LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 – 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

TASMANIA

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 45

THURSDAY, 20 AUGUST 2026

1 **COUNCIL MEETS.—** The Council met at 11.00 o'clock a.m.

2 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PEOPLE.—** The President said:

"We meet today on Tasmanian Aboriginal land. We acknowledge and pay respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal people and elders, past and present. We recognise them as the first inhabitants and the continuing custodians of this land."

3 **PRAYERS AND REFLECTION.—** The President read Prayers.

4 **LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.—** *Ordered*, That Ms *Rattray* have leave to Table answer to Question No. 43 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.

5 **MYSTATE BANK ARENA LEASE.—** Ms *Thomas* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — In responses to questions raised during Budget Estimates, the Government confirmed that LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd pays base rent of approximately $200,000 per annum under the MyState Bank Arena lease, while also receiving a taxpayer-funded hiring fee contribution that has totalled almost $800,000 since 2021.

The Government has subsequently suggested there is a performance or percentage rent component to the lease.

In relation to the lease of the MyState Bank Arena to LK Stadiums (Tas):

(1) What is the formula used to calculate the performance or percentage rent payable under the lease?

(2) What total amount of performance or percentage rent has been paid by LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in each financial year since the commencement of the lease?

(3) What was the total rent received by the Crown from LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in each year of the lease, including both base rent and performance rent?

(4) Has the total rent received by the Crown from LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in any year exceeded the value of the hiring fee contribution paid by the Government to LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd?

(5) What independent assessment was undertaken before entering into the lease to determine market rent for MyState Bank Arena?

(6) Was the lease subjected to an open competitive process or market testing prior to being awarded to LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd?

(7) If the Government considers the lease represents value for money for Tasmanian taxpayers, will it release the total net financial benefit received by the Crown under the lease since its commencement?

(8) How many community groups have received subsidised access to MyState Bank Arena under the non-commercial hiring arrangements since the lease commenced?

(9) What was the total value of hiring fee discounts provided to community groups in each year of the lease?

(10) How many community organisations sought access to the venue but were required to pay full commercial rates because they did not qualify under the subsidised arrangements?

(11) Given the Auditor-General's findings regarding the proposed sale of land at Wilkinsons Point, what assurance can the Government provide that any future arrangement involving LK Group and Wilkinsons Point will be subject to greater transparency and market testing than occurred with the MyState Bank Arena Lease?

(12) What assurance can the Government provide that the lease arrangements for the Stadium at Macquarie Point is being negotiated in the best interests of Tasmanians, rather than the best interests of the AFL or Cricket Australia as the proposed head tenants?

The Leader answered:

(1) Capitalised terms used in this response have the meanings given to them in the Lease. Percentage Rent is outlined in clause 4.3 of the Lease and means, for an Accounting Period, the amount (if any) by which the Agreed Percentage of Gross Annual Turnover exceeds the aggregate of:

(a) Base Rent for the Accounting Period;

(b) Outgoings for the Accounting Period (other than Excluded Outgoings);

(c) Accumulated Operating Losses immediately before the commencement of the Accounting Period; and

(d) to the extent the Outgoings (excluding Excluded Outgoings) for the immediately prior Accounting Period were greater than the Gross Annual Turnover for that Accounting Period, the difference between the Outgoings (excluding Excluded Outgoings) and the Gross Annual Turnover for that prior Accounting Period.

(2) No percentage rent has been payable by LK Stadiums.

(3) The following table outlines total rent received by the Crown:

Year	Base rent	Percentage rent	Total
2021-22	$126,301	-	$126,301
2022-23	$213,022	-	$213,022
2023-24	$224,708	-	$224,708
2024-25	$230,885	-	$230,885
2025-26	$234,891	-	$234,891

(4) Yes. The total rent received by the Crown exceeded the Hiring Fee Contribution paid to LK Stadiums in each relevant financial year.

(5) The Lease was negotiated and prepared by King & Wood Mallesons through the Office of the Crown Solicitor, with advice from the Valuer-General.

(6) No. The Lease formed part of the initial negotiations with the LK Group surrounding the purchase of land at Wilkinsons Point and the establishment of a National Basketball League team in Tasmania.

(7) Please refer to the answers to questions 3 and 4 above. A single net financial benefit figure would not capture the full value of the arrangement, which also delivers broader public benefits alongside the rights and obligations under the Lease.

