (4) Did you, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, take any actions following her receipt of advice from NSW Treasury on the Corporation's \$32 million loss in 2025, to reduce annual losses, stabilise the Corporation's worsening financial position and mitigate the cost burden of underwriting the Forestry Corporation's annual losses on public funds?
 - (a) If so, did the actions taken by you, as shareholder minister include:
 - (i) requesting NSW Treasury to conduct a thorough audit of the financial accounts of NSW Forestry Corporation's hardwood division?
 - (ii) commissioning and receiving an independent review of the costs of production of hardwood native forest timber products?
 - (iii) requiring a comprehensive overhaul of the Forestry Corporation's product pricing policy?
 - (b) If these actions were not taken, what were the actions taken by you?
 - (c) If you took no actions, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, following advice from NSW Treasury on the Corporation's \$32 million loss in 2025, why did you not take action to reduce annual losses, stabilise the Corporation's worsening financial position and mitigate the cost burden of underwriting the Forestry Corporation's annual losses on public funds?
- (5) Did you, as shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, discuss advice from either the Forestry Corporation or NSW Treasury on the Corporation's \$32 million annual loss for 2025, with the Treasurer, as the senior shareholder minister in the Corporation?
 - (a) If so, when was this advice discussed with the Treasurer?
 - (b) If so, did you and the Treasurer reach any conclusions, as shareholder ministers in the Corporation, about the need to stabilise the financial position of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, what were these conclusions?
 - (ii) If you and the Treasurer did not reach any conclusions, in your discussions as shareholder ministers, on actions needed by the board in response to the Forestry

Corporation's 2025 annual loss of \$32 million, why did you not reach any conclusions?

- (c) If you did not discuss advice from NSW Treasury, or the Forestry Corporation, on the Corporation's \$32 million annual loss in 2025, with the Treasurer, why did you not discuss this advice with the Treasurer, as senior shareholder minister in the Corporation?
- (6) Did you and the Treasurer agree on any recommendations that you would make, as shareholder ministers, to the Forestry Corporation to reduce annual losses and help stabilize their financial position, following the \$32 million annual loss in June 2025?
 - (a) If so, what were these recommendations?
 - (b) If so, to whom in the Forestry Corporation were these recommendations made?
 - (c) If so, when were these recommendations made?
 - (d) If not, why did you and the Treasurer, as shareholder ministers in the Forestry Corporation, not develop recommendations to help stabilize the financial position of the Forestry Corporation, following their \$32 million annual loss in June 2025?
- (7) Did you, or any delegate of yours, attend any meeting(s) of the Forestry Corporation's board at which the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million was discussed?
 - (a) If so, when was/were the meeting(s) held?
 - (b) Did those meeting(s) with the board of the Forestry Corporation discuss:
 - (i) the need to stabilize the Corporation's worsening financial position?
 - (ii) any actions identified by officers of the Forestry Corporation to reduce annual losses?
 - (iii) any actions recommended by you and the Treasurer to help stabilise the Corporation's financial position?
 - (iv) any actions suggested by NSW Treasury to rein in the Forestry Corporation of NSW's worsening financial position?
 - (c) If so, what specific actions were discussed?
 - (i) What actions were agreed to be taken?
 - (d) If not, why did you not meet with the board of the Forestry Corporation?
- (8) If you did not meet with the Corporation's board, did you, or your delegate, discuss the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million, the advice from NSW Treasury officials or advice from the NSW Forestry Corporation, in any meetings with any corporation officers, being:
 - (a) the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), being the sole executive director of the corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the advice from NSW Treasury officials on the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (b) the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the advice from NSW Treasury officials on the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (c) the Chair of the board of directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?

- (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
- (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the advice from NSW Treasury officials on the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
- (d) any individual directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the advice from NSW Treasury officials on the 2025 annual loss of \$32 million with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
- (9) Given the Forestry Corporation's financial position has deteriorated from a \$29 million loss in 2024 to \$32 million loss in 2025, why have you, as shareholder minister in the Corporation, not taken appropriate action to instruct the board to reduce losses, improve Forestry Corporation's financial position and lessen the cost of underwriting losses from public funds?

Answer—

Forestry Corporation's 2024-25 Annual Report disclosed normalised earnings of \$0.3m and a Net Profit After Tax of \$19.8m. As shareholding minister, I regularly engage with all State Owned Corporations and NSW Treasury to oversee commercial performance and accountability of the State Owned Corporations.

* 5084 FINANCE—INDEPENDENT PRICING AND REGULATORY TRIBUNAL REPORTS—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources—

- (1) Are you aware that the New South Wales Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) in its 2017 and 2021 reports reported that hardwood product prices do not cover the costs of production?
 - (a) If not, why?
- (2) Are you aware of the IPART's concerns about below-cost discount prices for hardwood products?
 - (a) What have you done to address these concerns?
- (3) What have you done, as one of the two shareholder ministers on the Board of the Forestry Corporation, to ensure that the Board and its senior managers comply with public sector principles for ethical management of public resources, such as 'fiscal responsibility', and 'putting the public interest first'?
 - (a) What have you done to ensure that senior management has taken the actions necessary to minimise its multi-million dollars annual losses?
- (4) Have you commissioned any 'due diligence' investigations into the financial liability of the NSW Treasury from the New South Wales timber industry's claimed 'right' to be paid compensation by the Government for the creation of the Great Koala National Park (GKNP)?
 - (a) If not, why?
- (5) Are you aware of any 'due diligence' investigations that have been undertaken, or are being undertaken, by NSW Treasury officials into the timber industry's claimed 'right' to be compensated for the Government's proposed creation of the GKNP?
 - (a) If not, why?
 - (b) If so, is there a legal basis for the Government being financially liable to pay compensation to the New South Wales timber industry for creating a new national park?
 - (i) What is this legal basis?

Answer—

Section 91 of the NSW Forestry Act 2012 (the Act) requires FCNSW to review, benchmark and report on its native timber harvesting and haulage costs every 3 years. It also requires IPART to review FCNSW's report and make recommendations for reducing these costs.

Long-term wood supply agreements are in place and can be reviewed when they expire.

The Shareholding Ministers are not appointed to the Board of Forestry Corporation.

* 5085 TREASURER—FORESTRY CORPORATION AND NSW TIMBER INDUSTRY—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Treasurer—

- (1) Are you aware that the New South Wales Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) in its 2017 and 2021 reports reported that hardwood product prices do not cover the costs of production?
 - (a) If not, why?
- (2) Are you aware of the IPART's concerns about below-cost discount prices for hardwood products?
 - (a) What have you done to address these concerns?
- (3) What have you done, as one of the two shareholder ministers on the Board of the Forestry Corporation, to ensure that the Board and its senior managers comply with public sector principles for ethical management of public resources, such as 'fiscal responsibility', and 'putting the public interest first'?
 - (a) What have you done to ensure that senior management has taken the actions necessary to minimise its multi-million dollars annual losses?
- (4) Have you commissioned any 'due diligence' investigations into the financial liability of the NSW Treasury from the New South Wales timber industry's claimed 'right' to be paid compensation by the Government for the creation of the Great Koala National Park (GKNP)?
 - (a) If not, why?
- (5) Are you aware of any 'due diligence' investigations that have been undertaken, or are being undertaken, by NSW Treasury officials into the timber industry's claimed 'right' to be compensated for the Government's proposed creation of the GKNP?
 - (a) If not, why?
 - (b) If so, is there a legal basis for the Government being financially liable to pay compensation to the New South Wales timber industry for creating a new national park?
 - (i) What is this legal basis?

