

Department of Defence – Budget Estimates 2022-23 QON Index

Question Number	Senator	Question number & Broad Topic	Full text	Written/ Spoken	Proof Hansard Page
1	Mirabella, Greg	RAAF Base Point Cook - Senator MIRABELLA	<p>On 2 November 2020 the Point Cook Flying Club Inc. a licensee of the RAAF Base Point Cook, was asked by the Base's property manager, JLL Pty Ltd, to vacate and depart the site no later than Saturday, 30 January 2021. In the letter served to the Point Cook Flying Club, the Base manager stipulated that their licence was ceased as part of the Department of Defence's Base Redevelopment and increased RAAF Operational requirements: despite the base having no operational flying unit assigned to it.</p> <p>Can the Department please provide the rationale as to why the Point Cook Flying Club Inc. can no longer undertake civilian flying operations at RAAF Base Point Cook?</p>	Written	
2	Carr, Kim	Q2 - Land 400 Phase 2 - Senator CARR	<p>1. With respect to the delivery of the Land 400 Phase 2 program by Rheinmetall Defence Australia, please advise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The total value of the contracts awarded to Australian industry. Provide a breakdown by state and territory.. b. The number of contracts awarded to Australian businesses, broken down by state and territory. c. The number of people employed by Rheinmetall to deliver this project, broken down by state and territory (FTE and headcount). d. The number and value of export contracts awarded to Australian companies, broken down by state and territory. e. Have any changes been made to Rheinmetall's AIC Plan since its creation in 2018. <p>2. Please provide a list of all Australian companies that have been contracted by Rheinmetall Defence Australia for delivery of Land 400 Phase 2, broken down by state and territory.</p>	Written	

3	Wong, Penny	Attack Class Contract Cancellation - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: I start with the Attack class and the fiscal consequences of the cancellation of that contract. Can you confirm the total cost, to date, of the cancellation of the Attack class submarine program?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The total cost expended against the Attack class program to date?</p> <p>Senator WONG: That's right.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It's \$2.5 billion as of the end of January.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It's \$2.5 billion as at the end of January?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Let's just be clear. That is \$2.5 billion to the end of January. That is the total expenditure to date?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: To the end of January.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What proportion of that deals with termination costs? Let's not get into the confidentiality bit now, because of your negotiations. But, of the \$2.5 billion in taxpayers' funds expended, how much relates to the cancellation of the contract?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I guess that the way I would put it is that, at the time that the contract was cancelled, we had expended \$2.4 billion, so we've had another \$1 million-\$100 million.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Only in the Defence portfolio would you make that mistake of two decimal points! One hundred million dollars, okay. What is it to date? It's 1 April.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Why?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Because I don't have those figures available with me right now.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Why not?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: We are paying invoices as they come in. We have a transition-out plan that was agreed in February with Naval Group. I will take it on notice. I could probably get it back to you today.</p>	Spoken	4
4	Wong, Penny	Attack Class Transition- Out Plan - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: Can you tell us about the transition-out plan?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The transition-out plan is a requirement under the strategic partnering agreement, and that describes how we will manage-</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm sorry, I've just been distracted by another senator. Could you repeat that answer?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The transition-out plan is described in the strategic partnering agreement as the way we will manage the transition of the contract to its final termination.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can you table those clauses of the SPA, please?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I'll certainly take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	4

5	Wong, Penny	Attack Class Workforce - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: What's been agreed as part of that framework?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It looks at the transition costs, which include paying for the workforce that manages the termination. There are different treatments for a workforce that will be no longer required under the contract and a workforce that will manage the contract to termination, and there are different regimes that apply to how profit is applied to those bits of it. That's described in the transition-out plan.</p> <p>Senator WONG: 'How profit is applied'-</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Indeed.</p> <p>Senator WONG: to the workforce components?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: That is a normal contractual practice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: No, I'm just clarifying.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Alright. So that's one aspect, which is 'workforce not required' and 'workforce to manage', presumably under a particular formula that's been agreed?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Are you able to give me any cost estimate of that component?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It is commercially sensitive.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How many people are we talking about in each of those categories?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The current workforce for Naval Group Australia is sitting at a tad under 90 at the moment. So that's down from 360.</p> <p>Senator WONG: In each of those components-'workforce not required' and 'workforce to manage'.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The transition plan for Naval Group Australia has that workforce. I can take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	5
---	----------------	--	---	--------	---

6	Wong, Penny	Attack Class Break Payment - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: How does the SPA treat that; how does the partnership agreement treat that?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It's silent on that.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It's silent. It's silent on how much the taxpayer would pay if the contract were broken-for the loss of the contract?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It's silent for a termination at this point in the contract; that's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What do you mean by 'at this point in the contract'?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Inside the contract, there were negotiated points at which a break payment would be payable if the contract was terminated at or beyond that point.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When was the first of those?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The first of those was once they passed a preliminary design review milestone.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Had they passed that?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: No.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Why did we not wait for that?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: That would have been in 2023.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Right. But there was an identified compensation sum at that point?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: At that point.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Of what?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Again, I think we have not put the actual payment figures into the public domain yet because they were commercially sensitive.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But that's not for negotiation.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: No.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm asking you what the contract said about what would be paid out as at that milestone not being reached.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Can I take that on notice?</p>	Spoken	5-Jun
---	----------------	---	--	--------	-------