(8) LK Stadiums is expected to provide the Department with detailed booking system data in late August 2026 as part of its reporting requirements. Further information can be provided once this information is received.

(9) Please refer to the answer to question 8 above.

(10) Please refer to the answer to question 8 above.

(11) The proposal will continue to be considered having regard to the public interest, value for money, risk allocation, probity, deliverability and any relevant legal or commercial considerations. No final decision will be made unless the Government is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so. Consistent with advice provided to the Public Accounts Committee, the Department of Premier

and Cabinet and Building Tasmania have reengaged with the LK Group since May 2026 in relation to the proposal. The masterplan for the site, the potential development and site activation, as well as how the precinct integrates with Dowsing Point, have been discussed

(12) The Tasmanian Government is committed to ensuring that lease arrangements are negotiated transparently, fairly, and in the best interests of all Tasmanians, with a strong focus on achieving value for money and delivering public benefit.

6 HYDRO TASMANIA GENERATION ASSETS.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Renewables — Regarding the generation assets of Hydro Tasmania, can the Minister:

(1) Please provide a breakdown of electricity generated (in GWh) by each of the 30 power stations in the fleet for:

(a) the 2025 drought year;

(b) the 2022 above-average year; and

(c) the 1994–1996 baseline period used to set the original REC baseline figures?

(2) Are there any power stations in the fleet where generation output has declined materially relative to historical averages for hydrological reasons that are comparable, and if so, is this attributable to asset condition rather than inflows?

(3) Following the transformer fire at Reece power station, what full independent review of transformer condition across the Hydro Tasmania generation fleet was undertaken:

(a) What were the findings; and

(b) what remediation actions have been completed or are planned?

(4) (a) Has Hydro Tasmania engaged any external engineering assessment of the overall condition of its generation fleet in the past five years; and

(b) if so, what were the key findings of that assessment regarding life expectancy of critical components including turbines, stators, transformers and penstocks?

(5) (a) How many transformers across the Hydro generation fleet have been assessed as requiring replacement or significant refurbishment;

(b) what is the estimated capital cost; and

(c) what is the estimated timeline for that work?

(6) Please provide a breakdown by power station of the number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline for:

(a) Maintenance;

(b) Refurbishment; and/or

(c) unplanned reasons?

(7) Regarding the Gordon Number 2 major refurbishment:

(a) what was the original expected completion date; and

(b) if the works continue or continued beyond that date;

(i) when was it, or is expected to be completed; and

(ii) what was the original budget and the total cost to date or completion?

(8) Regarding the following refurbishments to Poatina 2 machine, Lemonthyme, recently completed in the past 5 years are Poatina 3, Rowallan, Lake Echo, Trevallyn 1 and 2, Wilmot, for each, please advise:

(a) what was the original expected completion date; and

(i) when were the works completed; and

(b) what was the original budget; and

(ii) what was the total cost to date or completion?

(9) Please provide a breakdown by power station of number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline and indicate the expected return-to-service date for each.

(10) (a) What is the total capital expenditure budget allocated for asset maintenance, refurbishment and replacement of generation assets in the 2026–27 financial year; and

(b) how does this compare to the previous two financial years?

The Minister answered:

(1) Answers for a) and b) are provided below, by calendar year.

Hydro Tasmania advises that generation at power stations can vary from year to year due to a range of operational, market and environmental factors, including water inflows, planned and unplanned outages for maintenance and refurbishment activities, generation strategy, and prevailing market and trading conditions. Accordingly, differences in generation between years do not necessarily indicate changes in asset condition or capability.

	2025 Generation (GWh)	**2022 Generation (GWh)**
Bastyan	232	273
Bell Bay Three - FT8s	3	8
Bell Bay Three - Trent	79	83
Butlers Gorge	61	65
Catagunya / Liapootah / Wayatinah (combined dispatch unit)	822	760
Cethana	282	352
Cluny	81	74
Devils Gate	199	260
Fisher	172	243
Gordon	855	1635
John Butters	533	356
Lake Echo	78	8
Lemonthyme / Wilmot (combined dispatch unit)	269	367
Mackintosh	220	270
Meadowbank	140	152
Paloona	89	117
Poatina 110	387	456
Poatina 220	529	812
Reece 1	497	329
Reece 2	153	405
Repulse	130	118
Rowallan	23	27
Tamar Valley CCGT	72	0
Tarraleah	463	496
Trevallyn	259	509
Tribute	219	189
Tungatinah	411	412

With regard to c), the baselines are all published in the REC Registry here:

https://www.rec-registry.gov.au/rec-registry/app/public/power-station-register

(2) Hydro Tasmania advises its hydrology and generation have seen increases in volatility (higher highs and lower lows) across the portfolio rather than a significant decline in average inflows. This is correlated across storages.