Answer—

Section 91 of the NSW Forestry Act 2012 (the Act) requires FCNSW to review, benchmark and report on its native timber harvesting and haulage costs every three years. It also requires IPART to review FCNSW's report and make recommendations for reducing these costs.

Long-term wood supply agreements are in place and can be reviewed when they expire.

The Shareholding Ministers are not appointed to the Board of Forestry Corporation.

* 5086 ENVIRONMENT—GREAT KOALA NATIONAL PARK AND TIMBER INDUSTRY—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) Have any discussions been held between the Government and the New South Wales timber industry regarding claims for the payment of compensation by the Government to the New South Wales timber industry for the Government's eventual creation of the Great Koala National Park?
 - (a) If so, who did you meet with from the New South Wales timber industry?
 - (i) When did it happen?

- (b) If so, what were the terms of the compensation demands made by the New South Wales timber industry for the creation of the Great Koala National Park?
- (2) Have you made any commitments to the New South Wales timber industry regarding the payment of compensation to the industry for the Government's eventual creation of the Great Koala National Park?
 - (a) If so, what were they?
 - (b) If so, what was the legal basis for the Government's proposal to pay compensation to the timber industry for the Great Koala National Park?
- (3) Have any discussions been held between the Government and any environment advocacy groups, such as Nature Conservation Council, regarding the payment of compensation by the Government to the New South Wales timber industry for the Government's eventual creation of the Great Koala National Park?
 - (a) If so, who did you meet with from these advocacy groups?
 - (i) When did it happen?
 - (b) If not, why?
- (4) What due diligence have you undertaken with the NSW Treasury Office into the financial liability faced by the NSW Treasury from the New South Wales timber industry's claimed 'right' to be paid compensation by the Government for the creation of the Great Koala National Park?

Answer—

- (1) Yes. The NSW Government is working directly with those in the timber industry that are affected by the reduction in timber supply resulting from the moratorium to ensure they are appropriately supported. These discussions are commercial in confidence and legally privileged. The NSW Government is also providing a comprehensive worker support package, as well as supports for other businesses in the supply chain who may have suffered downstream impacts. Details on the Government's work in this space is publicly available at: <https://www.nsw.gov.au/environment-land-and-water/great-koala-national-park>.
 - (a) See answer to question (1).
 - (i) See answer to question (1).
 - (b) See answer to question (1).
- (2) No, I have not made commitments to the NSW timber industry regarding the payment of compensation by the Government to the NSW timber industry.
 - (a) Not applicable.
 - (b) Not applicable.
- (3) My office and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water routinely meet with environment advocacy groups on a range of environmental issues but have not discussed details around the payment of compensation by the Government to the NSW timber industry.
 - (a) See answer to question (3).
 - (i) See answer to question (3).
 - (b) See answer to question (3).
- (4) NSW Treasury has advised it has undertaken due diligence. However, the advice is commercial in confidence, cabinet in confidence and subject to legal professional privilege.

* 5087 AGRICULTURE—FORESTRY CORPORATION TIMBER PRODUCT PRICING—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales—

- (1) Are you aware of Frontier Economics' report "Public native forest logging: a large and growing taxpayer burden" in 2023, and the New South Wales Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal's concerns in 2017 and 2021 that the prices the New South Wales Forestry Corporation charges the

New South Wales timber industry for hardwood logs are below the costs of production and have been for many years?

- (2) What is the rationale for selling hardwood logs at below-cost discount prices, with public funds subsidising the costs of their production?
 - (a) How does this rationale align with the Government's principles for the ethical management of public resources by public sector bodies including state-owned entities like the New South Wales Forestry Corporation?
 - (b) How does this rationale align with the State's public sector management principles requiring "integrity, accountability" and "putting the public interest first"?
 - (c) How is this rationale fiscally responsible?
- (3) What work, if any, has been done to review the costs of production of native forest timber products, especially the current pricing policy of hardwood timber products?
- (4) Do you have any plans to recommend what the prices of hardwood timber products ought to be, in order to fully recover the costs of their production?
- (5) What work, if any, has been done to overhaul the New South Wales Forestry Corporation's timber product pricing policy?
- (6) In light of the breaches proven in the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales, carried out by the New South Wales Forestry Corporation and the million-dollar losses of their hardwood timber products, would you consider referring the New South Wales Forestry Corporation to the New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption?
 - (a) If not, why?

Answer—

I am advised:

- (1) IPART reviews Forestry Corporation of NSW's native timber harvesting and haulage costs, not log prices. The revenue Forestry Corporation receives from customers exceeds the cost of harvest and haulage payments and administration costs associated with delivery of that timber.
- (2) Hardwood logs are not sold at below-cost discount prices. The revenue Forestry Corporation receives from customers exceeds the cost of harvest and haulage payments and administration costs associated with delivery of that timber.
- (a)-(c) N/A.
- (3)-(5) The revenue Forestry Corporation receives from customers exceeds the cost of harvest and haulage payments and administration costs associated with delivery of that timber.
- (6) Matters heard by the Land and Environment Court did not relate to any suggestion of corruption and have been dealt with by that court.

* 5088 CORRECTIONS—IN-CELL ONLINE VIDEO COUNSELLING FOR PRISONERS—The Hon. Aileen MacDonald to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—

- (1) In correspondence to you dated 9 December 2025, the Community Justice Coalition raised concerns regarding the lack of access to confidential individual counselling services for prisoners in New South Wales correctional centres and proposed that prisoners be allowed to access online video counselling through existing in-cell tablet infrastructure. Has the Government formally considered this proposal?
- (2) Given that prisoners already have access to tablets and infrastructure that allow audio calls and video streaming from within their cells, what specific technological barriers prevent the use of those devices for confidential video counselling with external providers?

- (3) Does Corrective Services NSW permit external psychologists or counsellors to provide individual therapy to prisoners via secure video link?
 - (a) If not, why?
- (4) What assessment has Corrective Services NSW undertaken regarding the potential benefits of allowing prisoners to access independent counselling services through telehealth or video platforms?
- (5) How many psychologists, psychiatrists or counsellors are currently available within the New South Wales prison system to provide therapeutic counselling services to prisoners?
- (6) What proportion of prisoners currently receive regular individual psychological counselling while in custody?
- (7) What safeguards would be required to allow prisoners to access independent counselling services while maintaining appropriate privacy, security and operational controls?
- (8) Has the Government considered whether remote counselling delivered through prisoners' tablets could improve continuity of care when prisoners are transferred between correctional centres or released back into the community?
- (9) Has the Government examined models in other jurisdictions where prisoners receive counselling services via telehealth or video conferencing while in custody?
- (10) Will you commit to reviewing the feasibility of permitting secure in-cell video counselling with accredited external providers, including those funded through Medicare or privately funded by prisoners or their families?

Answer—

I am advised:

Please refer to page 36 of the hearing transcript from the recent Budget Estimates hearing on Thursday 26 February 2026.

