



Estimates were heard between 25th June to 4th July. Full Hansard of Estimates can be found at www.parliament.sa.gov.au Herewith questions that Liz was directly involved with.

Tuesday 3 July 2007

Primary Industries

Mrs PENFOLD: My question relates to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.23, sub-program 4.5, 'State Food Plan'. The budget papers identify another reduction in funding for the South Australian Food Plan. Subprogram 4.5 shows that the actual expenditure in 2006-07 was \$3.967 million, with the new financial year being funded for \$3.433 million, a reduction of \$545 000 or nearly 15 per cent. Can the minister outline where the savings will be made and what impacts he expects from these changes? Has the minister abandoned the targets initially set when the Food for the Future strategy was adopted and the target set? I point out that in 2002 the actual achievement was close to \$1 billion ahead of schedule, but it is now behind.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I will take the last bit of that first. I do not think that the member for Flinders will blame me for the drought. It was only one of the reasons. The member for MacKillop will be quick to remind me as well that there are a number of reasons why—

The Hon. S.W. KEY: We blame you!

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Thank you; I am delighted. I will deal with the last bit of the question first. Yes, there are a number of reasons why those targets slipped. The member for Schubert also made the very valid point about exchange rates. We have been through some difficult times at both ends and we have had to refocus. The 2007 to 2010 Food Plan, which has been signed off by the Food Council and which I think we will be launching in the next week or so—

Mr WILLIAMS: It is on your website.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Yes, it is a draft. It has been signed off. I do not know that we have done the official launch. I think that, even today, we are printing the final version, but certainly there is nothing secret about it. Again, I think you have to be careful when you look narrowly at that business and look at the 3.9 to 3.5. Certainly, there is \$500 000 less in that program in the next generation. There always was. It was always known that that money would not be in there forever: it was for a particular purpose. There was no secret about that. Equally, we are picking up some of the businesses in another way. You could now actually add in some other work that will probably pick up \$300 000 of that \$500 000, anyway, particularly the work we are doing with the Export Centre to which Geoff might allude.

Importantly, what we have to do is focus not just on the work that is being done within that team but also on the work that is being done on behalf of the team. At the last meeting of the Premier's Food Council at the Waite, we spent some time with SARDI on the types of research that it is doing that will have an impact on food and on the Food Plan. You have to be very careful when you take a very narrow focus on a bit of the work we are doing. Obviously, it is a significant

part of the business activity—the wealth generation of the state. In the same way as I described what we are doing in the wine cluster, obviously we are doing a whole range of things in and around food, around food quality, access to markets, etc.

We have done a couple of things, though again we have shifted the balance a little. One of the criticisms might be that we have reduced the effort at the front end. Certainly the 12 FIDOs (Food Industry Development Officers) had a role in terms of scope and working quietly with people. The first part of that role was discovering the capacity and capability out there. That role has now changed and there will be five or perhaps six FIDOs but at a higher level position. We are certainly advertising the position at a higher level, but it is a different role now because, once we had scoped all the capacity and capability, we then had to identify those that had the ability to grow at something like 8 per cent year on year.

Having concluded that first part of the work, we now have a new role in terms of the second phase for FIDOs. They now have to work more closely with those identified as wanting to grow to start with, because not all small businesses necessarily want to grow, and then those wanting to be recognised in terms of import replacement or export. So, our new role for the FIDOs will emerge. We have a subgroup of the Premier's Food Council working with me (Rose Kemp and Grant King) because, again, that role has a very close association with the regional development board. They will work with us over the next little while in terms of managing that new capacity at that end.

The other thing we have changed slightly is what we do in terms of the market development end. Traditionally, Food Adelaide and Flavour SA have always carried out some of that work. In the past, Food Adelaide has not needed to compete for its allocation; its allocation has simply been handed over and it has done the job. There was a feeling that we ought to open that up a bit more, because there are other people who can contribute to that work. So, there will be a bit more competition, and we have rolled that over for six months. Des entered into negotiations with Des King in relation to the ongoing role of Food Adelaide. Again, as it becomes more competitive, that needs to be contestable.