The only stations where asset condition has significantly impacted production on a sustained and ongoing basis are Tarraleah and Lake Margaret, which are also Hydro Tasmania's oldest power stations. As a result, the business is considering redevelopment and/or refurbishment options for these stations.

(3) Hydro Tasmania advises that transformer condition assessment and replacement is a long standing and continuous program of work.

The transformer replacement and midlife refurbishment program was recently updated, with the funding allocated as part of the Corporate Plan capital investment settings.

Hydro Tasmania has 55 transformers installed within its Hydro generation fleet.

Over the next 5 to 7 years, 12 of these transformers are targeted for replacement, based on current useful life assessments.

The Reece transformer was replaced with a strategic spare transformer (owned by Hydro Tasmania), and the Reece station is back in service.

(4) Hydro Tasmania frequently utilises external advice and Entura to assist with condition assessment of assets within the generation fleet.

This is usually done at an asset or station level, not an overall assessment of the fleet.

(5) Hydro Tasmania has 55 transformers installed within its Hydro generation fleet.

Over the next 5 to 7 years, 12 of these transformers are targeted for replacement, based on current useful life assessments.

This funding is included within existing capital expenditure forecasts at an estimated cost, on average, of $7.5m each transformer (based on current prices).

(6) Most of Hydro Tasmania's maintenance is a daily activity and thus changes day-to-day. In accordance with the National Electricity Rules, all outages are publicly shown on the Australian Energy Market Operator's (AEMO's) website in the market data section under the Projected Assessment of System Adequacy (PASA).

Outages of significance at the time of writing are the Poatina station outage (for painting of its penstock) which is a planned maintenance activity, as well as Poatina #2, Gordon #2 and Lemonthyme refurbishments.

There is also an outage on Tarraleah #4, although the constraint on the canals is currently more impactful than the machine outage.

The FT8 gas turbines are also undergoing significant maintenance with several machines offline pending return of turbines from overhauls in the USA.

Lake Margaret has machines 1, 6 and 7 out of service.

In total, 16 units are offline, out of a total of 65, which includes mini hydro units but excludes micro hydro and Bass Strait Island units.

(7) Gordon Number 2

(a) January 2025

(b) (i) December 2026

(ii) $44.69m, approved variation by the Hydro Tasmania board to raise to $66.96m, costs to date $51.61m.

Hydro Tasmania has advised that additional complexity encountered during disassembly and reassembly was a key driver of budget increase for Gordon #2. This complexity arose from the condition of certain components, which were found to be more degraded than anticipated due to age-related deterioration specific to this 1970s-era hydroelectric technology. Such issues are an inherent risk in brownfield refurbishment projects, where some machine components are only dismantled and inspected every 20 to 40 years.

Hydro Tasmania also experienced significant challenges with the quality of some components supplied from Europe. As a result, the business relied on its internal engineering and technical expertise to source, manufacture and machine critical replacement parts. These issues contributed to both the increased project costs and the extended outage duration.

(8) Hydro Tasmania advises that for all completion dates and estimated durations, projects are often moved around in its capital plan to give flexibility for its generation and trading strategies. This refers to both adjusting start date (either bringing forward or delaying) and strategically reprioritising site effort to other outages, resulting in an extended outage duration.

Where a duration has extended it does not always mean additional site effort is required, on occasions site effort can be paused until Hydro Tasmania returns to the implementation.

Please find details of all refurbishments requested below, as provided by Hydro Tasmania:

Poatina 2

Original expected completion date: December 2025 (estimated duration 10 months)

Actual completion date: ongoing, expected completion April 2027 (would be a duration of 12 months due to later commencement of the works)

Original budget: $27.12m

Costs to date: 13.51m

Lemonthyme

Original expected completion date: July 2026 (estimated duration: 9 months)

Actual completion date: ongoing, expected completion September 2026 (would be a duration of 10 months)

Original budget: $62.52m

Costs to date: $58.55m

Poatina 3

Original expected completion date: January 2025 (estimated duration: 11 months)

Actual completion date: February 2026 (actual duration: 22 months)

