

Report 4/2015

# Referrals made December 2014 and March 2015

- Cox Peninsula Remediation Project
- Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory
- Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works

© Commonwealth of Australia 2015

978-1-74366-317-2 Printed version

978-1-74366-318-9 HTML version

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Australia License.




The details of this licence are available on the Creative Commons website:  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>.



# Contents

Membership of the Committee .....	v
List of recommendations .....	vii
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Structure of the report .....	2
<b>2 Cox Peninsula Remediation Project .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Conduct of the inquiry .....	5
Kenbi land claim.....	5
Need for the works .....	6
Previous works.....	7
Options considered .....	8
Scope of the works.....	10
Cost of the works .....	12
Opportunities for Indigenous participation.....	13
Committee comments .....	13
<b>3 Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Conduct of the inquiry .....	17
Need for the works .....	18
Options considered .....	20
Scope of the works.....	20
Cost of the works .....	22
Committee comments .....	23

<b>4 Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.....</b>	<b>25</b>
Conduct of the inquiry .....	25
Need for the works .....	26
Options considered .....	27
Scope of the works.....	27
Cost of the works .....	29
Committee comments .....	30
 <b>Appendix A – List of Submissions.....</b>	<b>33</b>
 <b>Appendix B – List of Hearings and Witnesses.....</b>	<b>35</b>



## Membership of the Committee

Chair	Senator Dean Smith
Deputy Chair	Mr Graham Perrett MP
Members	Senator Matthew Canavan
	Ms Sharon Claydon MP
	Senator Alex Gallacher
	Mr Ian Goodenough MP
	Ms Joanne Ryan MP
	Ms Fiona Scott MP
	Dr Andrew Southcott MP

## Committee Secretariat

Secretary

Dr Alison Clegg

A/Inquiry Secretary

Dr Cathryn Ollif

Senior Research Officer

Ms Melita Caulfield

Administrative Officer

Mrs Fiona McCann



## List of recommendations

### 2 Cox Peninsula Remediation Project

#### Recommendation 1

The Committee requires the Department of Finance to provide progress reports to the Committee on an annual basis.

#### Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Cox Peninsula Remediation Project.

### 3 Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory

#### Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory.

### 4 Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan

#### Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.





## Introduction

- 1.1 Under the *Public Works Committee Act 1969* (the Act), the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works is required to inquire into and report on public works referred to it through either house of Parliament. Referrals are generally made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance.
- 1.2 All public works that have an estimated cost exceeding \$15 million must be referred to the Committee and cannot be commenced until the Committee has made its report to Parliament and the House of Representatives receives that report and resolves that it is expedient to carry out the work.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.3 Under the Act, a public work is a work proposed to be undertaken by the Commonwealth, or on behalf of the Commonwealth concerning:
  - the construction, alteration, repair, refurbishment or fitting-out of buildings and other structures;
  - the installation, alteration or repair of plant and equipment designed to be used in, or in relation to, the provision of services for buildings and other structures;
  - the undertaking, construction, alteration or repair of landscaping and earthworks (whether or not in relation to buildings and other structures);
  - the demolition, destruction, dismantling or removal of buildings, plant and equipment, earthworks, and other structures;

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Public Works Committee Act 1969* (The Act), Part III, Section 18(8). Exemptions from this requirement are provided for work of an urgent nature, defence work contrary to the public interest, repetitive work, and work by prescribed authorities listed in the Regulations.

- the clearing of land and the development of land for use as urban land or otherwise; and
  - any other matter declared by the regulations to be a work.<sup>2</sup>
- 1.4 The Act requires that the Committee consider and report on:
- the purpose of the work and its suitability for that purpose;
  - the need for, or the advisability of, carrying out the work;
  - whether the money to be expended on the work is being spent in the most cost effective manner;
  - the amount of revenue the work will generate for the Commonwealth, if that is its purpose; and
  - the present and prospective public value of the work.<sup>3</sup>
- 1.5 The Committee pays attention to these and any other relevant factors when considering the proposed work.

## Structure of the report

- 1.6 The proposed projects were referred to the Committee in December 2014 and March 2015 by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance, The Hon Michael McCormack MP.
- 1.7 In considering the works, the Committee analysed the evidence presented by the proponent agencies, submissions and evidence received at public and in-camera hearings.
- 1.8 In consideration of the need to report expeditiously as required by Section 17(1) of the Act, the Committee has only reported on significant issues of interest or concern.
- 1.9 The Committee appreciates, and fully considers, the input of the community to its inquiries. Those interested in the proposals considered in this report are encouraged to access the full inquiry proceedings available on the Committee's website.<sup>4</sup>
- 1.10 Chapter 2 of this report addresses the Cox Peninsula Remediation Project. The estimated cost of the project is \$31.8 million, over four years.
- 1.11 Chapter 3 of this report addresses the Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility at East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory. The estimated cost of the project is \$18.0 million, excluding GST, with the cost to Defence being \$16.1 million, excluding GST.