Equally, we have asked Angelo Demasi from the Pooraka Market to head up a small team within the Premier's Food Council to have a look at how we can get the best value in relation to that. There were a few tensions with Food Adelaide around that issue, but I think that has all settled down. I think it is appropriate that that marketing money should be available more generally. For example, some of the regional development boards might want to seek access to some of that money. However, in the overall scheme of things, we have probably, if anything, reduced the core funding by about \$200 000 in a \$3.4 million budget. However, more importantly, we are getting the team to gather other resources and to focus more precisely on that whole of value chain, which is what we talked about earlier. I will ask Mr Knight to talk about where we are with the Food Centre, which might be just outside the numbers the member for Flinders is looking at.

Mr KNIGHT: I will cover the three points that I think are relevant. One relates to the timing of when budget papers go into the publication process, which was before the Food Council finally signed off on the plan in early May. Subsequent to that, we have re-allocated some additional funds in excess of the \$3.42 million figure. That is the first thing I would say. We worked with the council and the industry for some months to get the right balance between market development and the food innovation, which will be initiated this year for the first time. So, that is an important new initiative which is being funded as part of this and the revised FIDO program, to which the council agreed earlier in this calendar year. That \$3.42 million understates by about \$300 000 the net impact of that.

The second thing that is probably worth stating is that I have previously touched on some restructuring we undertook. When I came to this role fairly early on, industry was saying to me, 'Geoff, you have to make this part of the department a bit more effective than it has been,' and we have done that. Industry felt that too much of the \$3.8 million or \$3.9 million was going into our own positions and salaries in Food SA. What we have done is to take out one senior position, which has created some significant savings. So, a fair chunk of that reduction from last year into the year we are in now has occurred as a result of us fine tuning our operation. We saved quite a bit there by bringing agriculture and wine together with Food SA.

Taking those two factors into consideration—the additional funds we have now put into 2007-08 over and above these published numbers consequent to the Food Council signing off on a new plan in early May at its last meeting and the fact that we have made some significant administrative savings in some of our own operations within Food SA itself—I am very confident that it has not impacted in any way on the actual deliverables on the ground in terms of the food plan.

The two other things I think are relevant are as follows. The council, for at least two years, has been saying an important part of growing the food sector in South Australia is the need for some investment in food innovation—and that is about product innovation and improvement of some of the technical issues through the value chain. We had a good look at that, and we decided we would cut what we were spending in terms of the food industry, with the support of the industry players at the council. We are pleased to be able to say that we have been able to redirect some of that money: around three-quarters of a million dollars will go into the Food Innovation initiative that will sit at Regency alongside South Australia's world-recognised food capability at the Regency campus. It will be a node of the Centre of Innovation, so it will not be a stand alone entity, and it will link in very closely with what the commonwealth and the state governments do in relation to innovation.

We are hoping that, with the commonwealth's expansion of the Food Innovation grants in its last budget, this capacity at Regency Park will enable us to get a bigger slice of those national grants that are around. Lastly, the Food Centre is in discussion with the industry itself about where that sits. I think members are probably aware that the centre started its life at Enterprise House on Greenhill Road. However, due to the growth in Business SA, it had to move into larger premises on Dequetteville Terrace. However, longer term—

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: At short notice, though, Business SA said it wanted that space for someone else and that the centre had better find itself another home. So, that is why it went over to Dequetteville Terrace.

Mr KNIGHT: We had limited choice there. It is not quite where I would like it to be, so, over this year, we will be talking with industry about the option of also locating the centre at Regency. There is a space at Regency we are currently negotiating around. We would like to get synergy between the food capacity that is on that campus together with our new food innovation program. We will be recruiting externally into that program very shortly. The Food Centre itself, together with organisations that work with us in a partnership sense (that is, both Food Adelaide and Flavour SA) are also trying to get some Austrade capability in that same centre.

I am very confident that, notwithstanding those headline numbers, we will get a much more effective bang for our buck—and the industry is saying that. Less of the money is going into overheads within PIRSA, which has had to make some administrative savings. Sometimes that is one of the ways in which that can be achieved, and we have done that. I am very confident about it and I think the council certainly gave the new plan its ringing endorsement at its last meeting. With food innovation, in particular, I think we will see that become a key part of the new Food Plan 2007-10. It has not been launched yet but the minister will launch it in the next month or so.