* 5089 FINANCE—FORESTRY CORPORATION COURT CASES—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources—

- (1) Do you agree with the statement, posted on the NSW Treasury website, that NSW Treasury's role in relation to state-owned corporations includes "advising Portfolio and Shareholding Ministers about critical current and emerging issues that may affect the business" being State Owned Corporations (SOCs)?
- (2) Do you agree that decisions of the Land and Environment Court of NSW, NSW Court of Appeal and High Court of Australia regarding the Forestry Corporation's liability to prosecution for breaches of environmental law, constitute "critical current issues" or "emerging issues" that "may affect the forestry corporation" and hence warrant the provision of advice by Treasury?
- (3) Did you, in your role as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the NSW Land and Environment Court's decision in *South East Forest Rescue Inc INC9894030 v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWLEC 7, delivered on 7 February 2024, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
 - (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Land and Environment Court in *South East Forest Rescue Inc INC9894030 v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWLEC 7, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?

-
- (4) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that the South East Forest Rescue Incorporated (SEFR Inc) had 'standing' to bring proceedings against the Forestry Corporation of NSW, being a critical issue that may affect its business?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Treasury, to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (5) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that SEFR Inc had 'standing' to bring proceedings against corporation, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation received?
- (i) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation's officers?
- (ii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did Forestry Corporation officers not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (6) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the corporation's appeal with costs, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (7) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the corporation's appeal with costs, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation's officers?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?

- (b) If not, why did Forestry Corporation officers not provide advice on the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (8) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the commencement on 28 August 2025, of a criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for 29 offences alleged to have been committed between 1 January 2023 and 31 August 2023, in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995) being a critical emerging issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Treasury to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the commencement of a further criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the EPA, for 29 offences in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995), to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (9) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from the directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the commencement on 28 August 2025, of a criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) for 29 offences alleged to have been committed between 1 January 2023 and 31 August 2023, in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995) being a critical emerging issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW directors/officers?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did directors or officers of Forestry Corporation of NSW not provide advice on the commencement of a further criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the EPA, for 29 offences in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995), to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (10) Did you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, discuss advice from either the Forestry Corporation or NSW Treasury on the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia decision in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with the Treasurer, as the other shareholder minister in the corporation?
- (a) If so, when was this advice discussed with the Treasurer?
- (b) If so, did you and Treasurer reach any conclusions, as shareholder ministers in the corporation, about the need to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (i) If so, what were these conclusions?
- (ii) If you and Treasurer, as shareholder ministers in the corporation, did not reach any conclusions on what actions were needed to improve the corporation compliance with applicable environmental laws, why did you not reach any conclusions?
- (c) If you, as senior shareholder minister, did not discuss advice from NSW Treasury or Forestry Corporation, on the implications of recent court decisions for the corporation's business,

with the Treasurer, why did you not discuss this advice with the other shareholder minister in the corporation?

- (11) Did you and the Treasurer agree on any recommendations that you would make, as shareholder ministers, to the board and or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws, following the decision of the Court of Appeal delivered on 16 May 2024, *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113?
 - (a) If so, what were these recommendations?
 - (b) If so, to whom in the Forestry Corporation were these recommendations made?
 - (c) If so, when were these recommendations made?
 - (d) If not, why did you and Treasurer, as shareholder ministers in the Forestry Corporation, not develop recommendations to improve the corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (12) Did the Minister, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, discuss advice from either the Forestry Corporation or NSW Treasury on the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia decision in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with the Minister for Agriculture, as the portfolio minister for the Forestry Corporation?
 - (a) If so, when was this advice discussed with the Minister for Agriculture?
 - (b) If so, did you and the Minister for Agriculture reach any conclusions, as shareholder minister in and portfolio minister for the corporation, about the need to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (i) If so, what were these conclusions?
 - (ii) If you, as shareholder minister in the Corporation, and the Minister for Agriculture, as portfolio minister for the Corporation, did not reach any conclusions on actions needed to improve the corporation compliance with applicable environmental laws, why did you not reach any conclusions?
 - (c) If you, as senior shareholder minister, did not discuss advice from NSW Treasury or Forestry Corporation, on the implications of recent court decisions for the Corporation's business, with the Minister for Agriculture, why did you not discuss this advice with the portfolio minister with responsibility for the corporation?
- (13) Did you and the Minister for Agriculture agree on any recommendations that you would make, as shareholder minister and portfolio minister, to the board and or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws, following the decision of the Court of Appeal delivered on 16 May 2024, *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113?
 - (a) If so, what were these recommendations?
 - (b) If so, to whom in the Forestry Corporation were these recommendations made?
 - (c) If so, when were these recommendations made?
 - (d) If not, why did you and the Minister for Agriculture not develop recommendations to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (14) Did you, or any delegate of yours, attend any meeting(s) of the Forestry Corporation's board at which the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that SEFR Inc had standing to bring proceedings against FCNSW, was discussed?
 - (a) If so, when was/were the meeting(s) held?
 - (b) Did those meeting(s) with the board of the Forestry Corporation discuss:

-
- (i) the need to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (ii) any actions identified by officers of Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (iii) any actions recommended by the Treasurer and Minister for Finance to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (iv) any actions suggested by NSW Treasury to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (c) If so, what specific actions were discussed?
 - (i) What actions were agreed to be taken?
 - (d) If not, why did you not meet with the board of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (15) Did you, or any delegate of yours, attend any meeting(s) of the Forestry Corporation's board at which the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the Corporation appeal against the Court of Appeal decision, was discussed?
 - (16) If you did not meet with the Corporation's board, did you, or your delegate, discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, or advice from NSW Treasury officials about these cases, in any meetings with any officers of the Corporation being:
 - (a) the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), being the sole executive director of the Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (b) the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (c) the Chair of the board of directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (d) any individual directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?

- (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
- (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?

Answer—

As a shareholding minister, I regularly engage with NSW Treasury and State Owned Corporations on matters. I have made clear that the Treasury Commercial Framework is to be followed at all times.

* 5090 TREASURER—FORESTRY CORPORATION COURT CASES—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Treasurer—

- (1) Do you agree with the statement, posted on the NSW Treasury website, that NSW Treasury's role in relation to state-owned corporations includes "advising Portfolio and Shareholding Ministers about critical current and emerging issues that may affect the business" being State Owned Corporations (SOCs)?
- (2) Do you agree that decisions of the Land and Environment Court of NSW, NSW Court of Appeal and High Court of Australia regarding the Forestry Corporation's liability to prosecution for breaches of environmental law, constitute "critical current issues" or "emerging issues" that "may affect the forestry corporation" and hence warrant the provision of advice by Treasury?
- (3) Did you, in your role as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the NSW Land and Environment Court's decision in South East Forest Rescue Inc INC9894030 v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWLEC 7, delivered on 7 February 2024, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
 - (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Land and Environment Court in South East Forest Rescue Inc INC9894030 v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWLEC 7, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (4) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that the South East Forest Rescue Incorporated (SEFR Inc) had 'standing' to bring proceedings against the Forestry Corporation of NSW, being a critical issue that may affect its business?
 - (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Treasury, to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (5) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that SEFR Inc had 'standing' to bring proceedings against corporation, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?

- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation received?
 - (i) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation's officers?
 - (ii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (b) If not, why did Forestry Corporation officers not provide advice on the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (6) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the corporation's appeal with costs, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (7) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the corporation's appeal with costs, being a critical issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation's officers?
 - (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation to ensure the corporation improved its compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (b) If not, why did Forestry Corporation officers not provide advice on the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (8) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from NSW Treasury officials on the implications of the commencement on 28 August 2025, of a criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for 29 offences alleged to have been committed between 1 January 2023 and 31 August 2023, in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995) being a critical emerging issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from NSW Treasury received?
 - (i) Will you table that advice?
 - (ii) What was the substance of that advice from NSW Treasury officials?
 - (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Treasury to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (b) If not, why did NSW Treasury officials not provide advice on the commencement of a further criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the EPA, for 29 offences in Tallaganda State Forest being *EPA v FCNSW* (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995), to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?