---

2 The Act, Section 5.

3 The Act, Section 17.

4 <[www.aph.gov.au/pwc](http://www.aph.gov.au/pwc)>.

- 1.12 Chapter 4 of this report addresses Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan. The estimated cost of the projects is \$23.25 million.
- 1.13 Submissions are listed at Appendix A, and hearings and witnesses are listed at Appendix B.



## Cox Peninsula Remediation Project

- 2.1 The Department of Finance (Finance) seeks approval from the Committee to remediate sections of the Cox Peninsula in the Northern Territory (NT).
- 2.2 The primary objective of the project is to implement a land remediation strategy that will address the Commonwealth's liability that exists as a result of widespread contamination across Sections 32, 34 and 41 of the Cox Peninsula.<sup>1</sup>
- 2.3 The estimated cost of the project is \$31.8 million, over four years.
- 2.4 The project was referred to the Committee on 3 December 2014.

### Conduct of the inquiry

- 2.5 Following referral, the inquiry was publicised on the Committee's website and via media release.
- 2.6 The Committee received one submission and two supplementary submissions from Finance, one submission from the Office of the Chief Minister in the Northern Territory and one submission from the Northern Land Council (NLC). A list of submissions can be found at Appendix A.
- 2.7 The Committee received a briefing from Finance and conducted an on-site briefing and inspection, and public and in-camera hearings in Darwin on 22 April 2015. A transcript of the public hearing and the public submissions to the inquiry are available on the Committee's website.<sup>2</sup>

### Kenbi land claim

- 2.8 The Cox Peninsula is subject to an Indigenous Land Claim by the Kenbi Aboriginal People. The Kenbi Land Claim (Claim 37) was lodged in March 1979, and is the oldest unresolved land claim under the *Aboriginal Land*

---

1 Finance, submission 1, p. 12.

2 <[www.aph.gov.au/pwc](http://www.aph.gov.au/pwc)>

*Rights (NT) Act 1976*. In December 2000, the Aboriginal Land Commissioner recommended that a substantial area of the land claimed, be granted as Aboriginal Land. In January 2009, the Australian Government welcomed the in-principle agreement between the NT Government and the NLC to settle the Claim and announced that it would move to finalise outstanding issues, including the status of Australian Government facilities on the site. The remediation of the Commonwealth lands on the Cox Peninsula will allow for the final resolution of the Kenbi Land Claim.<sup>3</sup>

2.9 At the public hearing the Committee heard that:

...it remains the Northern Land Council's preferred position that the Commonwealth transfer the land as soon as possible to the Kenbi Land Trust. The Trust would then be able to grant a lease back to the Commonwealth over those areas of land which need remediation.<sup>4</sup>

2.10 Finance responded to this by stating:

There are a range of reasons why it is certainly our preference – and I think it is now the agreed position – that the remediation of particular areas of section 32 and section 34 take place before those areas are transferred. Just to be clear, that does not mean that none of section 32 or section 34 will be transferred prior to all of the remediation being complete. There is certainly scope for the greater part of section 32... over 90 per cent [to] be transferred on settlement of the claim, with a small portion of the site not transferred until the remediation is complete there. On section 34, similarly, while the contaminated area is larger than it is on section 32, there is scope for some areas of section 34 to be transferred at the time of the settlement and for the Commonwealth to continue owning those until the remediation is complete. I understand that that position has been much discussed in consultations with the various stakeholders, and I understand that it is now a position that all of the parties are comfortable with.<sup>5</sup>

## Need for the works

2.11 The Commonwealth has utilised 4,750 hectares of land on the Cox Peninsula for maritime, communications and Defence purposes for 70 years, resulting in extensive contamination across a wide area both below

---

3 Finance, submission 1, p. 12.

4 Ms Leanne Liddle, Northern Land Council, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 12.

5 Mr John Edge, Finance, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 10.

and at ground level. Asbestos is widespread and pesticides, heavy metals and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) have been detected above safe levels at a number of sites on Cox Peninsula. This presents a potential health risk to site users and the local community.<sup>6</sup>

- 2.12 Without substantial remedial works, there is a risk that in-ground contamination will migrate further and will impact local bore water. The quality of the water across much of the Peninsula is such that future extraction and use of this resource (such as for drinking water) cannot be ruled out. Therefore, its contamination represents a liability if left unmanaged and allowed to migrate from the identified sources. Interaction of the groundwater and ephemeral surface water bodies, such as the wetlands (and associated ecosystems) in Section 32 is another potential impact if contamination is not managed in the near future. Some of this bore water provides the only drinking water supply to the population of the Wagait township, the largest permanent community on the Peninsula.<sup>7</sup>
- 2.13 During the site inspection, the Committee saw the need for remediation firsthand, as evidenced by remote tip sites, several different types of concrete footings covering hazardous material and shipping containers used to securely store bagged material containing asbestos.
- 2.14 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the work exists.

