

As requested, I am pleased to provide the following answers to the two questions from the Inquiry. I assume that these are the only two questions that the Inquiry is seeking responses to from me.

Question 1. What were the Terms of Reference for the Carapiet Review?

Answer:

The Review was called the Crown Lands Management Review rather than the Carapiet Review.

The Terms of Reference as contained in the Review are outlined on pages viii and ix of the Executive Summary;

"The terms of reference for the Review were to identify and recommend:

key public benefits (social, environmental and economic) derived from Crown land,

the NSW Government's future role in the management and stewardship of Crown land,

the basis of an appropriate return on the Crown estate, including opportunities to enhance revenue,

business, financial and governance structures that enable achievement of desired outcomes within financial and resource constraints,

opportunities for efficiency improvement and cost reduction, consistent with red tape reduction objectives and accountability,

introduction by NSW Government of incentives to enable the Crown Lands Division to manage and develop the Crown estate in line with NSW Government objectives, and

a contemporary legislative framework.

The Review was led by an inter-agency Steering Committee independently chaired by Michael Carapiet.

Only Crown land administered by Crown Lands Division is considered in this Review. National parks, state forests and community lands held by councils are out of scope on the basis that they are special categories of public land managed for specific purposes by other entities."

Question 2. What was the catalyst for the review?

Answer:

I am unaware of the reasons why the Government called for this review as I was not involved in the decision to undertake this review. I believe that it was after the decision was made that I was requested by the then Deputy Premier, the Hon. Andrew Stoner, to independently chair an inter-agency Steering Committee undertaking the review.

However, as outlined on page viii of the Executive Summary, I believed that a review was timely for the following reasons;

"Despite its importance, the estate has not had a major review for more than 25 years. It is now time to take an objective look at how Crown land can be best used.

The Crown Lands Management Review started in June 2012. It aims to improve the management of Crown land and increase the benefits and returns from Crown land to the community. It shows the NSW Government's ongoing commitment to the effective management of the Crown estate."

1. Question from The Hon. CATHERINE CUSACK: Did you look at the performance of the NSW Crown Holiday Parks Trust as a model of managing multiple reserves?

Answer: I do not recollect looking at the performance of the NSW Crown Holidays Parks Trust as a model of managing multiple reserves.

2. Question from The Hon. CATHERINE CUSACK: A common issue of complaint, for example, might be photographers wanting to take photos on a piece of Crown land with beautiful water in the background, whether that be on a beach or in the Domain or wherever. There are different Crown land managers who are going to licence and charge fees to those photographers I guess to make money, they would say, to manage the amount of photographers. I am not quite sure. If that popped up as an issue what is the Government's framework through which we could make sure that was being well and fairly regulated.

Answer: I mentioned to the Inquiry that I do not have a view on this question. On reflection, I do not have a view on this question. Perhaps the Crown Lands Department is best placed to answer this question.

3. Question from The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Pretty much all of your recommendations were reported or supported in principle except for one, which was the recommendation of removing the option to dedicate Crown land in the future. I just want to come to an understanding as to why you made the recommendation in taking that option anyway.

Answer: As outlined in Recommendation 22 on page 34 of the Review

"The Crown Lands Act contains provisions for the dedication of land, in addition to the reservation of land. There is not much practical difference between these two categories of land, other than dedicated land traditionally being regarded as more 'secure' because changing the purpose of or revoking a dedication requires tabling in both houses of Parliament.

There is limited benefit in retaining both categories of land and it is therefore recommended that no further land should be dedicated in the future. It could also be considered what benefits and risks there might be in changing the status of existing dedicated land to reserved land."

To the best of my recollection there was no other reasons.

I trust that there are the only questions on notice.

I trust that these answers are sufficient.

Regards

Michael Carapiet