-
- (9) Did you receive any written or verbal advice from the directors or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation of NSW on the implications of the commencement on 28 August 2025, of a criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) for 29 offences alleged to have been committed between 1 January 2023 and 31 August 2023, in Tallaganda State Forest being EPA v FCNSW (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995) being a critical emerging issue that may affect the business of the Forestry Corporation of NSW?
- (a) If so, when was the advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW received?
- (i) Will you table that advice?
- (ii) What was the substance of that advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW directors/officers?
- (iii) What actions did you take in response to that advice from Forestry Corporation of NSW to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (b) If not, why did directors or officers of Forestry Corporation of NSW not provide advice on the commencement of a further criminal prosecution of the Forestry Corporation by the EPA, for 29 offences in Tallaganda State Forest being EPA v FCNSW (case no. s 2025/00328967 to 2025/00328995), to you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation?
- (10) Did you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, discuss advice from either the Forestry Corporation or NSW Treasury on the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia decision in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with the Minister for Finance, as the other shareholder minister in the corporation?
- (a) If so, when was this advice discussed with the Minister for Finance?
- (b) If so, did you and the Minister for Finance reach any conclusions, as shareholder ministers in the corporation, about the need to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (i) If so, what were these conclusions?
- (ii) If you and the Minister for Finance, as shareholder ministers in the corporation, did not reach any conclusions on what actions were needed to improve the corporation compliance with applicable environmental laws, why did you not reach any conclusions?
- (c) If you, as senior shareholder minister, did not discuss advice from NSW Treasury or Forestry Corporation, on the implications of recent court decisions for the corporation's business, with the Minister for Finance, why did you not discuss this advice with the other shareholder minister in the corporation?
- (11) Did you and the Minister for Finance agree on any recommendations that you would make, as shareholder ministers, to the board and or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws, following the decision of the Court of Appeal delivered on 16 May 2024, *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113?
- (a) If so, what were these recommendations?
- (b) If so, to whom in the Forestry Corporation were these recommendations made?
- (c) If so, when were these recommendations made?
- (d) If not, why did you and Minister for Finance, as shareholder ministers in the Forestry Corporation, not develop recommendations to improve the corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (12) Did you, as senior shareholder minister in the Forestry Corporation, discuss advice from either the Forestry Corporation or NSW Treasury on the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia decision in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, with the Minister for Agriculture, as the portfolio minister for the Forestry Corporation?

-
- (a) If so, when was this advice discussed with the Minister for Agriculture?
 - (b) If so, did you and the Minister for Agriculture reach any conclusions, as shareholder minister in and portfolio minister for the corporation, about the need to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (i) If so, what were these conclusions?
 - (ii) If you, as shareholder minister in the Corporation, and the Minister for Agriculture, as portfolio minister for the Corporation, did not reach any conclusions on actions needed to improve the corporation compliance with applicable environmental laws, why did you not reach any conclusions?
 - (c) If you, as senior shareholder minister, did not discuss advice from NSW Treasury or Forestry Corporation, on the implications of recent court decisions for the Corporation's business, with the Minister for Agriculture, why did you not discuss this advice with the portfolio minister with responsibility for the corporation?
- (13) Did you and the Minister for Agriculture agree on any recommendations that you would make, as shareholder minister and portfolio minister, to the board and or senior officers of the Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws, following the decision of the Court of Appeal delivered on 16 May 2024, *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113?
- (a) If so, what were these recommendations?
 - (b) If so, to whom in the Forestry Corporation were these recommendations made?
 - (c) If so, when were these recommendations made?
 - (d) If not, why did you and the Minister for Agriculture not develop recommendations to improve the Forestry Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
- (14) Did you, or any delegate of yours, attend any meeting(s) of the Forestry Corporation's board at which the decision of the NSW Court of Appeal in *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, delivered on 16 May 2024, that found that SEFR Inc had standing to bring proceedings against FCNSW, was discussed?
- (a) If so, when was/were the meeting(s) held?
 - (b) Did those meeting(s) with the board of the Forestry Corporation discuss:
 - (i) the need to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (ii) any actions identified by officers of Forestry Corporation to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (iii) any actions recommended by the Minister for Finance and Minister for Finance to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (iv) any actions suggested by NSW Treasury to improve the Corporation's compliance with applicable environmental laws?
 - (c) If so, what specific actions were discussed?
 - (i) What actions were agreed to be taken?
 - (d) If not, why did you not meet with the board of the Forestry Corporation?
- (15) Did you, or any delegate of yours, attend any meeting(s) of the Forestry Corporation's board at which the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc* [2025] HCA 15, delivered on 9 April 2025, that dismissed the Corporation appeal against the Court of Appeal decision that SEFR Inc had standing to bring proceedings against FCNSW, was discussed?
- (16) If you did not meet with the Corporation's board, did you, or your delegate, discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal *South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW* [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in *Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East*

Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, or advice from NSW Treasury officials about these cases, in any meetings with any officers of the Corporation being:

- (a) the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), being the sole executive director of the Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
- (b) the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
- (c) the Chair of the board of directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?
- (d) any individual directors of the Forestry Corporation?
 - (i) If so, on what dates and with whom were these discussions on this advice held?
 - (ii) If so, what actions or other outcomes were agreed to, by whom, in the Forestry Corporation, due to these discussions?
 - (iii) If not, why did you not discuss the decisions of the Court of Appeal South East Forest Rescue Inc (No.2) v Forestry Corporation of NSW [2024] NSWCA 113, and or the High Court of Australia in Forestry Corporation of NSW v South East Forest Rescue Inc [2025] HCA 15, with relevant officers of the Forestry Corporation?

Answer—

As a shareholding minister, I regularly engage with NSW Treasury and State Owned Corporations on matters. I have made clear that the Treasury Commercial Framework is to be followed at all times.

* 5091 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—INSTALLATION OF PAINTED BICYCLE LANES ON PYRMONT BRIDGE—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—

- (1) Have you or the Department received correspondence regarding the installation of painted bicycle lanes on Pyrmont Bridge to improve safety and clarify movement for cyclists and pedestrians?
- (2) In relation to the correspondence received from a commuter who cycles between Glebe and Barangaroo via Pyrmont Bridge, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Has the Department assessed the safety concerns regarding cyclist-cyclist and cyclist-pedestrian conflicts on the bridge?

- (b) What action, if any, has been taken in response?
- (3) Has the Department undertaken any formal safety assessments, traffic studies or pedestrian/cyclist movement analyses of Pymont Bridge in the last five years?
- (a) If so, when were these conducted?
- (4) Has the Department considered the installation of line markings or other delineation measures on Pymont Bridge to separate pedestrians and cyclists?
- (5) What engineering, heritage, or operational constraints exist that might prevent the installation of painted cycle lanes on Pymont Bridge?
- (6) Has the Department received any reports of crashes or near-miss incidents involving cyclists or pedestrians on Pymont Bridge in the last five years?
- (7) Will you commit to installing painted cycle lanes on Pymont Bridge?