7	Patrick, Rex	Money Spent on FSP since 2009 - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Does that number of \$2.918 billion include the cost of work done from 2009, when the Future Submarine Project was first announced in the Defence white paper? For example, in 2012, \$214 million was allocated to the Future Submarine Project for de-risking, research and so forth.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: No, it does not include that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So this really just covers it from the contract with Naval Group?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Correct.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can I ask you to take on notice how much money has been spent on the Future Submarine Program since it entered into the Defence white paper in 2009?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: We'll take it on notice. I'm not sure. We'll take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I've just given you one example: in 2012, \$214 million was allocated. Along the way, there would have been other allocations. I just want to understand how much has been spent on the general activity of a future submarine, since it was announced in the 2009 Defence white paper; thank you. Thank you, Senator Wong.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Senator, if it helps, I do have a split to the end of February of the \$2.526 billion life-to-date expenditure. I do have that split by financial year, if you wish.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So, actually going back, from 2009 to 2016, money was spent on the Future Submarine Project.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes, I think technically, but I would have to confirm that. But I think that was tracked as a separate project before it became the SEA 1000.</p> <p>CHAIR:...Senator Patrick asked a question on notice, I understand, of Defence. This is what he sent me: what is the total cost of the future submarine, to date, from 2009 when the program was announced in the white paper? Senator Patrick has requested you provide a breakdown of whatever the total cost is—for example, studies, research and development, de-risking, competitive evaluation project, Attack-class program, AUKUS activities et cetera. He'd like a breakdown of that.</p>	Spoken	13
8	Patrick, Rex	Super Hornet Cost of Repair - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay, thank you. This goes to the Super Hornet ejection at RAAF Amberley in December 2020. Previously CAF had advised that indications were the aircraft was repairable, though some further investigation was required. Has a decision been made in relation to that aircraft?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: I'll just get the right brief out. What I can say on the repair effort is that we've examined that aircraft. I might ask CASG to provide some additional details, but repair efforts have been completed and that aircraft completed a successful return-to-service flight on 6 December last year.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: And the cost of that repair?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: I might ask my CASG colleague.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Apologies, could you repeat the question, please?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: The cost of getting back into service the aircraft subject to the ejection at RAAF</p>	Spoken	22

			<p>Amberley. Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: We will take that on notice and get back to you.</p>		
9	Patrick, Rex	Super Hornet Investigation - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: There was an investigation into that. Has that concluded? If so what were the key findings? Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: Senator, the investigation was completed on 7 July 2021. The report made six recommendations. It noted that two safety actions were already underway. It related mainly to abort guidance, so when to make the decision to not proceed, aircrew resource management and conformance with standing instructions that support compliance against our regulations. As a result of that safety event, there was significant activity by our air combat group that operate the aircraft to address the primary causal factors that led to the runway excursion. I will leave it at that. Senator PATRICK: Can I just ask: if I understand what you have just said, are you suggesting the pilot may be shouldn't have ejected, that they were following some rule that has now been changed? Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: No, I think we made some of the guidance clearer for the crews to operate the aircraft. Senator PATRICK: Can you table that report on notice, please? Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: Senator, it is classified official sensitive. There are some things in the report about the aircraft and its operation that would make it difficult for public release. Senator PATRICK: Well, maybe a redacted version of it, please. CHAIR: It has been taken on notice, and consideration will be given. Senator Payne: We will see what we can provide, Senator.</p>	Spoken	22/23

10	Patrick, Rex	Growler Lost in Nevada - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. I, like you, don't want to be revealing secret information. In relation to the Growler that was lost in Nevada, CAF had advised in November 2019 that the Growler was worth approximately \$85 million. That is what he testified or provided as an answer to this committee. On 30 September the Defence Security Cooperation Agency in the US indicated that an aircraft would be made available to Australia out of lot 38 for US\$125 million, approximately \$160 million. Are we taking up that offer, and why the cost differential?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: I might ask my CASG colleague to talk about the acquisition, Senator.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Thank you. Yes, their government has agreed to replace the lost aircraft, and that approval was on 28 February 2022, so this year. We do have a letter of offer and acceptance with us that we are considering, but the figures you quoted are correct. They would be a not-to-exceed figure, as we understand it, and we will work out those costs as the US government puts that on contract.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So what are the differences between CAF's estimate to this committee on 29 November 2019 of \$85 million and the US number of approximately AU\$160 million?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Meredith: I suspect CAF in 2019 was just referring to the cost of the aircraft at that time. What we are talking about here is replacement of an aircraft several years downstream, so the replacement aircraft will require a configuration change to make sure it is up to speed with our current baseline of aircraft and consistent with the baseline that Australia is operating. It will include flight test activities to complete all of that work, so I think there is a difference between what may have been quoted back in 2019 and the actual acquisition process we are moving through at this stage.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: You said you suspect. Could you take on notice to provide just some further explanation of that. That would be appreciated. I have just one more for CASG. I had a conversation with Mr Fraser about moving forward, because we basically lost an aircraft that had 120 hours on it and had no recourse for cost recovery or warranty. Mr Fraser, who is now coming to the table, did indicate that he was going to look at this moving forward. I would just ask what you have resolved in respect of the Apache helicopter purchase and the additional Romeo purchase.</p>	Spoken	23
----	--------------	--	--	--------	----