## Previous works

- 2.15 A remediation program was attempted in 2010 to target areas of contamination across Section 34. Works were completed in and around the compound at Section 34 to remove materials around former underground and above ground storage tanks and to remove waste and asbestos materials from tip site areas.<sup>8</sup>
- 2.16 Large volumes of scrap metal waste and contaminated soils were removed from the site, and significant quantities of asbestos containing materials were buried in temporary earth-covered mounds. However, due to greater volumes of waste being identified than originally estimated, project cost escalated and the timeframe for remedial activities were projected to extend beyond the end of the 2010 dry season. As a result, the remediation program was concluded at the end of the 2010 dry season and temporary controls and measures were adopted to manage risks relating to materials that had been excavated and screened. These temporary controls and

---

6 Finance, submission 1, p. 6.

7 Finance, submission 1, p. 7.

8 Finance, submission 1, p. 16.

measures included placing asbestos contaminated materials in bags and storing these in buildings within the Section 34 compound. It was recognised that future remediation works would need to address large areas of the site that were not remediated as part of the 2010 program and that the asbestos bags and buried asbestos waste would need to be managed appropriately.<sup>9</sup>

- 2.17 A Risk Mitigation Project, considered by the Committee as a Medium Work, commenced in June 2014. Work focused on taking advantage of the dry season to remove or relocate contaminants prior to the next wet season.<sup>10</sup>

## Options considered

- 2.18 Over 20 remediation options were assessed initially at the 'screen' stage, with two remediation options identified as providing value for money while significantly addressing the public risk of exposure to asbestos. These two options were:

- On-site containment of waste materials – whereby contaminated material be disposed of in an engineered sealed 'containment cell' on Commonwealth land within the existing industrial compound on Section 34 and for appropriate non-contaminated material be recycled where suitable, and
- Off-site disposal of waste materials – transport of contaminated material to a facility or facilities licenced to receive the particular type of contaminated material.<sup>11</sup>

- 2.19 Both of these options were compared against the base case "do nothing" option. A robust technical feasibility assessment of the two remediation options was undertaken with the options then assessed against the agreed assessment criteria that were developed in consultation with key stakeholder groups. In summary the following analysis was undertaken:

- Identification of remediation technologies and waste management strategies available;
- Preliminary screening assessment of potential options for technical and implementation feasibility and capability for meeting the rehabilitation criteria;
- Development and description of feasible remediation and management strategies available for the site;

---

9 Finance, submission 1, p. 16.

10 Finance, submission 1, p. 17.

11 Finance, submission 1, p. 21.



- Application of a robust multi-criteria analysis of potential options, using the outputs of stakeholder;
  - Consultation and engagement process and site contamination and waste investigations; and
  - Identification and development of preferred remediation and/or management strategies.<sup>12</sup>
- 2.20 Both the off-site and on-site remediation options met many of the key evaluation criteria, whilst meeting the agreed remediation targets of open space and commercial/industrial use.<sup>13</sup>
- 2.21 The on-site containment cell option was considered a superior option for the following reasons:
- The cost is significantly less (\$7.2 million lower) than the alternative;
  - The environmental impact is reduced with fewer truck movements through the neighbouring communities and a significantly reduced carbon footprint;
  - The option allows for the management of materials on-site which provides greater opportunities for Indigenous participation during construction due to a larger proportion of the works involving material tracking and management on site;
  - Demonstrates industry best practice for a remediation project in limiting the disposal of wastes by effectively managing materials on site;
  - The ongoing environmental controls in the Section 34 compound will provide employment opportunities for Indigenous groups;
  - Provides a solution that can be staged to facilitate the progressive transfer of land;
  - Allows for upgrade works at the Wagait Shire Tip to improve waste management operations and reduce any potential impact on the adjacent wetland and Savannah areas;
  - Provides for an administrative building in the Section 34 compound to support ongoing land management, training and environmental monitoring activities; and
  - Provides enhanced ongoing land management opportunities for Traditional Owners.<sup>14</sup>

---

12 Finance, submission 1, p. 21.

13 Finance, submission 1, p. 21.

14 Finance, submission 1, p. 22.

- 2.22 The Committee found that Finance has considered a range of options to deliver the project and has selected the most suitable option.