Mr VENNING: I have a supplementary question. In relation to the officers who are no longer going to be employed (seven of them), my question is: do they know they no longer have a job? Also, I am very concerned because we lose one of them in the Barossa area. That person was pivotal in relation to the success of the old Food SA program and was stationed with the Barossa Light Development and was critical to that program and will be severely missed. My questions are:

1. Are those people being told that they will no longer have jobs?
2. How are you going to cover this huge region with five officers?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: We have dealt with that in terms of the changing role. To start with, it is not a scoping role any more; it is not out there basically researching capacity and capability. We have now drafted them, so we go to the next phase. Obviously, we needed to deal with people on contract who would not necessarily wish to compete for the new contracts (and there are fewer of them; you are right there), but, again, we have limited resources to work with. If we say to industry and committees like the Premier's Food Council, 'We want you to give us guidance', we have to respect the guidance they give us.

The three pillars have required a change in the way we spend the money. We have to respect that. We simply cannot say, 'No, this is the way we have done it in the past and we are going to continue to do it this way.' That is the role. Geoff says everybody signed off and was happy in the end. That does not mean to say there was not some robust debate along the way, not only about the quantum but also about the size of the slice. You will always argue about the size of the cake first—everybody would like more. Once that was resolved then it was about how we can best position that money within those three pillars in the Food Plan. We are doing that very well. Don will respond, in terms of the detail, as to how we dealt in a respectful way with the FIDOs and the changeover to the new program.

Mr PLOWMAN: The FIDO program existed up until 30 June, and it was known by everyone that it would cease on 30 June. There was a specific program that went for the period up to 30 June 2007. There was communication with both the FIDOs themselves and their employers—who were usually the regional development boards or, in some instances, the food groups—certainly before Christmas 2006, that this program would terminate in June 2007.

As soon as the Food Council approved the new program (which was in early May 2007), both the regional development boards and the FIDOs were advised that the program would cease at 30 June but that it would be replaced by a new program which had a reduced number of more senior people who could take the next step of the Food Plan forward. This was not just a general food culture within the regions but an ability to identify those businesses that had the opportunity to contribute to the 8 per cent growth target that the council had set, and to be able to participate in food export activities.

Mrs PENFOLD: My question is regarding the Food Plan and the proposal to combine the sub-program within PIRSA and the State Food Plan with a sub-program of agriculture and wine. This is a dramatic change from the past as the agricultural and wine section has traditionally been aimed at pre farm gate, whereas the State Food Plan has been aimed more at post farm gate and post processor gate. Given the great success of the State Food Plan since its inception and considerable contribution to increasing the state's exports under the previous government, what benefits does the government see in incorporating this sub-agency with agriculture and wine?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I do not agree with your earlier comments. Both food and wine have to be whole of market chain. There is no point in growing stuff you cannot sell, and there is no point in putting resources into an area that does not need them when the deficiency, the gap, the rate limiter is somewhere else along that whole of distribution chain. We must take a whole of market focus. In fact, we must start with the customer and work our way back.

With both food and wine that is the appropriate approach. Many of those things (food and wine) you can combine. In many of the markets it is a food and wine market. We can promote food and wine in combination; they are not silos. There are some differences but, in many cases, there are similarities, and it is appropriate that we put those two teams together under Don's leadership. In doing that, we save a senior salary which makes that money available to industry as well. I think you would agree, also, it was a very smart way to use money. Everybody has applauded the strategy.

Mrs PENFOLD: My questions are:

1. Will the minister outline details of how the new agriculture, food and wine division will look?
2. How many staff members will be dedicated to the Food Plan?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Yes, I will ask Don to do that. Keep in mind, again, that they will not all be in the division. We have just discussed the FIDOs, for example, whose employment arrangements will depend upon negotiations with regional development boards and potentially with food groups. In the last generation we had, I think, an ACC that also employed at least one and an individual council in another case. They do not necessarily have to sit in the division. We can deliver these services in a range of other ways. We are very keen for communities to say, 'The best way to position and manage that resource is to work closely with other arrangements we have at a regional level.' Again, in terms of the answer to that question, just bear in mind that it is only part of the way we deliver the services. But to come back now in terms of who is in the agency, we can deal with that.