11	Patrick, Rex	Romeo Helicopter Crash in Philippines - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you, that is all I would like to know on that. Chief of Navy, on the loss of a Romeo helicopter off the Philippines?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Yes, Senator Patrick. Good morning. With respect to the loss of that particular aircraft last year we have sought advice from the US in terms of the production run of the Romeos. And I have sought to provide advice to government with respect to replacing that aircraft while the production run of the Romeos is still available to us.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Why did the crew ditch?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: There is an ongoing investigation in terms of the factors surrounding the loss of that aircraft, as I described at the last senate estimates. But I am satisfied that it was not as a result of mechanical failure of the aircraft, Senator.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay, because the airframe is sitting on the bottom of the ocean, isn't it?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: It's under about 6,500 metres of water in the Philippine Sea, Senator.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So you are not intending to recover that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: No, it is not possible.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: How old was this airframe in terms of flying hours?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I would have to take that on notice, Senator, in terms of flying hours. The airframe itself would have been three to four years old.</p>	Spoken	23/24
12	Ayres, Tim	MRH-90 Sustainment Cost - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: Thank you. I'd like to ask some questions about MRH-90 helicopters now. Thanks, Ms Lutz. There was a report in The Australian on 10 December that government had decided to replace the Army's and the Navy's 47 MRH-90s with Black Hawk and Seahawk helicopters. How much has the government spent so far on acquiring the 47 MRH-90 helicopters?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: I will refer you to the portfolio budget statements 2022-23, if that suits you. The cost of the MRH-90, estimated to 30 June this year, is 3.522 billion.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: That's 3.522 billion, and another 116 million forecast for 2022-23.</p> <p>Mr Fraser: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Can you tell me how much has been spent on sustainment?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: I'll take that on notice. We'll get that for you today; I just don't have that figure sitting in front of me at the moment.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Is it possible to get that this morning?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: We'll seek to do so.</p>	Spoken	26

13	Wong, Penny	Knowledge of Port of Darwin Review Finalisation - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: I'm going to move to port of Darwin now. Are you the person to whom I should address questions, Ms Perkins?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I can certainly try.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Over the Christmas break it was dropped out-and I don't think there was a formal press release-or it was given to the media that the Department of Defence review had found no national security grounds to recommend the overturning of a 99-year lease. Was this made public by any formal announcement, or simply by information being provided to the media?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: To the specifics of that review and consideration, my colleague Peter Tesch will be better aligned. I'm certainly able to talk to you about our infrastructure needs in Darwin.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm going to come to that. I'm just wanting to understand whether the government has actually fronted up and made public, out of any formal government communication, the fact that your review found no national security grounds, or whether it was simply provided to the media in order for them to write it without sourcing. Can someone tell me what happened?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: The review is an ongoing process. I am not aware of a formal statement by government at any point. I'm aware of the article to which you refer, of course.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It wasn't just one article. It was clearly a widespread briefing of the media. Did Defence have any knowledge that this would be briefed to the media before it appeared publicly?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: I was not privy to any discussions about media briefing.</p> <p>Senator WONG: That wasn't my question.</p> <p>Mr Tesch: To the best of my knowledge, no.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Were you CDF?</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: No.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Was Mr Moriarty?</p> <p>Senator Payne: We'll take that on notice in relation to the secretary.</p>	Spoken	29
----	----------------	--	---	--------	----

14	Ayes, Tim	ASPI New CEO - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: I want to ask some questions about the recent announcement of a new CEO of the Australian Strategic Policy Institute. I note that Minister Dutton made this announcement on 29 March. General Campbell, did Defence have any input into the appointment?</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: I think it's best to refer to Dr Sawczak with regard to Defence's engagement.</p> <p>Dr Sawczak: The question related to Defence input in relation to the appointment of the new executive director of ASPI: Defence didn't provide any advice in relation to candidates for this position.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Thank you. Did the minister make this appointment, Minister?</p> <p>Senator Payne: The cabinet did.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I think the ASPI constitution says that the directors of the company, in consultation with the minister, may appoint a person to the office of chief executive officer of the company. You say that the cabinet, effectively the minister, made the decision: is that your evidence?</p> <p>Senator Payne: It was a decision of government, approved by the cabinet.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Was it a decision of the ASPI board?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I don't have further detail than that. I can take any further questions you have in relation to the seating process on notice.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: What I want to know is if the eventual candidate who was successful was the preferred candidate of the directors of the board of ASPI.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It wasn't. You know that.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Actually, I have been extremely careful not to be engaged in this process for obvious reasons.</p>	Spoken	38
15	Ayes, Tim	Communication between ASPI and Minister of Defence - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: I just want to know, just to be absolutely clear: within your knowledge of what's occurred here, are you saying that you have no knowledge of whether or not the ASPI board provided the minister with a preferred candidate in the process? I've heard what you've said about suitable candidates and I've heard what you've said about the operation of the ASPI constitution. But I want you to reflect on what my question was, and answer it if you can.</p> <p>Dr Sawczak: I can take on notice the communication between ASPI and the minister and any involvement that Defence might have had in relation to that. I can't recall what ASPI's preferences might or might not have been and certainly I'm not in a position to speak on behalf of ASPI in relation to its preferences.</p>	Spoken	39

16	Wong, Penny	Letter to be Tabled - Senator WONG	<p>Dr Sawczak: I have seen a communication from ASPI to the minister. Defence forwarded that communication to the minister in order to prepare for processes related to appointment. I can't recall-</p> <p>Senator WONG: Really?</p> <p>Dr Sawczak: whether the preferred candidate was indicated in that letter. I do recall that Mr Bassi was among the suitable candidates. In terms of going into detail about ASPI's preferences that might or might not have been indicated in that letter, I think that's a matter for ASPI rather than for me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: No it's not, actually. And you don't get to choose that, with respect.</p> <p>Senator Payne: The official has now answered your question.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So can I ask that the letter be tabled, please?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You've seen the letter. He's now given evidence. It's government-</p> <p>Senator Payne: I'll take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It's a Department of Defence document. He has possession of it. He can't simply say-</p> <p>Senator Payne: It's an ASPI document, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It has been provided to the Department of Defence. It's within their possession. With respect, the official can't avoid provision of that simply because he says it's someone else's view. I'd like a copy of the letter tabled.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I've said I'll take it on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: That has been taken on notice and it is now well and truly past-</p> <p>Senator WONG: Thank you.</p>	Spoken	40
----	----------------	---------------------------------------	--	--------	----