### Scope of the works

- 2.23 The remediation project is not simply an extension of the previously undertaken risk mitigation works. It is a much larger project that will remove contaminants as much as practicable and ensure the site is able to be used in line with future use aspirations.<sup>15</sup>
- 2.24 In line with the chosen option, a containment cell will be built as follows:
- The 74 metre x 74 metre cell will be excavated to a depth of 8 metres below ground level (taking note of local seasonal groundwater levels);
  - The cell will be lined with an impermeable geosynthetic clay liner (GCL);
  - The encapsulated material will be capped with a GCL to minimise surface water ingress in to the cell, thereby reducing rates of leachate generation;
  - The cell will incorporate provisions for venting of accumulated gas including a gas collection layer and landfill gas venting wells;
  - The cell will be contoured to encourage surface water runoff towards the edges;
  - As some water may still permeate through the GCL cap over time, a drainage layer will be placed immediately on top of this liner to further promote lateral movement of surface water towards the edges of the cell; and
  - Since it may not be possible to eliminate surface water ingress and leachate generation entirely, the cell will also incorporate a leachate collection system.<sup>16</sup>

### Location of the containment cell

- 2.25 The current Section 34 compound has been selected as the preferred location for the containment cell for the following reasons:
- Proximity to the most significant tip sites (Tip Site 1/1A, Tip Site 2 and Tip Site 3) and other sources of waste (Section 34 compound). This reduces both transport distances and associated costs, and risks associated with the movement of soils impacted by hazardous materials (particularly fibrous asbestos);

---

<sup>15</sup> Finance, submission 1, p. 17.

<sup>16</sup> Finance, submission 1, p. 23.

- The site is located within an area that has been disturbed previously. As such, the need for extensive native vegetation clearance will be minimised;
- The presence of an existing roadway provides good access to the containment cell during construction, filling and capping of the cell;
- The Section 34 compound has been identified as an area that may be zoned in the future for commercial/industrial use. This future use is compatible with the placement of a containment cell;
- The Section 34 compound represents the preferred location for a transfer station for the sorting and pre-treatment of material at the site prior to either off-site disposal or containment. As such, the location of the containment cell nearby makes practical sense; and
- The observed soil profile and groundwater levels at the nominated location are considered suitable for the construction of a containment cell. Similarly, the area is also largely flat.<sup>17</sup>

2.26 At the public hearing, Mr Jolly, a member of the public with several years' experience in assessing groundwater on the Cox Peninsula, alerted the Committee to a possible problem with the selected site.

...underneath section 34 we did investigation drilling, and bores capable of producing 10 to 20 litres per second of potable water were intersected at depth. The containment cell is proposed to be located right on top of where that bore field would be located.<sup>18</sup>

2.27 Further to this, in a response to the matter from Finance the Committee was assured that the geology of the site reduces the risk of leachate from the containment cell contaminating the water source.<sup>19</sup>

2.28 Additionally, several strategies have been identified to manage and mitigate any risk of contamination:

- only treated and non-leachable material will be placed in the containment cell;
- the containment cell is designed to be covered with an impervious layer and hardstand to reduce the potential for surface water infiltration;
- at least ten groundwater wells on s.34 will be located around the containment cell for the ongoing monitoring and testing of the aquifer;
- all leachates will be removed from the site and disposed of;

---

17 Finance, submission 1, pp. 25-26.

18 Mr Peter Jolly, private individual, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 21.

19 Finance, submission 1.2, p. 3.

- remediation will not be complete until there is independent site auditor sign off;
  - and 20 years of regular post-project monitoring and testing will be conducted to observe water quality.<sup>20</sup>
- 2.29 The Committee is satisfied that the selected site for the containment cell is the appropriate option.

### Seasonal considerations

- 2.30 Subject to Parliamentary approval of the project, construction is expected to commence as soon as possible and conclude by June 2018, with a defects and liability period extending for 12 months from commissioning.<sup>21</sup>
- 2.31 The wet season in the NT generally occurs from October-April each year so remediation works at Cox Peninsula will generally be completed between April and October in any given year.<sup>22</sup>
- 2.32 At the public hearing, the Committee heard that:
- ...the containment cell can be actually constructed in two stages. The first stage would be available for the first dry season, then we can close it off during the wet season and then construct the second stage of the containment cell for that second stage of the works.<sup>23</sup>
- 2.33 The Committee finds that the proposed scope of works is suitable for the works to meet its purpose.

### Cost of the works

- 2.34 The estimated cost of the project is \$31.8 million, over four years. Approved funding is \$16.0 million in financial year 2014-15, \$12.0 million in financial year 2015-16 and \$3.5 million in financial year 2016-17. Operating costs are not included but will be absorbed by Finance in future.<sup>24</sup>
- 2.35 Finance provided further detail on the project costs in the confidential submission and during the in-camera hearing.

---

20 Finance, submission 1.2, p. 3.

21 Finance, submission 1, p. 31.

22 Finance, submission 1, p. 31.

23 Ms Tooley Elliott, Finance, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 9.

24 Finance, submission 1, p. 30.

- 2.36 The Committee considers that the cost estimates for the project have been adequately assessed by Finance and the Committee is satisfied that the proposed expenditure is cost effective. As the project will not be revenue generating the Committee makes no comment in relation to this matter.