Original budget: $35.98m

Cost at completion: $34.49m

Lake Echo

Original expected completion date: 15 January 2022 (estimated duration: 9 months)

Actual completion date: August 2022 (duration of 17 months)

Original budget: $34.24m

Actual costs: $32.93m

Trevallyn 1

Original expected completion date: December 2021 (estimated duration: 10 months)

Actual completion date: September 2022 (duration of approximately 19 months)

Original budget: $17.56m, budget varied by $1.44m to approve $19m

Actual costs: $16.84m

Trevallyn 2

Original expected completion date: September 2020 (estimated duration: 9 months)

Actual completion date: June 2021 (duration of approximately 15 months)

Original budget: $18.9m

Actual costs: $17.80m

Wilmot

Original expected completion date: June 2020 (estimated duration: 9 months)

Actual completion date: September 2020 (duration of approximately 12 months)

Original budget: $33.36m

Actual costs: $25.26m

(9) Outages of significance at the time of writing are Poatina station outage (for painting of its penstock) which is a planned maintenance activity, as well as Poatina #2, Gordon #2 and Lemonthyme refurbishments. Further detail is noted in response to Question 6.

(10) (a) The capital budget for generation assets (and related assets) FY2026-27 is $200m.

(b) The budget for FY2025-26 was $172.8m and the budget for FY2024-25 was $154.1m.

7 PAYMENT IN LIEU OF RATES SCHEME FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Renewables — With regard to the Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) scheme for renewable energy generation, consistent with Victoria and other states can the Minister for Energy and Renewables respond to the following:

(1) Renewable generation plant is currently classified as a chattel rather than a capital improvement to land, and is therefore not rateable in the ordinary way.

(a) What is the legal or administrative origin of this classification, and has the Government reviewed whether it remains appropriate given the scale of current and committed wind, solar and battery investment in Tasmania; and

(b) does this classification apply equally to Hydro Tasmania's generating assets, and if so, has the Minister sought advice on whether it is consistent with the Commonwealth's competitive neutrality framework?

(2) Does the Minister support, in principle, a nationally consistent rating treatment for renewable generation assets (i.e. PiLoR), given operators of multi-state portfolios already budget for and accept this model elsewhere?

(3) Has the Minister or the Department had any direct engagement with any windfarm operators or proponents, on the rates treatment of their Tasmanian current or future assets, including any complaints or concerns raised about administrative complexity under the current multi-landholder valuation approach?

The Minister answered:

(1) (a) Based on advice from the Office of the Valuer-General, statutory valuations under the Valuation of Land Act 2001 assess the fee simple interest in land. Where renewable energy infrastructure is installed on land owned by another party, ownership of that infrastructure remains separate from ownership of the land. Section 49G of the Electricity Supply Industry Act 1995 expressly provides that ownership of prescribed electricity infrastructure is not affected by its attachment, affixation or annexation to land. Accordingly, infrastructure which is not owned by the fee simple owner cannot form part of the statutory valuation of that fee simple interest. The valuation treatment reflects the application of the existing legislative framework by the Office of the Valuer-General in undertaking statutory valuations.

(b) Hydro Tasmania operates within Tasmania's Government Business Enterprise and competitive neutrality frameworks. It makes an annual rates equivalent payment directly to the Tasmanian Government. These arrangements are designed to maintain competitive neutrality, reflecting its unique position as a Government-owned entity with land exempt from rates under legislation.

(2) The Tasmanian Government recognises the interest within the local government sector regarding rating arrangements for renewable energy developments. Further work is required to assess whether a Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) scheme would be suitable for Tasmania. As the Minister for Local Government advised in response to Questions on Notice on this matter, detailed investigation of alternative rating frameworks, including PiLoR arrangements, has not yet been undertaken and forms part of future rating reform considerations.

(3) I have not been advised of representations raising concerns regarding the administrative complexity of the current valuation and rating arrangements for renewable energy developments.

8 COMPETITIVE NEUTRALITY ENTURA.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Renewables — With regard to matters related to competitive neutrality and other related matters, can the Minister provide answers to the following questions:

(1) Hydro Tasmania has stated that Entura directs around 60 per cent of its effort to Hydro Tasmania.

(a) What share of Entura's revenue, in both percentage and dollar terms, came from Hydro Tasmania and related State entities in each of the last three financial years;

(b) Over the same period, what proportion of Hydro Tasmania's contestable engineering, testing and commissioning work was awarded to Entura without an open competitive tender; and

(c) What is the policy basis for directing that work to Entura rather than openly tendering it to the Tasmanian market, and absent competitive tension, how is value for money demonstrated?