17	Steele-John, Jordon	Historical Examples of Designated Anchorages - Senator STEEL-JOHN	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: At my last estimates session I had a couple of exchanges with Vice Admiral Noonan in relation to contingency planning for incidents of various types involving nuclear powered submarines at HMAS Stirling in Western Australia. The defence department have provided me some answers on notice-they are for your reference from number 15-and I've got some subsequent questions that may go to the vice admiral or that may go to the department. Vice Admiral Noonan, in response to question No. 15, you said that, in the event of an incident that required the venting of reactor material, part of the management of that incident may require the removal of the vessel to something described as the 'designated remote anchorage'. Could you tell me the exact location of the designated remote anchorage?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: The designated remote anchorage would be an anchorage that we would designate and construct particularly for the vessel when it arrived. It's not a point in space right now. For a different sort of vessel-if it was a submarine, for example, or if it was an aircraft carrier-the particular location would change based on the actual vessel when it arrived. That plan is derived as part of the visit plan for the vessel. I could probably come back to you on notice with some historical examples of designated anchorages for specific visits, if that would be of some use to you.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes, that would be. Could you tell me, particularly, for October 29-the visit of the last British nuclear submarine-which area was designated at that time as the remote anchorage location for that vessel. Any other historical examples would be useful. Do you have any of that information now? I'm aware that we're about to go into the election period and so questions on notice will take a while to get back.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I don't have that particular geographic information available now. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Okay. In relation to the criteria for what amounts to a designated remote anchorage location, could you give me any information about what kinds of considerations go into the identification of such a location?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: The sorts of considerations that we would take into account would be water depth; proximity to shipping lanes; proximity to populated areas; proximity to marine or national park areas; proximity to emergency services and medical services; and probably proximity to flight regions, so that we could get stores to and from a vessel that was in that anchorage.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Thank you very much for that. If you could provide that on notice, that would be really useful. I suspect I'll come back to the next estimates session and ask the same question again. I would also like to go to an announcement in the budget of some \$10 billion for infrastructure in relation to submarine bases and submarine infrastructure. That's probably not for you, Vice Admiral Noonan, but what I would like to know is a bit more about how that money is intended to be spent and specifically what projects it is to be spent on-a little bit more clarification around the intention for the expenditure of those funds.</p>	Spoken	42
----	---------------------	---	--	--------	----

18	Wong, Penny	JASSM-ER letter of request - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: Presumably with the JASSM-ER, if we're acquiring in 2024, we would actually be getting the capability the following year-do I assume that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: For which weapon?</p> <p>Senator WONG: The other one: JASSM-ER. If you acquire in 2024, when are we able to utilise the capability? That's the time frame the vice admiral talked about in terms of the naval missiles you acquire but it takes a while to be able to do it, as it were.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: Because we're accelerating that, we're still working through some of that, and, dependent on the US interactions and some work with congressional approvals and integrating it into the Super Hornet spiral upgrade program, which we need to align that with-we're still refining that, but it would be in that kind of similar time frame.</p> <p>Senator WONG: One year later-2025, would that be about right?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: That would be about right. But we're still refining it.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Is congressional approval required for this one?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When is the government proposing to seek that approval?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: Now that we have the approval we'll submit the LOR to seek that approval and build the FMS case.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You should expand those acronyms for the mere mortals around us.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: 'Letter of request' to build a 'foreign military sales' case-</p> <p>Senator WONG: Thank you very much.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: part of the process of which would be, for this weapon, acquiring a congressional approval.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Do you have some indicative time frame about when we're going to seek that approval and when you would anticipate a response?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: We would be submitting our letter of request now.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Has it been done?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: I'd have to come back to you on that. We're talking in virtual real time.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Time frames around approval?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: That would be a function of the US government.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sure, but I assume we have some indication of how long that might take.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: It will depend on the sensitivities of the US system.</p>	Spoken	6
----	----------------	---	---	--------	---

20	Ayres, Tim	SkyGuardian Cancellation Public Announcement - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: Why wasn't there an announcement about the SkyGuardian cancellation?</p> <p>Senator Duniam: Why wasn't there a public announcement?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: A lot of other things are announced and many of them not delivered, but why was there no announcement of this cancellation? We had to wait for Mr Yannopoulos to tell us last week.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: I'll take some advice on exactly what the reasoning was behind any decision related to that. Obviously, a lot of public commentary, including comments from the minister and others, has been made around that. It's all on the public record, but I'll seek specific answers.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: But it wasn't on the public record.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: It is now. I'll seek an answer to your question directly.</p>	Spoken	10
21	Patrick, Rex	APS Dismissal Process - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator Duniam: In general terms, appointments of that nature are made by the Prime Minister, and I suspect, therefore, that decisions about terminating a contract would be made by the same person.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: To go a little bit lower: does a minister or even the Prime Minister have the ability to say: 'I'm not happy with that EL3. I'm not happy with that EL2. I'm not happy with that EL1. They have to go'? Is that something that a minister can do?</p> <p>Senator Duniam: I'd have to take that on notice, but I don't—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: It worries me that you don't know that.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: [Inaudible]</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Well, he's the assistant minister. Okay, I'll look to the secretary. What are the rules around a minister, unhappy with a public servant, and their ability under our Public Service Act arrangements and employment arrangements for them to come to you and say, 'You need to get rid of this guy or this girl'?</p>	Spoken	20/21