Answer—

I am advised:

- (1) Placemaking NSW has received two written enquiries over the last five years regarding the potential installation of painted bicycle lanes on Pymont Bridge.
- (2)
- (a)-(b) Based on the information provided, Placemaking NSW is unaware of correspondence from a commuter who cycles between Glebe and Barangaroo via Pymont Bridge during the past five years.
- (3) Yes. In 2024, Placemaking NSW commissioned a cycling study including safety assessments and a pedestrian/cyclist movement audit and analysis. This report is publicly available at: <https://www.darlingharbour.com/strategy>.
- (4) The delineation of cycling and pedestrian modes on Pymont Bridge has been considered as part of the Darling Harbour Tumbalong Cycling Strategy.
- (5) Placemaking NSW advises that further design investigation is required before line markings or other delineation interventions could be delivered on Pymont Bridge, due in part to complex resolutions with east and west entry and exit points and multiple adjacent renewal projects either in delivery or in late stages of planning such as Harbourside to the west and Cockle Bay Wharf to the east of the Pymont Bridge approaches.
- (6) Placemaking NSW movement monitors estimate that approximately 5.5 million people cross the Pymont Bridge every year. Based on incident logs and Ranger reports, Placemaking NSW has recorded ×6 collisions. None of these incidents required medical treatment. A further ×6 were categorised as near misses.
- (7) Placemaking NSW has a range of management strategies in place to reduce the risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians on Pymont Bridge, including a 10km per hour speed limit for cyclists and Ranger supervision during peak hour periods. Any installation of painted cycle lanes will require further consideration of the engineering, heritage and operational constraints that exist on the site.

* 5092 ENVIRONMENT—NATIVE VEGETATION REGULATORY MAP—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) What data sources are used by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) to produce the Native Vegetation Regulatory Map, including land classified as Category 2 – Sensitive Regulated Land ("pink mapping")?
- (2) To what extent does the Native Vegetation Regulatory Map rely on satellite imagery or remote sensing data, and is DCCEEW investigating the use of higher-resolution data to improve mapping accuracy?

- (3) What work is DCCEEW currently undertaking to improve the quality, accuracy and resolution of native vegetation mapping across New South Wales?
- (4) How much funding has been allocated in each of the past three financial years to the development, maintenance and improvement of the Native Vegetation Regulatory Map?
- (5) When landholders raise concerns that mapped vegetation does not reflect the vegetation present on their property, what process does DCCEEW follow to review the mapping?
 - (a) Under what circumstances are on-ground inspections conducted by departmental staff?
- (6) Since 1 January 2023, how many requests has DCCEEW received to review or amend native vegetation mapping?
 - (a) In how many cases has the mapping been amended following review?
- (7) What assistance or support is currently available to landholders seeking to resolve discrepancies between the Native Vegetation Regulatory Map and the vegetation present on their land?
- (8) What is the average time taken for the NSW Threatened Species Scientific Committee to assess and determine submissions?
 - (a) How many submissions are currently awaiting assessment?
- (9) In relation to the Biodiversity Conservation and Local Land Services Legislation Amendment (Broombush and Blue Mallee Coppicing) Bill introduced by Ms Steph Cooke MP, did you request or direct DCCEEW to undertake any analysis of the potential impacts of the Bill?
 - (a) If so, what advice was provided?
- (10) Is the Government considering any reforms to improve the process for resolving disputes between native vegetation mapping and the actual vegetation present on a property?

Answer—

- (1) Information on the NVR Map methodology is publicly available.
- (2) See answer to Question (1).
- (3) The NVR Map was a requirement arising from the laws passed by the previous government in 2016. The finalisation of the NVR Map was not done after the passage of that legislation. The NSW Government continues to work with landholders, farmers, the TSSC and local MPs to address the legacy issues with the land management framework.

In conjunction with NSW Farmers and LLS, DCCEEW has undertaken regional roadshows to increase awareness of the NVR Map with landholders. Any landholder can request a free map review. DCCEEW also conducts systematic flora surveys across NSW to inform ongoing improvement to the Integrated BioNet Vegetation Data program, which includes the State Vegetation Type datasets and maps.
- (4) 2025-26: \$2,869,000.
2024-25: \$2,619,000.
2023-24: \$2,551,000.
- (5) An outline of the map review process is publicly available.
 - (a) See above.
- (6) 253.
 - (a) 113 reviews resulted in corrections to map categories through the NVR map method, with a total change of 8.6 per cent to the areas of land requested for review.

77 reviews resulted in amendments to the map because the Department was provided a new approval or other document which changes the land category according to Part 5A of the Local Land Services Act.

- (7) The Landholders can contact DCCEEW on 1800 001 490 to understand what the mapping means and receive a report which explains the mapping on their landholding. If landholders consider the mapping is incorrect, they can seek a free map review.
- (8) The time taken for an assessment depends on the complexity of the nomination, the availability of data and expertise, whether consultation with other jurisdictions is required, the number of submissions received during the public exhibition period and the extent of public comments.
 - (a) 27.
- (9) Advice on the Bill is cabinet-in-confidence.
- (10) The NSW Government has worked closely with the Member for Cootamundra on this issue. I suggest that you speak to the member in relation to what is being contemplated through these reforms.

2 APRIL 2026

(Paper No. 712)

- 5196 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—HOURS OF DIRECT SOLAR IN STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (HOUSING) 2021—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) In relation to State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 that details "hours of direct solar access between 9.00 am and 3.00 pm at mid-winter", do State Significant Developments comply with this law?
- 5197 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—HOURS OF DIRECT SOLAR IN STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT IN LINDFIELD—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) In relation to State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 that details "hours of direct solar access between 9.00 am and 3.00 pm at mid-winter", will SSD-79276958 comply with this law?
- 5198 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—PROCESSES OF RE-EXHIBITION IN STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) In relation to the processes of re-exhibition in State Significant Developments (SSDs), why do some SSDs go to re-exhibition and other SSDs do not?
 - (a) If SSDs are not re-exhibited, how is the community able to respond to revised plans?
 - (i) What is the timeframe to allow the community to respond, and be considered by the Housing Development Authority?
- 5199 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—RE-EXHIBITION OF STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT IN LINDFIELD—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) In relation to State Significant Development 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue 1A&1B Valley Road Lindfield (SSD-79276958), are there plans to re-exhibit this proposal?
 - (a) If not, why?
- 5200 CLIMATE CHANGE—COST FOR COMMISSIONER SITTING FEES FOR NET ZERO COMMISSION—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) Can you please advise the cost for Commissioner sitting fees for the Net Zero Commission in Financial Year 2024-2025?
- 5201 ENVIRONMENT—NSW CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—
- (1) Further to your answer to Supplementary Question 26(b) from the Budget Estimates Hearing in February 2026, where you stated: "The EPA is speaking to its counterparts in other states and territories to establish the project, as there is value in state and territory governments adopting a harmonised approach to progress this matter", can you please list the interstate agencies and stakeholders the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has spoken to regarding adopting a harmonised approach to container deposit schemes?
- (a) Does the EPA have a timeframe as to when the cost benefit analysis into examining increasing the refund rate for the NSW Container Deposit Scheme will be finalised?
- (i) If so, can you please provide date?
- (b) Will the cost benefit analysis be published?
- (i) If not, why?
- 5202 ENERGY—ELECTRIC VEHICLE DESTINATION CHARGING GRANTS SCHEME—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—
- (1) Out of the \$199 million allocated by your Government to the electric vehicle destination charging grants scheme, is there any money left unspent to date?
- (a) If so, can you please advise the amount for Financial Year 2024-2025 and Financial Year 2025-2026 to date?
- (b) Given the ongoing fuel crisis, will the Government commit to redirecting any unspent money from that grant to support New South Wales farmers and primary producers fuel needs in regional and rural New South Wales?
- 5203 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS FOR REVIEW OF CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN'S 2021 BANKSTOWN CITY CENTRE MASTER PLAN—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) Further to the answer to Supplementary Question 10a from Budget Estimates Planning and Public Spaces hearing on 26 February 2026, which external consultants did the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure engage with to review and refine Canterbury-Bankstown's 2021 Bankstown City Centre Adopted Master Plan?
- 5204 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—MEMBERS OF PROJECT WORKING GROUP AND EXECUTIVE ADVISORY GROUP—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- (1) Further to your answer to Supplementary Question 13 from the Planning and Public Spaces Budget Estimates February 2026 hearing, can you please advise the names of each member of the Project Working Group, and Executive Advisory Group, including the number of meetings attended?
- 5205 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—REGISTERED TRAINING ORGANISATIONS—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—