(2) When Entura tenders against private firms, how is full cost attribution applied so that no advantage arises from Hydro Tasmania ownership, including cost of capital, tax equivalent payments, guarantees and shared overhead?

(3) (a) Does Entura's external pricing include a competitive neutrality adjustment as contemplated by the national competition policy principles; and

(b) if so, how is it calculated, and who verifies it?

(4) What is Entura's published operating model, and how does it define the niche it was established to serve versus services already supplied by Tasmanian private firms?

(5) Given that Entura's results are consolidated into Hydro Tasmania's accounts, will the Minister request Hydro Tasmania publish Entura's revenue split between internal and external work, and the competitive neutrality measures it applies?

(6) Has the Tasmanian Economic Regulator ever assessed Entura for competitive neutrality compliance, and if not, would the shareholder Ministers refer the matter?

(7) Given Marinus Link and the broader transmission pipeline, what steps is Hydro Tasmania taking to maximise contestable participation by Tasmanian private firms rather than directing work to Entura?

(8) Will the shareholder Ministers commit to a competitive neutrality review of Entura's operating model and report the outcome to Parliament?

(9) What share of Entura's revenue comes from clients other than Hydro Tasmania, and what share from interstate and overseas work?

(10) (a) Is Entura's national and international commercial expansion within the charter Hydro Tasmania was established under, and have the shareholder Ministers and the Board sanctioned it; and

(b) if so, please provide an explanation?

(11) What public capital and commercial risk are committed to that interstate and overseas activity, and is Entura's performance reported to Parliament separately from Hydro Tasmania's core results?

The Minister answered:

By way of background, all Government businesses are expected to apply the Government's *Competitive Neutrality Policy* to ensure that they compete on fair and equal terms with businesses in the private and community sectors. I note that competitive neutrality policy is not about preventing competition between government-owned and private businesses. Instead, it aims to remove any inherent advantages that government businesses might have, such as subsidies, tax exemptions, or regulatory benefits, which could distort the market.

The Tasmanian Government is committed to implementing the revitalised National Competition Policy (NCP) and, as part of this process, will conduct a review of the competition framework in the State, including the operation of the *Economic Regulator Act 2009*, to ensure that Government policies and processes meet the updated requirements of the NCP Agreement. Any changes to Tasmania's competitive neutrality framework will be implemented by 31 December 2026 to ensure that Tasmania can meet its NCP commitments.

Hydro Tasmania is subject to national competition policy requirements and pays Government Guarantee Fees, Income Tax Equivalents and Dividends.

For answers to questions 5, 6, and 8, please see below.

> *5) Given that Entura's results are consolidated into Hydro Tasmania's accounts, will the Minister request Hydro Tasmania publish Entura's revenue split between internal and external work, and the competitive neutrality measures it applies?*

The preparation of Hydro Tasmania's financial statements, including decisions about the level of detail disclosed in relation to Entura's operations and performance, is a matter for Hydro Tasmania's Board and management, consistent with applicable financial reporting and disclosure requirements.

However, it is noted Hydro Tasmania already reports on Entura's activities in its Annual Report, including information on the nature of the business and its work supporting both Hydro Tasmania's projects and external clients. Hydro Tasmania has advised in its response that it measures and reports Entura's performance primarily through project delivery and utilisation measures (hours) rather than by separately disclosing internal and external revenue streams.

Additionally, it is important to note that, with the exception of Entura India, Entura is not a separate entity to Hydro Tasmania and therefore it doesn't generate revenue from Hydro Tasmania work. The competitive neutrality measures applied to Hydro Tasmania are outlined in the answer to Question 2, while 1(a) provides information about the projects Entura has supported internally and externally.

> 6) *Has the Tasmanian Economic Regulator ever assessed Entura for competitive neutrality compliance, and if not, would the shareholder Ministers refer the matter?*

No, the Tasmanian Economic Regulator has never received a competitive neutrality complaint against Entura and has not conducted a competitive neutrality investigation of Entura. Only people who have been adversely affected by a supposed contravention of competitive neutrality principles by a prescribed body can make a competitive neutrality complaint.

The costs incurred by Hydro Tasmania in accordance with the Competitive Neutrality Principles are reviewed through the annual audit of financial statements consistent with all other costs incurred by Hydro Tasmania.