22	Ayres, Tim	Decision of Capability Announcements - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: Mr Yannopoulos, I listened carefully to what you said to Senator Wong, and it seems to me that what the public can now expect is a set of political announcements of capability decisions that have been taken but not yet announced. You were careful, I think, and straightforward, thank you, in terms of your response-that is, defence and national security questions arise, or capability decisions that are taken during a caretaker period, and the position you've been asked to advance is that the opposition would be briefed. I think it was clear from your answer that there are a series of capability decisions that have been taken but not yet announced and, as Mr Sheridan says, you can't protect the country with announcements, but there are announcements to come. That's right, isn't it?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I don't know. I wouldn't characterise it as a series, but-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Well, can you tell me how many?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I don't know.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But there are.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I don't know whether the government will make further announcements.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How many capability decisions have been taken?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Are we talking one, two or 20?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I'd need to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Well that just means you don't give it to me before the election.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: To add to my earlier answer, the opposition can seek a briefing from us through the Minister for Defence. We're in the PECO period now, the pre-election consultation, so that remains an option for you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can you give the answer before the end of the day? Surely that's a simple thing to do.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: There are lots of decisions that are taken by government that don't get announced because they're classified capabilities or the like, so I don't have-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: That's not the reason that SkyGuardian wasn't announced though, was it? That wasn't announced because the government was embarrassed about it.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: It's a conflict, obviously.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Senator Patrick's question is a sensible one. Yes, there are details and classified issues; however they would not be the subject of announcements during an election campaign normally in any case.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: He's taken it on notice, with the best endeavours, to provide whatever information can be provided today.</p>	Spoken	22
----	------------	--	---	--------	----

23	Wong, Penny	Caretaker Convention - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: Mr Yannopoulos, I want to go back to capability decisions awaiting announcement on the eve of an election. You gave a good estimates answer, which was that there are lots of decisions governments don't announce. But you're an experienced officer and you would know there are certain capabilities which governments will announce, typically. I want to know how many capability decisions are awaiting announcement.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I answered that earlier. I will take it on notice and do my best to get an answer today.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Thank you. If there are secret capability decisions this government is holding off for an election campaign, I think the public have a right to know.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: Understood.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You've referenced-is it 'PECO'?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: Pre-election consultation.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes. And then obviously there are caretaker briefings. I'm going to ask you this publicly. Are you prepared to ensure the opposition, as the alternative government, is briefed about decisions which have been taken?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I will need to seek some advice from Prime Minister and Cabinet in terms of how I'm interpreting the caretaker conventions. My understanding is that we can brief on processes of government.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sure, which we could ask: which capability decisions have been determined by the national security of cabinet and not yet announced?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: Yes. I need to take some advice.</p>	Spoken	23
----	----------------	--	--	--------	----

24	Ayres, Tim	JSF Sustainment Cost Projection Date - Senator AYRES	<p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Senator, would you like me to continue?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes, please.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: So, as at the end of last financial year, we had a current sustainment budget that was approved of \$1.613 billion, and that related to sustainment all the way through to 2024-25.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: That's a three-year-</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Four years.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Four years, thank you.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Correct. I'm adding them up too!</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So that's four years. As was pointed out, the size of the fleet is expanding, but that's more than a doubling of sustainment costs over the forwards.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Yes. I can give you a sense of those numbers. In the last financial year, FY 2020-21, we started with 22 aircraft. We have grown that to 37 aircraft. By the end of this financial year, we expect to be at 54 aircraft. Again, you would appreciate that, as we increase our fleet, we have a commensurate increase in our sustainment costs for those aircraft.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And, at the end of 2022-23, 72 aircraft?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: December 2023.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I know that doesn't sit with the financial years, but at the end of 2023, 72 aircraft?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: Correct.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And, presumably, at the end of the financial year, a little bit short of that. What's the 2021-22 budgeted sustainment costs?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: The 2021-22 budget sustainment cost is \$314 million. That's our expected expenditure.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And 2022-23?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: I have \$328 million.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: What happens after that?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: As we move from 54 aircraft, we increase that sustainment cost. We also have-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: But the number of aircraft is not the only variable, is it? There will be maintenance cycles and-</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So you will have a clear idea for 2023-24 and 2024-25?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: We have an estimate out to 2024-25-that's correct-which we will continue to revise.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Is that as far as the estimate goes?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: We do have a figure that was appropriated in December last year. Another seven years was appropriated. I'd have to take a question on notice as to that figure. I don't have that</p>	Spoken	28
----	------------	--	--	--------	----

at hand at the moment.

Senator AYRES: So in December 2021-

Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: There was a further government agreement for the next seven years.

Senator AYRES: And that was seven years from 2021-22 or seven years from 2022-23?

Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: I expect it is from 2024-25 onwards.

Senator AYRES: So that would take you through to 2031. Is that right?

Air Vice-Marshal Phillips: If you are talking about roughly, you're roughly right. I'd have to take a question

on notice if you want more specific dates.