## Opportunities for Indigenous participation

- 2.37 The Kenbi Ranger Group has been employed through the Commonwealth's 'Caring for our Country Program' to provide comprehensive conservation and land management activities on the Cox Peninsula. Recent risk mitigation works have utilised the Kenbi Rangers for security, transport and labour services. Part of the mitigation works also includes a pilot vegetation regeneration project, which the Kenbi Rangers have been contracted to manage.<sup>25</sup>

- 2.38 At the public hearing, the Committee heard that Indigenous groups are keen to participate. Ms Liddle from the Northern Land Council said:

I would be disappointed if people did not extend some of the opportunities for surveying, for people to work in the remediation work – not just ranger work, but beyond that in scientific roles. There is a wealth of Aboriginal people out there looking for work in this area of expertise who could be mentored into these areas.<sup>26</sup>

- 2.39 Following this, Mr Risk, a local small business owner stated:

...my understanding is that there is going to be a large contractor come in, and he will be deemed as the contractor, and then you will have subcontractors that are brought in under them to complete the scope of works. It is at that level that I could see Larrakia businesses – small to medium – being able to use the time in the remote remediation process to develop and grow. They would then be on a much more level footing to be able to compete in the larger market.<sup>27</sup>

## Committee comments

- 2.40 The Committee notes the opportunities for Indigenous participation and employment in the remediation project, and encourages Finance to make a range of employment and training positions available to local Indigenous residents where possible.

---

25 Finance, submission 1, pp. 14-15.

26 Ms Leanne Liddle, Northern Land Council, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 15.

27 Mr William Risk, private individual, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 22.

- 2.41 The Committee is aware that a culturally sacred site is nearby a proposed works site. It accepts Finance's assurances that it is working closely with the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority to ensure adequate protection and respect is shown.<sup>28</sup>
- 2.42 The successful remediation of sites on the Cox Peninsula is crucial to final resolution of the Kenbi Land Claim. Nevertheless, the Committee understands there is scope for transfer of a significant portion of the land to the traditional owners prior to the completion of remediation.
- 2.43 The Committee accepts Finance's assurances that the land will be remediated to industry standards.<sup>29</sup> The Committee expects Finance to report annually on key milestones including progress and expenditure to date. Additionally the Committee would be pleased to receive information on Indigenous employment associated with the project and feedback from the community on any matter arising.

### Recommendation 1

- 2.44 **The Committee requires the Department of Finance to provide progress reports to the Committee on an annual basis.**
- 2.45 The Committee commends staff from the Department of Finance and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet who demonstrated throughout this inquiry that they have invested substantial effort over a long period to achieve the best outcome for the local community. This was particularly apparent while showing the Committee the site. The Committee was also impressed by the level of co-operation demonstrated between staff from both departments.
- 2.46 The Committee did not identify any issues of concern with Finance's proposal and is satisfied that the project has merit in terms of need, scope and cost.
- 2.47 Proponent agencies must notify the Committee of any changes to the project scope, time, cost, function or design. The Committee also requires that a post-implementation report be provided within three months of completion of the project. A report template can be found on the Committee's website.
- 2.48 Having regard to its role and responsibilities contained in the *Public Works*

28 Mr Adrian Kirk, Finance, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 7.

29 Mr John Edge, Finance, transcript of evidence, 22 April 2015, p. 5.

*Committee Act 1969*, the Committee is of the view that this project signifies value for money for the Commonwealth and constitutes a project which is fit for purpose, having regard to the established need.

## **Recommendation 2**

- 2.49 **The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Cox Peninsula Remediation Project.**





## Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory

- 3.1 The Department of Defence (Defence) seeks approval from the Committee to create a Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility (MUBRF) at East Arm in Darwin, Northern Territory.
- 3.2 The proposed facility is a collaboration between Defence and the Land Development Corporation (LDC) in the Northern Territory.<sup>1</sup>
- 3.3 The works will provide Defence watercraft round-the-clock capability to load and unload helicopter docks, other amphibious ships and explosive ordnance irrespective of tidal conditions in Darwin.<sup>2</sup>
- 3.4 Additionally, the works will allow Defence to provide humanitarian assistance, disaster relief and civil evacuation duties in the region.<sup>3</sup>
- 3.5 The estimated cost of the project is \$18.0 million, excluding GST, with the cost to Defence being \$16.1 million, excluding GST.
- 3.6 The project was referred to the Committee on 4 March 2015.