Entura's success rate in tendering indicates that Entura is competing on an even playing field with third parties, sometimes being successful in bids and, at other times, losing to other firms.

Given this and that no specific complaint has been made, there is no need to currently consider referring Hydro Tasmania (as the company) to the Tasmanian Economic Regulator for a review.

> *8) Will the shareholder Ministers commit to a competitive neutrality review of Entura's operating model and report the outcome to Parliament?*

There is no evidence to suggest that Entura needs to be reviewed for compliance with competitive neutrality policy.

Ordered, That Mr *Dugain* have leave to Table answers to Questions provided by Hydro Tasmania and have it incorporated into the Hansard record.

Attachment 1: Answers to Question on Notice, provided by Hydro Tasmania

Note: Entura is the consulting arm of the Hydro Tasmania group and not a separate legal entity.

Question	**Response**
(1) Hydro Tasmania has stated that Entura directs around 60 per cent of its effort to Hydro Tasmania. (d) What share of Entura's revenue, in both percentage and dollar terms, came from Hydro Tasmania and related State entities in each of the last three financial years; (e) Over the same period, what proportion of Hydro Tasmania's contestable engineering, testing and commissioning work was awarded to Entura without an open competitive tender; and (f) What is the policy basis for directing that work to Entura rather than openly tendering it to the Tasmanian market, and absent competitive tension, how is value for money demonstrated?	(a) With the exception of Entura India, Entura is not a separate legal entity or subsidiary; rather it is a business unit within Hydro Tasmania, sharing the same ABN. This is why Entura's effort for Hydro Tasmania is quantified in Hydro Tasmania's annual report in hours and projects, rather than in dollar terms. In FY25: • Hydro Tasmania projects accounted for 66 per cent of Entura's total resource effort. This equates to approximately 186,000 person-hours of specialised technical work, delivered via 262 packages of work, including the ongoing Tarraleah redevelopment and Cethana pumped hydro services. • Entura also supported the delivery of a number of non-Hydro Tasmania water and renewable energy projects with involvement in 137 projects across Tasmania, 165 across the rest of Australia and 52 projects in the Indo-Pacific region. (b) Hydro Tasmania uses internal resources for its work program where possible and therefore work coming from Hydro Tasmania projects is generally given to its employees in first preference where they have appropriate skill, expertise and availability. This includes Entura employees. When Hydro Tasmania needs to source expertise outside Entura it does this in accordance with its procurement procedures which align with Government procurement guidelines. (c) see answer to (b).
(2) When Entura tenders against private firms, how is full cost attribution applied so that no advantage arises from Hydro Tasmania ownership, including cost of capital, tax equivalent payments, guarantees and shared overhead?	As contemplated by the Competitive Neutrality Principles: - Hydro Tasmania is subject to all state taxes and charges including land tax, payroll tax; local government rates and stamp duties as well as income tax and sales tax through the tax equivalent regime. - It also pays government guarantee fees and dividends - Hydro Tasmania is also subject to regulations to which private sector businesses are

	normally subject, such as those relating to the protection of the environment, and planning and approval processes, on an equivalent basis to private sector competitors. As noted above, the Entura business unit provides significant support to Hydro Tasmania's work requirements. Where capacity exists, Hydro Tasmania also takes on work in the external market through the Entura business unit. When doing so Entura's market rates incorporate typical on-costs and profit margins.
(3) (a) Does Entura's external pricing include a competitive neutrality adjustment as contemplated by the national competition policy principles; and (b) if so, how is it calculated, and who verifies it?	(a) see answer to (2). (b) Hydro Tasmania's financial statements report on all its costs and these are reviewed by the auditor general each year as required under the GBE Act and the Audit Act 2008 (Tas).
(4) What is Entura's published operating model, and how does it define the niche it was established to serve versus services already supplied by Tasmanian private firms?	Entura's niche is specialised power and water services, backed by operational and asset management exposure as a key differentiator in the renewables sector. Its focus areas and capabilities are originally derived from the skills and expertise developed through hydro industrialisation and the early development of wind farms. This has evolved as the renewables market and technology have changed. Entura continues to add value to a renewables transition in Tasmania, and targeted external assignments that build on that capability and bring returns. Refer: https://entura.com.au/about/about-us/
(7) Given Marinus Link and the broader transmission pipeline, what steps is Hydro Tasmania taking to maximise contestable participation by Tasmanian private firms rather than directing work to Entura?	As stated in the response to question 1 (b) above, Hydro Tasmania currently optimises the use of its Entura employees to meet its engineering needs, as appropriate to skill levels and capacity and seeks services from third parties where necessary in accordance with its usual procurement procedures. As a significant employer of over 170 Tasmanian smart jobs that have been retained in the State, Entura (Hydro Tasmania) not only adds value to scheduled business-as-usual projects, but to major projects as well as acting as an important risk management insurance for when there are emergency matters. Hydro Tasmania's external procurement activities contributed over $195m into the Tasmanian economy in the 2024-25 financial year.
(9) What share of Entura's revenue comes from clients other than Hydro Tasmania, and what share from interstate and overseas	Entura's work program differs year on year and based on Hydro Tasmania's work program.