25	Ayes, Tim	LRASM Fitting Date - Senator AYRES	<p>Senator AYRES: I have a question about the long-range air-to-surface missile. Have I got that right? I think people have been referring to it as the 'LRASM'-do people really say that?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: There is the LRASM, which is the long-range anti-ship missile, Senator, as distinct from the JASSM.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Of course! When will they be fitted to the F35s?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: The LRASM?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: Senator, it's still being negotiated as part of the road map for F35, but we are talking in the vicinity of 2027.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Was that 2027?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Denney: That's correct. But I'll take that on notice and confirm the number with you, Senator.</p>	Spoken	29
26	Wong, Penny	Date of AUKUS - Senator WONG	<p>Senator WONG: Can somebody explain to me the national shipbuilding plan revision or update? When was AUKUS. It's been with government six months?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: Yes. AUKUS is seven months.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Therefore, it's been with the minister for at least six months?</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I'm not sure I heard Mr Dalton's evidence clearly. I thought it went up late last year. Tony, do you remember the actual month? Have you got that detail?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: It was late last year. I think it was [inaudible].</p> <p>Senator WONG: Perhaps after lunch you can come back with the date. I asked some questions in relation to the Henderson announcement and Captain Cook Graving Dock. Why is it called a 'graving dock'? Is 'graving' a technical term that I'm not aware of?</p>	Spoken	32

27	Rice, Janet	Repatriation of Australian women and children held in al-Hol or al-Roj refugee camps - Senator RICE	<p>Senator RICE: I want to ask about operations in the Middle East. I'll start off by asking whether a joint special operations advisory group or task group that involves Australian advisers, alongside other governments, and that focuses on counterterrorism operations and strategy in the Middle East is currently operating or was previously operating.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: I'll just check I'm clear on your question. We do have people deployed in the Middle East on supporting counterterrorism activities, yes.</p> <p>Senator RICE: And is it structured as an advisory group or a task group?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: They are structured as a task force but the purpose of them is supporting other Australian government agencies to ensure we understand what's occurring in the Middle East in terms of its relevance back into our region.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you give me a bit more detail about its purpose, its membership and its scope?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: Not substantively, Senator. Its purpose is as I described it-that is, it's there to assist particularly the lead Australian government agencies for counterterrorism with the provision of information.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Which are they, then? Can you outline which agencies they are assisting.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: We assist the Department of Home Affairs, the Australian Federal Police and the other national intelligence collection agencies, using our ability to work with other military partners in the region to gain access to information. So it's an information collection purpose. There are no Australian Defence Force people conducting military operations in the region. They are there as part of an information collection activity.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me how many people are involved in those activities?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: It is less than 50.</p> <p>Senator RICE: They're advising Australian agencies-our lead agencies. Are they advising any foreign entities?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: Our information is provided back into the Australian lead agencies. They might share that with others, but that's within their authorities rather than coming up through the military information flow.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So there's no direct flow of information from these defence people working with other foreign entities?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: They are working in an environment where other nations are present, but information that we collect is brought back into our system.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Are they working in a fairly ad hoc, flexible way, or are there specific terms of reference for this group of people?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: Like all of military deployed people, they have a very clear set of instructions that provide a direction on what they can and can't do.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Has the Australian government sought advice from this group of people? I mean, is it</p>	Spoken	38/39
----	-------------	---	--	--------	-------

fair enough to call them an advisory group or a task force?

Vice Adm. Johnston: A 'task force', Senator.

Senator RICE: Has the Australian government sought advice from this task force about how it might repatriate Australian women and children who are currently held in the al-Hol or al-Roj refugee camps?

Vice Adm. Johnston: To my knowledge, no, because that's not their purpose-that is, of the military presence there. The Australian government may have sought advice from others. But no, not my knowledge-from the people we have there conducting this information collection.

Senator RICE: Would you be able to take on notice whether somebody else might know whether that has occurred?

Vice Adm. Johnston: Specifically in terms of the military people who are deployed?

Senator RICE: Yes, in terms of the people who are involved in that task force.

Vice Adm. Johnston: We can take that on notice.

Senator RICE: Yes-whether they have information or advice that's been sought from them. I now want to go to the Global Coalition against Daesh. Since the inception of the Global Coalition against Daesh, has the Australian government sought advice from the global coalition about how it might repatriate Australian women and children held in al-Hol or Roj?

Vice Adm. Johnston: To my knowledge, no, but I will also take that on notice to make sure we answer that fully.

28	Rice, Janet	Financial Expenditure from Work in Syria - Senator RICE	<p>Senator RICE: Okay. Is there any funding provided by the Australian government to the Syrian defence force?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: The answer to that is no.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How about to the provincial regional internal security forces?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: No, Senator. We don't have any formal or informal funding relationship with any entity in Syria, whether it be the Syrian government or Syrian opposition forces.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Would you be able to provide on notice our financial expenditure on the things we are doing on operational defence activities-training, logistics, planning, support and equipment overseas-arising from our work in Syria either as part of the global coalition or the coalition to defeat Daesh?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: We can provide that on notice. We don't have any formal funding arrangement out of the defence corporation budget, which my division manages, that has anything to do with Syria. We are, of course, engaged in the global coalition to defeat Daesh, but I'll come back to you if there are any specific funding relationships in that context.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If there is funding in those contexts back to, say, about 2014-15, or something like that, that would be great. Thank you. Thanks, Chair.</p>	Spoken	40
29	Patrick, Rex	Leonardo Contract value for OPV - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you very much. I've got some questions about the Arafura OPV program that might require CASG and the Chief of Navy. They relate to the gun on board the OPV. My understanding is that that program was cancelled in June 2021. Is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: The gun subcontract was cancelled in June 2021.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Were there technical certification concerns about the gun, or was there some other reason, such as a lack of compatibility with the calibre that the Navy normally uses? What was the reason for that?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: There were COVID delays and then there were certification issues. This was a new gun, and we were going to be the parent navy, and this would have been the first time it would have been certified globally.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I think Brunei had these vessels, didn't they? Is that right?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes. Royal Brunei have the offshore patrol vessels. They use the Bofors 57-millimetre gun.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So why was there a change in this contract from what was off the shelf?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Luerssen assessed that this gun wouldn't meet the requirements of the offshore patrol vessel, and they selected the Leonardo gun.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What was the value of the contract to Leonardo, who I think are the gun producer?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I believe it was \$41 million, but I'll confirm that.</p>	Spoken	40/41