### Conduct of the inquiry

- 3.7 Following referral, the inquiry was publicised on the Committee's website and via media release.
- 3.8 The Committee received one submission and one supplementary submission from Defence. A list of submissions can be found at Appendix A.
- 3.9 The Committee conducted an inquiry briefing and inspection, and public and in-camera hearings in Darwin on 23 April 2015. The public

---

1 Defence, submission 1, p. 6.

2 Defence, submission 1, p. 7.

3 Commodore Braddon Wheeler, Defence, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 3.

submission to the inquiry and a transcript of the public hearing are available on the Committee's website.<sup>4</sup>

## Need for the works

- 3.10 In February 2001, a Deed of Licence between Defence and the Darwin Port Corporation (DPC) gave Defence access to Stokes Hill Wharf, Iron Ore Wharf, and the Fort Hill Wharf Roll On/Roll Off facility (and adjacent land area) for the purposes of fuelling and de-fuelling vessels and loading and unloading cargo including military vehicles, personnel, equipment and supplies.<sup>5</sup>
- 3.11 The Fort Hill Wharf Roll On/Roll Off facility was decommissioned in November 2008 due to deterioration.<sup>6</sup>
- 3.12 The *Defence White Paper 2009* outlined enhancements for specific infrastructure, including a new boat ramp in Darwin. Subsequently in late 2010, Defence conducted discussions with the DPC to develop a MUBRF. This facility would also be managed under a Deed of Licence.<sup>7</sup>
- 3.13 In July 2011, Stokes Hill and Iron Ore wharves were removed from the Deed of Licence, the former being structurally unsuitable for large vessels and the latter having previously been demolished.<sup>8</sup>
- 3.14 Defence currently uses an existing barge ramp owned by the Paspaley Group, however this is unable to fully support Defence's requirements.<sup>9</sup>
- 3.15 Noting that the transportation of heavy military equipment and explosive ordnance by road through the Darwin CBD is becoming increasingly less viable, Defence identified the East Arm Wharf complex as the only practical alternative through which future amphibious loads could be conducted.<sup>10</sup>
- 3.16 Furthermore, East Arm is in close proximity to both Robertson Barracks and Darwin's CBD and provides good road and rail connections.<sup>11</sup>
- 3.17 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the work exists.

---

4 <[www.aph.gov.au/pwc](http://www.aph.gov.au/pwc)>

5 Defence, submission 1, p. 2.

6 Defence, submission 1, pp. 2-3.

7 Defence, submission 1, p. 3.

8 Defence, submission 1, p. 3.

9 Defence, submission 1, p. 5.

10 Defence, submission 1, p. 5.

11 Defence, submission 1, p. 5.

## Terms of the Deed of Licence

- 3.18 The proposed Deed will be between Defence and the LDC and will be valid for a period of 20 years, with the option of two five-year extensions. The Committee was told that the engaging the extension options would incur no extra cost to Defence.<sup>12</sup>
- 3.19 Defence will have access to the barge ramp facility for 60 days per calendar year. This is sufficient to meet Defence's needs. For the remaining days, the facility will be leased out to commercial users and revenue from such arrangements will fund ongoing maintenance. Defence therefore will not be financially responsible for maintenance.<sup>13</sup>
- 3.20 At the public hearing, the Committee enquired how Defence plan to ensure the facility is properly maintained. Defence confirmed that the LDC is legally bound by the Deed to undertake maintenance works.<sup>14</sup>
- 3.21 Defence will be granted first opportunity to take up any unused commercial days over and above the 60 days.<sup>15</sup>
- 3.22 At the public hearing, the Committee was assured that Defence's use of the facility over and above the 60 days would be at no extra cost:
- ...under the Defence Act, we do not pay for the use of wharves and access to them. And, particularly if it is for a declared contingency, there is certainly no requirement to meet any cost. If we have to move a commercial vessel – if it loses its wharfage in response to a contingency – then there is a fee that we would have to pay in compensation for that.<sup>16</sup>
- 3.23 Additionally, the Committee heard that, had it not been for Defence requirements, the LDC would not have prioritised a barge ramp facility.<sup>17</sup> However the LDC is confident it can attract suitable commercial clients:
- I am quite confident that the facility will still provide better access than any other barge ramp in the Darwin area, with far more tidal access, given our extreme tidal ranges. We have had some informal discussions with operators who have shown interest in a process. So, yes, we are quite confident.<sup>18</sup>

---

12 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 4.

13 Defence, submission 1, p. 7.

14 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 9.

15 Defence, submission 1, p. 7.

16 Brigadier Michael Ashleigh, Defence, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 3.

17 Mr Andrew Kirkman, Land Development Corporation, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 4.

18 Mr Andrew Kirkman, Land Development Corporation, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 7.

## Options considered

- 3.24 In addition to the preferred option to build a new facility, two options were considered for enhancing the existing wharf at East Arm. These included:
- A floating Roll On/Roll Off pontoon, connected to a fixed wharf deck by a steel ramp, and
  - A cut-out section in an existing wharf, fitted with a platform that could move vertically and connect to the wharf by a loading ramp.
- 3.25 When taking into account high design, construction and maintenance costs to create structures that could bear the required weight, these options were considered extremely expensive, with estimated costs for a moving ramp being in excess of \$50 million.<sup>19</sup>
- 3.26 Despite identifying two minor operational limitations associated with water depth and flow, Defence has stated that the proposed MUBRF was considered to be the most cost-effective and operationally effective solution.<sup>20</sup>
- 3.27 The Committee found that Defence has considered a number of options to deliver the project and has selected the most suitable option.