	work?	Information about FY25 work activities has been provided in the response to question 1(a).
(10)	(a) Is Entura's national and international commercial expansion within the charter Hydro Tasmania was established under, and have the shareholder Ministers and the Board sanctioned it; and (b) if so, please provide an explanation?	(a) As noted in the Charter, Hydro Tasmania has received approval from the Shareholding Ministers to undertake the provision of consultancy services in respect of electricity, environmental science and engineering services or any other area of expertise as consistent with its functions. Entura provides services in the Indo-Pacific and has maintained relatively stable participation in national and international commercial work over the last 10 years. There have been fluctuations depending on market (GFC, COVID), level of capacity required for Hydro Tasmania and organic changes in FTEs. The Shareholding Ministers and Board are informed about and support Entura's planned activities and approve targets as contemplated by the Ministerial Charter. (b) Entura's work in national and international segments of renewable energy and water markets aims to contribute value back to Tasmania through increased dividends and greater knowledge and expertise among its people.
(11)	What public capital and commercial risk are committed to that interstate and overseas activity, and is Entura's performance reported to Parliament separately from Hydro Tasmania's core results?	Entura's performance is not reported separately beyond what is in the annual report. Entura undertakes an annual capital review and budgets in accordance with Hydro Tasmania's budgeting process, and its risk assessment is reported annually to the Risk Management Committee of the Board. Capital expenditure for equipment, software, and any specialised hardware is recovered through commercial contracts and depreciated/accounted for in accordance with normal accounting procedures. Entura capital expenditure is very limited. Entura India returns profits on a stand-alone basis and has not received any capital from Hydro Tasmania since 2010.

9 PAPERS.— The Clerk of the Council laid upon the Table the following Papers:—

(1) The Tasmanian Government's Progress Against its 2026-27 Fiscal Strategy. Dated 31 July 2026.

(2) Ombudsman Tasmania: Report on inspections under the *Police Powers (Surveillance Devices) Act 2006* and the *Police Powers (Controlled Operations) Act 2006*.

(3) *Legal Profession Act 200*7: Statutory Rules 2026, No. 27, Legal Profession (Solicitors' Conduct) Amendment Rules 2026.

(4) *Nature Conservation Act 2002*: Statutory Rules 2025, No (xx), Proclamation Under the *Nature Conservation Act 2002*.

10 LEAVE TO TABLE DOCUMENT.— *Ordered,* That Ms *Armitage* have leave to Table a document.

11 PROJECT UNIFY.— Ms *Armitage* laid upon the Table additional information in relation to an outstanding response to Estimates Committee B in the Fifty-Second Session of Parliament from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management providing responses to questions asked regarding Project Unify.

12 MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE.— *Ordered,* That Ms *Rattray* have leave to move a Motion without Notice.

13 LEAVE OF ABSENCE.— *Ordered,* That the Honourable Member for Elwick, (Ms *Thomas)* be granted leave of absence from the service of the Council for this day's sitting. (Ms *Rattray)*

14 STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT: JOINT SITTING.— The President said —

"For completeness of the official record I wish to advise the Council that following the Joint Sitting of the Parliament at 10.00 o'clock am this day Vanessa Bleyer has been duly chosen to hold a place in the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia rendered vacant by the resignation of Senator Peter Whish-Wilson.

A copy of the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Joint Sitting will be tabled by the Clerk of the Council when printed."

15 BILL NO. 6.— The Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill 2026 was read the Third time and passed.

16 BILL NO. 6.— A Message to the House of Assembly:—

HONOURABLE SPEAKER,

The Legislative Council has this day agreed, without Amendment, to a Bill intituled, 'A Bill for an Act to amend the *Occupational Licensing Act 2005*, the *Building Act 2016* and the *Residential Building Work Contracts and Dispute Resolution Act 2016*'.