30	Patrick, Rex	Interim guns for the OPVs - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: It's still, in my view-if someone asked the question, is there an issue associated with the gun-</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Well, I don't believe the question asked was whether there were issues associated with the gun. It was interface issues and integration issues associated with testing with the weapon systems, and there was not.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Basically the answer to any journalist watching is, don't ask narrow questions! Has a new gun been selected?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: No. We're going out for an RFT for that gun in the next month or so.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: When are you likely to fit it to an OPV? We've got one at-</p> <p>Ms Lutz: No, in the interim we are using guns from the Armidale class. They are the Typhoon Mod 0, I think-I'd need to confirm that-and they will be fitted on the OPVs until the replacement gun is available, and that will be a common gun across all the Offshore Patrol Vessels and the variant Offshore Patrol Vessels being built under SEA 1905.</p>	Spoken	41/42
31	Patrick, Rex	Date of the OPV4 - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: in time for sea trials that it will have the Typhoon on board. Going back to the longer-term solution, when will the task of selecting and then integrating that new gun to the OPV-it will go on a first hull, which might be build 4, 5, or something like that-and which hull will it go on first?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: It's planned for the fourth OPV.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: And then you'll have to retrofit the first three on completion. What's the date of OPV4?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Good question. I don't know if I have that here with me.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What's the drumbeat on these things?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Delivered roughly every nine months, so it would be late 2024.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I'm glad you are doing maths under pressure and not me!</p> <p>Ms Lutz: My maths could be wrong.</p>	Spoken	42

32	Patrick, Rex	Certification Status for Fast Rescue Boats - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: Switching to the boats on the Arafura, what's the status of the fast rescue boats and rigid inflatable craft for the Arafura? Have they been delivered in accordance with the contracted schedule?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: The boats for the first ship have been delivered and have gone through initial testing.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Were they delivered within schedule?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Have there been any compliance issues with those boats?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: None that I'm aware of, but I'll have to get back to you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: More specifically, have the boats met the NSCV SOLAS requirements?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: That is the requirement that they need to meet, and I will confirm for you that they've met that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: But your view is that they had been certified?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: They've been through initial testing. I don't know if the certification is complete yet.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: In a previous answer you said that DMV would end up approving that.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I need to confirm, because I know they did trials and they've just completed trials. But I need to confirm whether that was all the certification and that everything has been done for that, or not.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: If it has been certified, can you provide the date on which it was and the certificate from DMV, please?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: If it's not, when will it be projected to be certified? If you wouldn't mind taking those on notice.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p>	Spoken	42/43
33	Patrick, Rex	Manufacturing country of Spike Missiles - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: I have a question for the land division. Which missiles are going onto the Boxer? Is it the Spike? I think it is. I then have some questions on hypersonic weapons.</p> <p>Major Gen. Blain: Apologies, I missed the question.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Which missiles is Defence putting on the Boxer?</p> <p>Major Gen. Blain: It's the Spike.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Will it be made in Australia?</p> <p>Major Gen. Blain: It's manufactured by Rafael. We'll take on notice where it's actually manufactured, and I'll come back to you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: If not, what is the AIC component of that, if possible?</p> <p>Major Gen. Blain: I'll get that for you as well.</p>	Spoken	43

34	Fawcett, David	Tripartite Program - Senator FAWCETT	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Just on the same line of questioning, the US across each of their services has about six or seven lines of effort around hypersonic weapons, spanning a range of propulsion technologies. SCIFire is specifically air-breathing scram jets. The announcement today-I haven't seen the detail that it goes to on this-is it a tripartite effort to develop, going from TRL 2 or 3 to production of air-breathing hypersonic weapons, or is this new agreement broader, matching the potential range of propulsion technologies that the US are considering?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: The announcement, as I have seen it, is not that specific. It says the tripartite countries will work together on hypersonic and counter-hypersonic technologies. I think it encompasses all of what you have described, not excluding any of it.</p> <p>Dr Sawczak: I might just add to VCF's remarks. He is absolutely right in terms of this being at the very early R&D stage. The AUKUS partnership agreed to establish an additional working group to look at hypersonics and counter-hypersonics, in addition to the four capabilities that were outlined in the leaders' statement back in September. That's a recognition of there being scope and relevance for initiatives to be developed, specific proposals to be developed, at a trilateral level in this area. But it's still at a very early stage. That work is ongoing and will be elaborated further over coming months. But that is obviously not something that gets in the way of the very extensive bilateral cooperation we have under way with SCIFire with the US.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: It seems logical to me that if our depth of expertise through the previous program of high shot et cetera, if that expertise is in air-breathing weapons, to build on that and seek to commercialise or productionise something, as opposed to launching into fields of expertise where others may be well ahead of us and we don't have a huge amount to contribute. Could you perhaps take that on notice? I would be interested to get some feedback as to where that tripartite program is focused and whether that will include some of the programs-for example, BAE Systems are already coming forward and saying that they have expertise through work in the UK in hypersonics that they want to bring to Australia. Some more clarity around that would be useful.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: We will do so. The strength of AUKUS is that it brings the benefits of each of the three countries and their technology base lines, instead of competing against each other or seeking to duplicate. Whether it's scram jet or other technologies, we actually harness the strengths of each of them to accelerate the delivery of capability for us.</p>	Spoken	44
35	Patrick, Rex	List of Entities for Contracted Services - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: What contractors are you using? We know you have some ASC people, which I would expect, noting their expertise in submarines.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: Yes, that is correct. There are some folk from ASC. There are other contractors that we have used above the line, who are experts with a strong nuclear background. Some of them are from the United States and the United Kingdom. There are also people from here in Australia. Again, that relatively small number of contractors are principally subject matter experts with an industry type background or nuclear and industry type background.</p>	Spoken	46