-
- (1) Has NSW Fair Trading identified any potential concerns relating to the quality, assessment integrity, or compliance performance of the 61 New South Wales registered training organisations (RTOs) delivering property services training?
- (a) If so, have those matters been referred to the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) for consideration?
- 5206 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—QUANTITY OF NO-FAULT EVICTIONS IN NEW SOUTH WALES—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—
- (1) In an answer to Supplementary Question 12 received on 25 March 2026 from the Budget Estimates Portfolio Committee No. 8 hearing on 26 February 2026, your answer stated that "NSW Fair Trading and the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) are working to improve data collection", in response to a question on the quantity of no-fault evictions in New South Wales. What specifically are NSW Fair Trading and NCAT doing to improve this data collection?
- (a) Will this include identifying no-fault terminations as a distinct category?
- 5207 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—DATA COLLECTION ON QUANTITY OF TERMINATION-OTHER INVOLVING DISPUTED EVICTIONS—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—
- (1) Why does NSW Fair Trading not collect data on the quantity of "termination-other" that involve disputed evictions, rather than uncontested terminations?
- (a) Will NSW Fair Trading begin collecting this data?
- 5208 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—AUTOMATIC MUTUAL RECOGNITION APPLICANTS—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—
- (1) Following the answer to Supplementary Question 17 from the 26 February 2026 Budget Estimates hearing, out of the 95 Automatic Mutual Recognition (AMR) applicants, how many are actively practising in New South Wales?
- (a) Have any complaints been made involving AMR agents practising in New South Wales?
- 5209 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—RISK ASSESSMENT COMPARING REAL ESTATE QUALIFICATION LEVELS ACROSS JURISDICTIONS—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—
- (1) Has the Department conducted a risk assessment comparing real estate qualification levels across jurisdictions, and the effect this might have on the quality of the Automatic Mutual Recognition (AMR) applicant services, given there is no mandatory bridging course?
- (a) If not, why?
- 5210 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—STANDARD STRATA MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT—The Hon. Tania Mihailuk to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—

-
- (1) Further to the answer to Supplementary Question 38 provided to the Budget Estimates hearing on 26 February 2026, what is the progress of this agreement?
- (a) When will it be available for use by strata managers and the community?
- 5211 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY GOVERNANCE PLAN—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—
- (1) In response to Portfolio Committee No. 7 Supplementary Question 63, relating to hearing date 04 December 2025, the Government stated that the Investment Delivery Authority was established through Premier's Memorandum M2025-09 and is governed by "a governance plan and operating model, including terms of reference". Has the Investment Delivery Authority (IDA) governance plan, operating model, and terms of reference been published?
- (a) If not, on what date does the Government intend to publish the document?
- (b) Does the governance plan describe the assessment methodology, scoring framework, or weighting applied to Expression of Interest (EOI) applications?
- (c) Does the governance plan describe any delegation of decision-making authority from the responsible ministers to officials within Investment NSW or the Investment Taskforce?
- 5212 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY EOI CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—
- (1) The Investment Delivery Authority (IDA) Expression of Interest (EOI) assessment criteria were published in September 2025 following the IDA's announcement in the June 2025 Budget. Was any stakeholder consultation conducted prior to the publication of the IDA EOI criteria in September 2025?
- (a) If so, which entities or individuals were consulted?
- (i) Were any eventual Round 1 applicants, or their representatives, among those consulted?
- (b) Was any "What We Heard" report, consultation summary, or equivalent document prepared following any consultation on the IDA EOI criteria?
- (i) If so, has the document been published?
- (c) Which officials or external advisers were responsible for drafting the EOI assessment criteria, including Objective 2 Criterion 6 (cross-sector capability)?
- 5213 BETTER REGULATION AND FAIR TRADING—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY CROSS-SECTOR CAPABILITY CRITERION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Better Regulation and Fair Trading, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Innovation, Science and Technology, Minister for Building, and Minister for Corrections—
- (1) The published Investment Delivery Authority (IDA) Expression of Interest (EOI) assessment criteria at Objective 2 Criterion 6 state that applicant capability may be demonstrated through experience in "similar projects/activities even if in a different sector". The published frequently asked questions (FAQs) confirm this cross-sector flexibility is a deliberate design feature. Can you please answer the following questions?
- (a) How many Round 1 EOI applicants relied on cross-sector experience to satisfy the capability criterion?
- (b) For each applicant that relied on cross-sector experience, in what sector was their prior experience?
- (c) Was any independent technical expert engaged by the IDA, Investment NSW, or any other government agency to assess the energy sector capability of any Round 1 EOI applicant whose prior experience was in a non-energy sector?

- (d) Does the Government intend to revise Objective 2 Criterion 6 for future EOI rounds to require sector-specific competency for energy projects valued at \$1 billion or more?

5214 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT COST VERIFICATION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—

- (1) The published IDA EOI criteria require applicants to submit an Estimated Development Cost Report prepared by a proponent-commissioned quantity surveyor who is a member of the AIQS or RICS. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Is any independent government audit or verification of proponent-declared EDC figures required before IDA endorsement is granted?
 - (b) For how many Round 1 applications did the IDA or Investment NSW request further evidence or clarification regarding the declared EDC figure?
 - (c) Were any Round 1 applications identified where the declared EDC figure exceeded other publicly available cost estimates for the same project site or development application?
 - (d) What mechanism exists to identify or address material discrepancies between a proponent's EDC figure submitted to the IDA and any cost figure declared in a separate development application for the same project lodged with a local council?

5215 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY HOTEL ENDORSEMENT AND EXISTING LOCAL APPROVAL—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—

- (1) Two hotel projects were endorsed in the IDA's Round 1, with a minimum EDC threshold of \$200 million for hotel developments. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) For each endorsed hotel project, did the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identify whether any existing development consent had been granted by a local council for any development on the same site prior to IDA endorsement?
 - (b) Where an endorsed IDA hotel project has an existing local council development consent for the same site, does IDA endorsement result in the transfer of planning assessment from the local council to the state Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure?
 - (c) In response to Portfolio Committee No. 7 Supplementary Question 73, relating to hearing date 04 December 2025, the Government stated that IDA recommendations regarding precinct rezonings flow through the Department "in the normal manner", including SSD/SSI applications. Under what circumstances would an IDA-endorsed hotel project be assessed as State Significant Development rather than under the existing local consent?