Mr PLOWMAN: In the industry development area, agriculture and wine are only part of it; the other parts are biosecurity, food safety, and NRMs, but I will restrict my comments to the industry development component. We have four groups there: horticulture, livestock, crops, and grape and wine. Certainly, for as long as I have been in this position, which is three years, they have had a whole of chain responsibility. We have linked the pre-farmgate with the post-farmgate through collaborative arrangements with Food SA, with SARDI and with other government agencies. So, essentially, the integration of the former Food SA into Agriculture and Wine adds just the food to the end of that chain. The considerable resources that sit in industry development, for example, intensive livestock development, for which both the chicken meat and the pork industries have been highly successful, adds a component to that capability. I do not believe that the overall capability in food has been diminished; in fact, if anything, I think it has been significantly increased.

The new positions that are created as a result of the new pillars of the food plan—and those pillars are: market development, business capability and innovation—so long as everything goes well, will be advertised this weekend. I would hope that we would get the senior positions in place within a month or two, depending on the nature of some of those positions. What we have established within the division are two new groups. One of them is innovation, and the innovation group has both the product development components and the business development components, including the linkage into the regional network. The second new component is market development, and that platform has strong integration with the Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED) market development program, again, a strength that I believe over the next three years will become evident.

We also put a number of other rate limiters, for which the capability sits either within Agriculture, Food and Wine, SARDI or commercial projects across the food sector. They are things such as: biosecurity, food safety, NRM workforce, value chain, etc. These are, I suppose, second order programs that sit within the industry development program within PIRSA, and particularly within Agriculture, Food and Wine.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: If the suggestion there was that there are fewer resources, it is the opposite. So, there are more resources, obviously within the agency, but equally, in many of the issues we deal with you would expect resources beyond the agency and we capture them. An example is the 457s and the work we have had to do beyond the agency on what is obviously core business for us—value-adding to meat—and you would understand what has happened with the abattoirs, etc. Now, there is a challenge. Equally, where we identify the need for industry development, the case manager that we would help to negotiate may sit within DTED, Primary Industries or a regional development board. For example, we are working with Tatiara Meats in terms of potential expansion there. The single biggest rate limiter is labour.

We have Grant King—so we have actually asked someone from a regional development board—to anchor the team that works with them. One thing I think we have got to do a lot more of is actually giving industries one face to government. To try and get an industry to scope the complexities of government and expect them to identify a whole range of entry points does not work. So, the case management approach is that, if somebody comes to us—an Inghams, a Tatiara Meats, the Penola Pulp Mill, etc.—we say to them, 'We will give you one face to manage all those entry points to government on your behalf.' It can be in DTED, Primary Industries, a regional development board or local government; we can be quite flexible about that, but it certainly means that industry knows that they have to ask only one person a question and can expect a timely response, and they are very appreciative of that approach.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer to the narrow gauge railway system on Eyre Peninsula and the upgrading of it. I believe it is happening under your portfolio.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: No. There was a contribution from primary producers to that. There was some public money, some transport infrastructure money and some money from primary producers, which is collected through the Primary Industries Funding Scheme Act, a voluntary scheme. We are only a part of that. About \$2 million of the \$43 million is contributed from farmers through that scheme.

Mr WILLIAMS: I will ask the member for Flinders.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: She will tell you all about it. Equally she will tell you that a couple of people have chosen to exercise their right to ask for it back, which is unfortunate because it is better if everybody contributes.

Mr WILLIAMS: The question was whether they are using convertible sleepers for the upgrade.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Can't help you with that at all.

Mrs PENFOLD: I really would have liked them to, but they haven't, much to my disgust, because it would have been better because one day we could have hooked into the main grid and standardised with the rest of Australia.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Good point. I will not accept responsibility for that.

Wednesday 4 July 2007

Local Government

Mrs PENFOLD: My question relates to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.28 and the performance commentary that relates to stormwater management and flood mitigation. Compared to last year, what developments have been planned in relation to the 30-year funding and governance agreement for stormwater management and flood mitigation?

The CHAIR: Minister, is that your area?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: As to the fact that councils need to deal with stormwater, the funding does not come out of our budget, but the government has committed to allocating at least \$4 million to local councils over the next 30 years, so it is a significant contribution to councils, and we have passed legislation in this place in relation to managing stormwater and assisting local government. The Local Government (Stormwater Management) Amendment Act 2006 has been proclaimed and came into operation on 1 July. The new framework requires councils to prepare stormwater management plans on a catchment basis, and to implement infrastructure works in accordance with the catchment plans. In some areas, catchment-wide planning is already quite advanced.