## Scope of the works

- 3.28 The design of the proposed MUBRF has been managed by the LDC, with key Defence stakeholders providing considerable input into the development of the design.<sup>21</sup>
- 3.29 The key aspects of the MUBRF design requirements were addressed in Defence's Functional Design Brief and include:
- accommodating amphibious landing craft;
  - allowing for the safe passage of two landing craft travelling in opposite directions;
  - providing staging and marshalling areas suitable for a wide range of Defence vehicles; and
  - incorporating appropriate maritime navigation aids suitable for 24/7 operations.

---

19 Defence, submission 1, pp. 7-8.

20 Defence, submission 1, pp. 8, 17.

21 Defence, submission 1, p. 15.

## Common use area

- 3.30 While not part of the project scope, it should be noted that the LDC is developing a 70,000m<sup>2</sup> staging area hardstand to be constructed within the 90,000m<sup>2</sup> common use area.<sup>22</sup> This will be located at the head of the proposed MUBRF access road and will be used to unload armoured vehicles and engineering plant from articulated transporters that have very wide turning circles.<sup>23</sup>

## Site management

- 3.31 The Committee heard that the common use area is not contingent on the barge ramp facility:

That is being driven by the local industry up here, which was crying out for a temporary hardened surface to do that sort of work within the logistics area. There is easy access to the marine supply base, the port of Darwin and the railway.<sup>24</sup>

- 3.32 Additionally, the Committee was told that LDC is currently liaising with industry regarding use and management of the facility:

Our intention is that we would put that out to a broader operator. Of course we would need to seek interest in that, and we are hopeful of getting some good interest. Then we would put that out for an operator to run both the barge facility for us and to have that direct liaison with the Defence officers and also with the other industry participants around the common use area.<sup>25</sup>

- 3.33 The Committee raised the issue of restrictions on corporations with large foreign ownership elements that might seek to undertake this management role<sup>26</sup>, but was subsequently satisfied in the in-camera hearing that arrangements would not adversely affect Defence's interests.

## Heritage

- 3.34 At the public hearing, the Committee commented on a media article regarding relics from the operational base of a World War II fighting unit, known as Z-Force.

---

22 This figure was corrected at the public hearing. See Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcripts of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 1.

23 Defence, submission 1, p. 16.

24 Mr Andrew Kirkman, Land Development Corporation, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 4.

25 Mr Andrew Kirkman, Land Development Corporation, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 5.

26 Senator Dean Smith, transcripts of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 9.

Defence is confident that, with the proposed construction methodology and the mitigation measures that we have in place, there is no impact to any environment or heritage issues, particularly in the Z-Force area that is adjacent to the proposed barge ramp. I add that there is no perceived or identified impact on that facility for the subsequent operation of the barge ramp facility. I also add that I think that article makes mention of the Catalina boat ramp on Paspaley group land. That was included in looking at the heritage precinct. I can also confirm that this proposal does not impact on the Catalina boat ramp or subsequent operations on that boat ramp.<sup>27</sup>

- 3.35 Subject to Parliamentary approval of the project, construction is expected to commence by mid-2015 and be completed by mid-2016.<sup>28</sup>
- 3.36 The Committee finds that the proposed scope of works is suitable for the works to meet its purpose.

### Cost of the works

- 3.37 The estimated cost of the project is \$18.0 million, excluding GST, with the cost to Defence being \$16.1 million, excluding GST.
- 3.38 At the public hearing, the Committee sought to address how LDC would meet ongoing maintenance costs if revenue from commercial opportunities is limited. The Committee was duly assured there were other sources of revenue:

The common user area will be a valuable piece of real estate for industry. We will take out short and longer term leases with industry for that land. That will support the barge ramp facility also.<sup>29</sup>

- 3.39 When asked about potential return on capital, Defence told the Committee:

...there was no requirement within that NPP [New Policy Proposal] to look at a potential revenue stream for Defence with this barge ramp facility.<sup>30</sup>

- 3.40 Defence provided further detail on the project costs in the confidential submissions and during the in-camera hearing.

---

27 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcripts of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 8.

28 Defence, submission 1, p. 21.

29 Mr Andrew Kirkman, Land Development Corporation, transcript of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 8.

30 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcripts of evidence, 23 April 2015, p. 4.