5216 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—DPHI STAFF SECONDMENT TO INVESTMENT NSW—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—

- (1) In response to Portfolio Committee No. 7 Supplementary Question 70, relating to hearing date 04 December 2025, the Government confirmed that Investment NSW has one staff member seconded from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) What is the role description of the DPHI staff member seconded to Investment NSW?
 - (b) To whom does the seconded officer report within Investment NSW?
 - (c) What protocols govern the sharing of information between the seconded officer and the DPHI planning assessment function, including any restrictions on the communication of assessment-related information to IDA staff or endorsed proponents?

- (d) Has the seconded officer had access to any planning assessment material relating to IDA-endorsed projects during the period of the secondment?

5217 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—

- (1) The published IDA probity framework requires both proponents and Investment Taskforce staff to formally declare conflicts of interest. The Investment Taskforce comprised seconded staff from seven government agencies. Can you please answer the following questions?
- (a) How many conflict of interest declarations were received from Investment Taskforce staff during the Round 1 EOI assessment process?
 - (b) How many conflict of interest declarations were received from Round 1 EOI applicants or their representatives?
 - (c) Were any conflict of interest declarations received that resulted in a Taskforce staff member being excluded from assessment of a particular application?
 - (d) Is a register of conflict of interest declarations maintained for the Investment Taskforce?
 - (i) If so, is the register publicly available?
 - (ii) If not publicly available, on what grounds is it withheld?

5218 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY ROUND 1 REJECTED APPLICATIONS—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—

- (1) Forty-eight EOI proposals totalling approximately \$136 billion were received in Round 1. Sixteen projects totalling \$34.4 billion were endorsed. Can you please answer the following questions?
- (a) How many EOI applications were received in Round 1 that were not endorsed?
 - (i) For each application that was not endorsed, on what grounds was it assessed as not meeting the published criteria?
 - (b) Were any applications not endorsed on the basis of the applicant's capability, as assessed under Objective 2 Criterion 6?
 - (c) Were any hotel EOI applications received that were not endorsed?
 - (i) If so, what was the declared EDC figure for each hotel application that was not endorsed?
 - (ii) On what grounds was each hotel application assessed as not meeting the criteria?

5219 PREMIER—INVESTMENT DELIVERY AUTHORITY ADVISORY STATUS AND PLANNING PRIORITISATION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Premier—

- (1) In response to Portfolio Committee No. 7 Supplementary Question 64, relating to hearing date 04 December 2025, the Government stated that the IDA has "no authority to direct" the Department of Planning to accelerate or prioritise assessments. In response to Supplementary Question 18, the Department confirmed it has "supported the establishment of the Investment Delivery Authority which will fast-track major investment projects in NSW". Can you please answer the following questions?
- (a) How does the Department reconcile the characterisation of the IDA as having "no authority to direct" Planning with the Department's confirmation that it "supported" the IDA to "fast-track" investment projects?
 - (b) Since 4 March 2026, have any IDA-endorsed projects been allocated a dedicated planning assessor, or been prioritised within the Department's assessment queue ahead of non-endorsed projects at the same stage of the planning process?

- (c) Have any ministers issued any formal or informal communications to the Department regarding the prioritisation of IDA-endorsed projects?

5220 ENVIRONMENT—BURRAGORANG VALLEY PUMPED HYDRO AND SYDNEY WATER SUPPLY—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) The IDA's Round 1 endorsed a pumped hydro project in the Wollondilly Shire that proposes to pump water from Lake Burrangorang, which is the primary drinking water supply for Greater Sydney. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Was any risk assessment conducted by the IDA, Investment NSW, or any other government agency regarding the potential impact of this project on the quality or security of Greater Sydney's drinking water supply prior to endorsement?
 - (b) Has WaterNSW entered into any commercial agreement, memorandum of understanding, or access arrangement with the proponent or its joint venture partners in relation to Lake Burrangorang or the Warragamba catchment?
 - (i) If so, on what date was the agreement entered into?
 - (ii) Were any ministers consulted prior to the agreement being entered into?
 - (c) Has any assessment been undertaken of the environmental contamination status of the proposed upper reservoir site, including any legacy contamination from prior coal mining or coal washing operations on the site?

5221 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—IDA ENDORSED PROJECT WITH ACTIVE COURT PROCEEDINGS—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—

- (1) Court records indicate that one IDA-endorsed Round 1 proponent is a party to active litigation before the NSW Supreme Court regarding the project site. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Does the IDA's assessment process include verification of whether the applicant holds secure title to the project site, or whether the site is subject to active litigation?
 - (b) For how many Round 1 endorsed projects did the proponent hold uncontested freehold title to the project site at the date of endorsement?
 - (c) Were any Round 1 endorsed projects identified where land title was subject to legal dispute at the date of endorsement?

5222 ENERGY—IDA ENDORSED ENERGY PROJECTS AND GRID CONNECTION CAPACITY—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) The IDA's Round 1 endorsed 14 energy projects, including battery energy storage systems in the Western Sydney area. Can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) For each endorsed battery energy storage system project, has the proponent lodged a connection application with the Australian Energy Market Operator or a Transmission Network Service Provider?
 - (b) Was the status of grid connection applications assessed by the IDA or Investment NSW as part of the EOI assessment process?
 - (c) Has any assessment been undertaken of whether IDA endorsement of a battery project by a proponent that has not yet secured a grid connection could affect the availability of finite transmission connection capacity for other energy developers?

5223 AGRICULTURE—FIRE IN KIWARRAK STATE FOREST—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales—

- (1) Are you aware that a hazard reduction burn carried out in November 2025 was a post-logging burn?
 - (a) Are you aware that this hazard reduction burn did significant damage to the canopy of the forest?
 - (b) Are you aware that this hazard reduction burn was part of the Koala Habitat Restoration Project, funded by Local Land Services?
 - (c) What oversight did Local Land Services have over the project?
 - (d) Was Local Land Services aware that the area was to be logged when it funded the project?
 - (e) When was Local Land Services made aware that the area was to be logged?
 - (f) Did the grant application to Local Land Services identify that Forestry Corporation NSW (FCNSW) would log the area where the Koala Habitat Restoration Project would be carried out?
- (2) Had FCNSW conducted logging operations in compartments 10-13 of Kiwarra State Forest in the two years prior to igniting a fire in the area on 12 November 2025?
 - (a) What work was completed immediately prior to the burn to identify if there were any koalas in the area?
 - (b) Was the burn an example of low-intensity mosaic burning?
 - (c) Did the fire consume the post-logging debris?
 - (d) What effort was made to protect coarse woody debris in compartments 11 and 12 from burning?
 - (e) Had there been any significant rainfall in the weeks leading up to the fire?
 - (f) Was the soil and material on the ground very dry in the lead up to the fire?
- (3) Why was the fire in Kiwarra State Forest called a hazard reduction burn and conducted as part of the Koala Habitat Restoration Project?
 - (a) Was the burn part of a project funded by Federal Biodiversity Conservation Funds via Local Land Services?
 - (b) Why did an area that was excluded from logging as a Wildlife Habitat Clump in the Harvest Plan get included in the burn?
 - (c) Why was the burn conducted under a Review of Environmental Factors (REF)?
 - (d) Whose decision was it to conduct the burn under a REF?
 - (e) The REF stated that "Burn has been planned and will be conducted to ensure scorch only occurs within the targeted shrub layer and not the recovering canopy layer", "Burning will be mosaic in nature leaving organic matter unburnt and groundcover intact", and "Conditions and fuel characteristics for burn will only allow grass patches to burn leaving connected shrubby areas unburnt". Given that these statements are contradictory, which of these was the intent of the burning?
 - (f) FCNSW's own staff have admitted that it is "Much safer burning in autumn and less likely to be interrupted by wildfire". Why was the burn in Kiwarra State Forest conducted in November 2025, when it was warmer?
 - (g) The Harvest Plan for the Kiwarra compartments that were logged prior to the burn, stated: "Kiwarra SF, Cpts 11 and 12 Clause 62. Coarse woody debris protection 62.1 Coarse woody debris that contains a hollow must not be removed from a compartment. 62.2 Coarse woody debris must not be removed from a compartment, including for use as firewood, as there is a record of Spotted Tailed Quoll in these compartments". Why was this not included in the REF?