The Stormwater Management Authority, which, I understand, was established as a result of that legislation, is charged with working with councils to facilitate and coordinate catchment stormwater management planning, allocation of state funding to projects in coordination with council and other source financing, and facilitating cooperative action by all relevant public authorities in the planning, construction and maintenance of stormwater management. So, we are working with local councils to progress stormwater management, and providing considerable support for it.

Mrs PENFOLD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, statement 3, page 5.28, program 6 and the State/Local Government Relations performance commentary. Paragraph 8 states:

Regulations supporting the Local Government (Financial Management and Rating) Amendment Act 2005 came into operation in January this year and are designed to improve accountability, financial management, flexibility and rating decisions by councils.

Are all councils now reporting in a manner that is open and accountable? If not, how many have failed to report in an effective manner, and who are they?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There will be a staged implementation of the requirements under that act. Those requirements came into operation this year, but they have until the next budget cycle to have all mechanisms in place. Even before the legislation was put in place, many councils were already picking up the initiatives and working through a whole range of those issues, so the willingness of councils to comply with the legislation is very evident. A whole range of the requirements under the act do not come into immediate operation, and we are working with the Local Government Association on the model financial statements. I think I signed off on that only the other day, so it is still a work in progress.

Mrs PENFOLD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, page 5.28, program 6 and the State/Local Government Relations, net cost of program, performance commentary. Minister, the net cost of program budget amount for 2007-08 is \$3.947 million. The community Outback review announced in May 2007 is part of the program to increase the accountability of councils. Can the minister advise the amount that will be paid to the steering committee comprising the trust members and representatives from the Office for State/Local Government Relations to head up the public consultation, the estimated final cost of the review, when the review will be completed and the findings implemented? I know the minister mentioned this earlier, but she did not go as far as I would like, now that I have Outback areas within my electorate.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We are putting the majority of our own resources into the review of the Outback Areas Trust, and I am advised that the estimated cost to conduct the review is \$50 000. I believe the review is incredibly timely. At the invitation of the trust, I very recently toured the Outback with the Local Government Grants Commission. The impact of the mining boom and increased tourism, with people wanting to have that Outback experience, is having an incredible impact on the small progress associations that, in the main, operate the small towns in those areas. Those small progress associations get their funding from the trust, and they operate purely on a voluntary basis. Many people

are either feeling the pressure of the dwindling population in their communities, which means that there are not enough people to share the burden, or, in towns like Andamooka, which is literally going gangbusters, progress associations are experiencing the burden of the task being too big for them to manage, with no planning mechanisms in place in the town. When I was up there, I was told that something in excess of 800 people are now living in Andamooka, so there is great pressure on small Outback communities.

However, there is tremendous spirit in the Outback communities, and I was absolutely blown away by what they have achieved in Andamooka with a relatively small grant of not quite half a million dollars for infrastructure from minister Conlon. The people up there dug the trenches and laid the water pipe for a distance of 30 kilometres from the desal plant at Olympic Dam to Andamooka. A group of about 40 volunteers dug the trenches and laid the water pipe to a small filtration plant. I found out later that the blokes drove the machines and the women got on their hands and knees and pulled the rocks out of the trenches. I am told that is because women have more nimble fingers! Jokes aside, it was an amazing effort, and it just goes to show how committed those people are to their community. However, those people are being quite overwhelmed. In the case of Andamooka, funding of \$150 000 has now been allocated from the Local Government Grants Commission for a government-appointed municipal development officer to be located in Andamooka to help put some structures in place.

I think the review of the Outback Areas Trust and the sort of structure we want to see operating in the Outback will bring some relief to these communities. So, it is a really important review. I urge anyone who has not been up there to do so because we found that these communities were only too willing to come out and meet with us. The issues they confront are quite different from anywhere else, and the spirit of those communities really has to be seen to be believed. They really are to be commended for their efforts.