Legislative Council, 20 August 2026 C.M. FARRELL, *President*

17 BILL NO. 59 OF 2025. — The Residential Tenancy Amendment (Safety Modifications) Bill 2025 was read the Third time and passed.

18 BILL NO. 59 OF 2025.— A Message to the House of Assembly:—

HONOURABLE SPEAKER,

The Legislative Council has this day agreed, without Amendment, to a Bill intituled, 'A Bill for an Act to amend the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*'.

Legislative Council, 20 August 2026 C.M. FARRELL, *President*

19 SITTING SUSPENDED.— *Resolved*, That the Sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the Division bells. (Ms *Rattray*)

The Sitting was suspended at 11.34 o'clock p.m. and resumed at 12.49 o'clock p.m.

20 BILL NO. 39 OF 2025.— The Order of the Day was read for the Second reading of the Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill (No. 2) 2025.

A Motion was made (Ms *Rattray*), and the Question was proposed, That the Bill be now read the Second time.

A Debate arose thereupon.

21 SITTING SUSPENDED.— It being 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Sitting of the Council was suspended.

The Council resumed the Sitting at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

22 QUESTION TIME.— The President called for Questions without Notice. There were two Questions asked.

23 BILL NO. 39 OF 2025.— The Council resumed the Debate on the Question, That the Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill (No. 2) 2025 be now read the Second time.

And the Question being put,

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

And the Bill was, accordingly, read the Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole Council.

And the President having left the Chair, the Council resolved itself into the said Committee.

(In the Committee)

Ms *Forrest* in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 7 agreed to.

Question put, That Clause 8 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

AYES 9	NOES 4
Mr *Duigan*	Ms *Armitage*
Mr *Edmunds*	Ms *Forrest*
Ms *Glade-Wright*	Mr *Gaffney* (Teller)
Mr *Hiscutt*	Ms *Webb*
Ms *Lovell* (Teller)	
Ms *O'Connor*	
Ms *Palmer*	
Ms *Rattray*	
Mr *Vincent*	

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

Clauses 9 to 21 agreed to.

Clauses 22 to 24 disagreed to.

Clauses 25 to 37 agreed to.

Title, Amendment made. (Ms *Armitage*)

Leave out "***Integrity Commission Act 2009,***" Title as amended agreed to.

Bill to be reported with Amendments.

The Council being resumed, Ms *Forrest* reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed her to report the same to the Council with Amendments.

Ordered, That the consideration of the Bill as amended in Committee be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow. (Ms *Rattray*)

24 BILL NO. 12.— The Order of the Day was read for the Second reading of the Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026.

A Motion was made (Ms *Rattray*)*,* and the Question was proposed, That the Bill be now read the Second time.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put,

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

And the Bill was, accordingly, read the Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole Council.

And the President having left the Chair, the Council resolved itself into the said Committee.

(In the Committee)

Ms *Forrest* in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 disagreed to.

Clauses 8 to 17 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill to be reported without Amendment.

Title, Amendment made. (Ms *Rattray*)

Leave out "**the Local Government Act 1993,**"

Title as amended agreed to.

The Council being resumed, Ms *Forrest* reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed her to report the same to the Council with Amendments.

Ordered, That the consideration of the Bill as amended in Committee be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow. (Ms *Rattray*)

25 BILL NO. 50 OF 2025.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly has agreed to the Amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled — '*A Bill for an Act to amend the Police Offences Act 1935*'.

House of Assembly, 20 August 2026 *Jacquie Petrusma*, *Speaker*

26 BILL NO. 16.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly has passed a Bill, intituled — 'A Bill for an Act to amend the *Monetary Penalties Enforcement Act 2005*',

to which the House desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

House of Assembly, 20 August 2026 JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

Ordered, That the Second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow. (Ms *Rattray*)

27 ADJOURNMENT.— *Resolved,* That the Council will, at its rising adjourn until 11.00 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, 1 September 2026. (Ms *Rattray*)

Resolved, That the Council do now adjourn. (Ms *Rattray*)

The Council adjourned at 6.09 o'clock p.m.

C.L. VICKERS, *Clerk of the Council*.

Briefings:

- *Charities and Associations Law (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025*
- *Taxation and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026*