-
- (4) The REF form for Kiwarra State Forest stated that the State Forest and Management Area was 'Mid North Coast Forest Protection Area'. What is the Mid North Coast Protection Area?
- Can you provide a map of the Mid North Coast Forest Protection Area?
 - What protection does the Mid North Coast Forest Protection Area receive?
- (5) Are there other Forest Protection Areas in New South Wales?
- If so, can you provide maps?
- (6) Can you please provide a detailed account of the record-keeping and version control procedures in place in the FCNSW and how previous versions of documents may be accessed by the interested public?
- Does FCNSW have any policy on document version control?
 - What effort is made to keep track of changes made to documents by different staff?
- (7) How many projects carried out by the FCNSW have been funded by Local Land Services in the last six years?
- Total funds dispersed?
 - What percentage of these funds came from the National Biodiversity Conservation Fund?
 - What percentage of these funds was spent on roading?
- (8) Are post-logging burns defined as forestry operations that should be carried out under the Coastal Integration Forestry Operations Approvals (CIFOA)?
- 5224 PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES—DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage representing the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces—
- How is the Government identifying and protecting wildlife corridors on land subject to historical development applications?
 - Regarding Development Applications approved prior to 1990, can current biodiversity survey standards, threatened species listings and climate resilience considerations be applied to subdivision works certificates issued today?
- 5227 WATER—PXP AUTOMATED SYSTEM (DAYFORCE)—The Hon. Mark Latham to ask the Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth—
- In relation to the PXP automated system (Dayforce):
 - What accounts for the cost blowout (over and above the estimated \$40 million) of the project?
 - How many defects have been identified in the project and how are they being addressed?
 - What accounts for the project's failure to achieve alignment with existing systems, including payroll, or the Enterprise Agreement?
 - When was this failure of alignment first brought to Sydney Water's attention, and how was this concern addressed?
 - Given the project was intended to make savings on a reduction of the head count to cover the cost, how has this been achieved and what have been those savings?
 - What accounts for the delays in delivery, and are any further delays expected? If so, why?
 - Is it true that payroll require more employees to manage the new system, and if so, what does this mean to the project being fit for purpose?
- 5228 TREASURER—COSTS OF LOCAL COURT REFORMS—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Treasurer—

-
- (1) What is the total estimated cost associated with changing the title of magistrate to judge in New South Wales Local Courts?
 - (a) Has the estimated cost ever changed?
 - (b) What was the estimated cost when it was first modelled?
 - (2) To date, what is the total actual expenditure associated with changing the title of magistrate to judge in the New South Wales Local Courts?
 - (3) Could you please provide a breakdown of how funds to facilitate the change from magistrate to judge were expected to be allocated?
 - (a) Could you please provide a breakdown of how those funds were actually spent?
 - (4) What was the estimated cost associated with the procurement of 210 judicial robes for District Court Judges and Local Court Magistrates (Opportunity ID RFx_1280_AN)?
 - (5) What was the actual cost associated with the procurement of 210 judicial robes for District Court Judges and Local Court Magistrates (Opportunity ID RFx_1280_AN)?
- 5229 ATTORNEY GENERAL—COSTS OF LOCAL COURT REFORMS—Ms Sue Higginson to ask the Treasurer representing the Attorney General—
- (1) What is the total estimated cost associated with changing the title of magistrate to judge in New South Wales Local Courts?
 - (a) Has the estimated cost ever changed?
 - (b) What was the estimated cost when it was first modelled?
 - (2) To date, what is the total actual expenditure associated with changing the title of magistrate to judge in the New South Wales Local Courts?
 - (3) Could you please provide a breakdown of how funds to facilitate the change from magistrate to judge were expected to be allocated?
 - (a) Could you please provide a breakdown of how those funds were actually spent?
 - (4) What was the estimated cost associated with the procurement of 210 judicial robes for District Court Judges and Local Court Magistrates (Opportunity ID RFx_1280_AN)?
 - (5) What was the actual cost associated with the procurement of 210 judicial robes for District Court Judges and Local Court Magistrates (Opportunity ID RFx_1280_AN)?
- 5231 WATER—PROJECT FLOW—The Hon. Mark Latham to ask the Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth—
- (1) In relation to Project Flow, which was to go live in March of this year but has been delayed multiple times:
 - (a) What accounts for the need to increase the \$65 million total estimated cost by another \$10 million?
 - (b) Have there been any system alignment issues with the project, and were any of these flagged earlier? What was done about these concerns once they were raised?
 - (c) Is it true that the system is being operated from the Homebush office, which was due to be sold last year?
 - (d) Would the Minister agree that this project has been a net burden, and not saving, on the taxpayer to date?
- 5232 WATER—RECRUITMENT PROCESS FOR EXECUTIVES AND BOARD MEMBERS AT SYDNEY WATER—The Hon. Mark Latham to ask the Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth—
- (1) What are the criteria used for the recruitment process for executives and Board members at Sydney Water?

- (2) Over the past five years (please provide this information broken down by year, in tabulated format):
 - (a) What has been the turnaround of executives and Board members in Sydney Water?
 - (b) How many redundancies and ex gratia payments have been paid out to executives and Board members?
 - (c) What has been the total quantum of redundancy and ex gratia payments made for each year?
- (3) How has Sydney Water managed the loss of corporate memory resulting from substantial turnover of its senior members and long standing employees?

5233 HERITAGE—MANLY COVE PAVILION—The Hon. Jacqui Munro to ask the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage—

- (1) In relation to Manly Cove Pavilion (State Heritage Register Listing 01433), can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) Are you aware of the installation of permanent speaker infrastructure on or adjacent to the heritage-listed site?
 - (b) Does such infrastructure require approval under section 57 of the Heritage Act 1977?
 - (c) Has any approval under section 57 been sought or granted for these works?
 - (i) If not, has Heritage NSW commenced or considered any investigation into the matter?
- (2) In relation to heritage protections and compliance at Manly Cove Pavilion, can you please answer the following questions?
 - (a) What assessment has been undertaken to ensure that current uses of the site are consistent with its heritage significance?
 - (b) Has Heritage NSW reviewed whether recent modifications or installations have impacted the heritage values of the site?
 - (c) What compliance or enforcement mechanisms are available where works are undertaken without required heritage approvals?

Steven Reynolds
Clerk of the Parliaments