Mrs PENFOLD: That is the kind of pressure I am seeing with the Kingoonya to Wirrulla road and Scotdesco Aboriginal community. That is why I have been very concerned that this review be completed, because I do not think these communities can cope with those pressures. It is also why I want to know when the review will be completed. Does the minister have any idea when the review will be completed and implemented, because we badly need something in place to assist these communities?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We are undertaking community consultation at the moment, and I am advised that we expect an outcome in about six or seven weeks.

Mrs PENFOLD: Perhaps the minister would like to visit Wirrulla and the Scotdesco Aboriginal community?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I would love to be invited, thank you.

Mrs PENFOLD: I will make sure that you are.

Mrs PENFOLD: My question refers to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 4.53 and the 2007-08 targets and 2006-07 highlights. A 2006-07 highlight was to lead the implementation of the Women's Safety Strategy across the South Australian government. I have a particular interest in this because of Aboriginal women, and I am well aware of the difficulties and issues in Ceduna and some of the outlying areas, in particular. Given that this program has been implemented for some two years, does the government have any data that indicates what impact this program is having on the incidence of family violence? Does the government intend progressing the program in 2007-08, and, if so, how?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The Women's Safety Strategy, as we said, is, I guess, the key link that we are working on to ensure women's safety in South Australia. A range of initiatives have come out of that particular safety strategy. I have already referred to one of them, that is, the family safety framework, which is about trying to address issues impacting on those families that are at greatest risk of violence in our community, and dealing with them in a more structured and systematic way.

It also complements a number of other initiatives that are currently occurring in relation to women's and children's safety. These include the South Australian police department's new domestic violence policing model, which, as I said, is due to be implemented in 2007. We have issued a domestic violence law reform discussion paper. The public

consultation phase of that, I understand, has finished, and Maurine Pyke QC is currently working on that. Child protection information sharing protocols and a range of other issues have been implemented. The Department for Correctional Services will hold cognitive behavioural programs for men, including a stopping violence program, a sexual behaviour clinic and a violence program. The DFEEST domestic violence workforce project will respond to professional development and training needs of workers, providing services to victims, children and perpetrators of domestic violence. The South Australian women's health policy focuses on developing a model of integrated responses across the regions to increase women's safety and the development and implementation of best practice standards in the provision of services to women.

On 23 and 24 November 2006 we held the Women's Safety Strategy Conference in Adelaide, following a successful conference in December the year before. Each conference was attended by over 200 people, and conference feedback indicated that both were quite successful events. They brought together service providers, police, emergency workers, government agencies and academics in the field. The family safety framework was actually borne out of those conferences, as I understand it. We have also undertaken work to support groups to identify priority issues and develop responses to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander family violence, women from culturally and linguistically diverse communities and violence against women with disabilities.

The lead for the family safety framework across the South Australian government—and the Office for Women will be doing that—is to provide the best possible outcomes for women. A child protection and domestic violence forum to assist with the implementation of the family safety framework and develop collaboration partnerships between child protection, domestic violence and SAPOL workers will be undertaken this year. Also, a culturally and linguistically diverse communities forum will raise awareness about issues facing women from these backgrounds who experience domestic violence and abuse. There will also be a women with disabilities forum.

We have also hosted in South Australia the State Aboriginal Women's Gathering. The first gathering I attended was in August last year in Adelaide. The theme of that gathering was local community solutions to indigenous family violence. About 70 women from across South Australia attended that forum. Key recommendations from previous forums were developed at this particular gathering and, for the first time ever, senior public officials came along to the function and heard first-hand the stories of these women. They were required to respond about the initiatives that they had put in place in relation to the recommendations that came out of the women's gathering. That publication is available and I would be happy to send it to the honourable member. It will give a good oversight of what has happened across government in addressing the issues identified specifically by South Australia's indigenous women.

In the last two years we have held the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Women's Gathering. That was held here in South Australia just a few weeks ago in sync with the senior officials meetings so that they could better inform the women's ministers council. When it was held in Adelaide previously, it was held at the same time the women's ministers were meeting, so there was no opportunity for the ministers to address the issues they had raised because the meetings were held in concert. We have now staggered those meetings so that they can feed directly into the women's ministers forum. I think that was a positive outcome. I can get a copy of the report that was developed across government about the initiatives that have been undertaken to address violence against indigenous women and their families and give it to the honourable member.

The CHAIR: The time agreed for examination of this section having expired, I advise that the proposed payments for the Attorney-General's Department and the Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department remain open.