			<p>Senator PATRICK: From those, can you provide a list of the entities from where you are getting contracted services?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: I will take that on notice and get back to you on the breakdown.</p>		
36	Patrick, Rex	Commodore Brown - Senator PATRICK	<p>Senator PATRICK: What is the mix of people there? Obviously there are submariners like yourself. Are there commercial people? Do you take ANSTO and ARPANSA people? What's the mix?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: Depending on the task, the mix is folk from a number of those departments. In the capability area, for example, we have commercial people, we have submarine capability experts, engineers-civilian and military-and some industry people. When we do the stewardship round of visits in the next month, we will have an ARPANSA rep. We've had ANSTO reps as well, so all of those folk. Depending on the focus of the visit, we will use various members of the task force, bearing in mind that we're an integrated team, as Admiral Meade said earlier. We have embeds from ARPANSA, ANSTO, ARWA, the waste guys. All of these people are being a part of the overseas visits.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Have you engaged former Commodore Brown? He's a submariner and an engineer?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: I know Commodore Brown (Retired) is working for the secretary. We are conducting initial work with Commodore Brown through that engagement.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So he's outside the team but providing effectively advice separately to the secretary. Is that right?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: He is not working for the task force but he is working with the task force on some aspects.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I will put that to the secretary.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: I will need to take it on notice. I'm not aware of the former officer or the role.</p>	Spoken	46/47

37	Patrick, Rex	Budget Allocation - Senator PATRICK	<p>Mr Casson: If I may, on your question about the budget: \$300 million has been allocated to the task force over this year and the 2022-23 financial year.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Is that-</p> <p>Mr Casson: That's in total over both years-120 this year, 180 next year.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So why is the task force continuing? Maybe I will go back to Admiral Buckley. My understanding was that the task force was initiated to get to the point of delivery of a report. It sounds like there is additional activity planned for next financial year after you've delivered the report.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Buckley: My expectation for the task force as it stands is we will complete our work at the end of the consultation period. Clearly, after that there will be a need to deliver whatever comes from that program, so work is no doubt underway in the department to think about how that will happen. For the task force remit, the completion of our work is essentially on 31 March.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: That was clear. To go back to the CFO: what is that additional money being provisioned for in in the context that the task force will complete its work in March?</p> <p>Mr Casson: I would have to take that on notice. I don't have the detail. I know some of the unknowns that we were dealing with in there were contributions to both the US and the UK systems, making contributions for their effort into the program as well, but I don't have the detail and breakdown.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So we're paying for their contribution in a trilateral program?</p> <p>Mr Casson: There are some elements of work where we were making contributions, yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can you provide some detail as to what funding the Australian government is providing the US and UK? Is it directly to the US government and the UK government?</p> <p>Mr Casson: I would have to take the details of the arrangement on notice, but yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Do you have provisions to be able to pay a foreign government?</p> <p>Mr Casson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. If you could provide details in relation to that, that would be appreciated.</p> <p>Mr Casson: We can take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	47/48
38	Whish-Wilson, Peter	Unidentified aircraft - Senator Whish-Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What the protocols for RAAF Aviation Safety Reporting that relate to unidentified aircraft identified by Air Force pilots or personnel entering military controlled airspace or considered to pose a safety risk to military aircraft? - What records of observations or sightings of unidentified aircraft have been made over the past 20 years? - What records of "unusual or unexpected events" (referring to previous QoN) have been made through the RAAF Aviation Safety Reporting procedures over the past 20 years? 	Written	

39	Wong, Penny	Port of Darwin review	<p>Senator WONG: So it goes into an intergovernmental process et cetera. In terms of the Defence input, does the report reasonably characterise your input or not?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Well, Senator, I don't think it's possible for an official to comment on a matter that is—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Does your input—as you describe it, your review—find no national security grounds to recommend the overturning of the lease?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: Our review considered the implications for Defence. Our judgement has been provided to that process and that is part of what is being weighed by government.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Does this characterise the judgement that Defence made?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: I'd like to just take advice, if I may, given that this is something that is still undergoing government consideration.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sure.</p>	Spoken	30
40	Ayres, Tim	Skyguardian development duration	<p>Senator AYRES: Isn't this becoming a risk, now, for confidence for defence industry contractors? They are making decisions about investments on the basis of announcements that the government makes, and this sky garden—SkyGuardian. I made the mistake of making a joke about SkyGuardian and 'sky garden' a couple of days ago, and the problem is that it's now stuck with me, so I deserve it. It was a bad joke. The SkyGuardian program was at least a decade in development. Is that right?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: It was shorter than that.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Shorter?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: Yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: How long?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: We'd have to clarify that. I think it, and its associated investment program, may have been in the 2016 white paper, but we'd need to check.</p>	Spoken	34-35

41	Kim Carr	Chamber questions on notice regarding the 'Steve Austin' Facebook page	<p>1) Does the Department of Defence and the Australian Defence Force stand by the answers that it gave to the Senate on Thursday 9 February 2012 in Questions on Notice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1473 • 1474 • 1475 • 1476 <p>2) Since February 2012 has the Inspector General Australian Defence Force (IGADF) made any comment on the answers provided in Questions on Notice 1473, 1474, 1475 and 1476?</p> <p>a. If yes, What comment did the IGADF make and on what date?</p> <p>3) At any point has the Department of Defence or the Australian Defence Force sought to clarify or correct any part of answers provided in Questions on Notice 1473, 1474, 1475 and 1476?</p> <p>a. If yes, on what date?</p>	Written	
----	----------	--	---	---------	--