- 3.41 The Committee considers that the cost estimates for the project have been adequately assessed by Defence and is satisfied that the proposed expenditure is cost effective. Revenue generated from the project after completion will be paid to the LDC and therefore the Committee makes no further comment on revenue.

### Committee comments

- 3.42 The Committee is satisfied that construction of the MUBRF will greatly assist in Defence's ability to provide humanitarian assistance and security operations efficiently and effectively.
- 3.43 The Committee did not identify any issues of concern with Defence's proposal and is satisfied that the project has merit in terms of need, scope and cost.
- 3.44 Proponent agencies must notify the Committee of any changes to the project scope, time, cost, function or design. The Committee also requires that a post-implementation report be provided within three months of completion of the project. A report template can be found on the Committee's website.
- 3.45 Having regard to its role and responsibilities contained in the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, the Committee is of the view that this project signifies value for money for the Commonwealth and constitutes a project which is fit for purpose, having regard to the established need.

### Recommendation 3

- 3.46 **The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory.**





## Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan

- 4.1 The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) seeks approval from the Committee to reconfigure and refurbish residential accommodation and staff amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.
- 4.2 The proposed project will substantially improve residential accommodation and amenities in the Australian Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan by improving security and safety arrangements and consolidating the current property footprint.<sup>1</sup>
- 4.3 The estimated cost of the project is \$23.25 million.
- 4.4 In February 2015, the Committee received two medium works notifications for the Embassy site in Kabul. It was unclear from further information why these two works should not be considered as one project, given the close location and purpose of the works. Consequently, the Committee sought a full referral of the project through a motion of the House, which was granted on 26 March 2015.

### Conduct of the inquiry

- 4.5 Following referral, the inquiry was publicised on the Committee's website and via media release.
- 4.6 The Committee received one submission and one supplementary submission from DFAT. A list of submissions can be found at Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> DFAT, submission 1, p. 1.

- 4.7 The Committee conducted public and in-camera hearings in Canberra on 11 May 2015. A transcript of the public hearing and the public submissions to the inquiry are available on the Committee's website.<sup>2</sup>

## Need for the works

- 4.8 The Australian Embassy chancery was opened in 2011 in Kabul's diplomatic quarter and consists of several leased properties spread out over a number of blocks.<sup>3</sup>
- 4.9 Diplomatic activity requires access to, and movement between, these properties. Due to the high-risk environment, such activity must be tightly controlled through special physical and operational security measures.<sup>4</sup>
- 4.10 DFAT states there is an urgent need to establish a contiguous security zone around the chancery, including residential accommodation along with dining, representational and recreational amenities, in a way that addresses security and safety risks.<sup>5</sup>
- 4.11 Consolidating the properties will significantly enhance physical and operational security. It will improve the standard and accessibility of amenities and create a more cohesive working environment.<sup>6</sup> Similar consolidation works have been undertaken for both the British and Canadian Embassies.<sup>7</sup>
- 4.12 At the public hearing, the Committee sought assurances regarding Australia's continued presence in Kabul.

... our plans are to continue the mission, which is doing some very important work taking forward our interests in engagement with the NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] mission going forward for the next two years until the end of 2016. ... we expect to maintain a significant aid program going forward as well. Also, part of our interest and mission is engagement with the US and other partners. We have significant interests which will be maintained.<sup>8</sup>

- 4.13 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the works exists.

---

2 <[www.aph.gov.au/pwc](http://www.aph.gov.au/pwc)>

3 DFAT, submission 1, pp. 1-2.

4 DFAT, submission 1, p. 1.

5 DFAT, submission 1, p. 2.

6 DFAT, submission 1, pp. 1-2.

7 DFAT, submission 1, p. 15.

8 Mr Richard Feakes, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 2.

## Options considered

- 4.14 DFAT has told the Committee that co-location with like-minded missions was explored, but proved unsuccessful.<sup>9</sup>
- 4.15 At the public hearing, the Committee sought further information on which options were trialled and reasons they were not pursued. DFAT told the Committee:
- ...there were investigations and inquiries and discussions around co-location with both the US embassy and the Canadians, in particular. Neither of those was able to provide sufficient accommodation to satisfy our needs, nor to give us the length of tenure to ensure that we were then able to maintain our presence at our desired numbers.<sup>10</sup>
- 4.16 DFAT told the Committee that creating a secure compound facility would still facilitate Embassy staff maintaining valuable relationships:
- ...a greater level of amenity that we can provide and offer. Subject to the security environment, the members of staff at the Australian embassy on occasions have been able to access some amenity at some of the other missions on an invitation basis. What we are seeking to do is to provide a level of amenity for our staff so that when that is not available and there is an activity that they can pursue within our own compound, they can do so. And also, importantly, to provide an opportunity for others to be invited to our compound.<sup>11</sup>
- 4.17 The Committee found that DFAT has considered a range of options to deliver the project and has selected the only viable option.

## Scope of the works

- 4.18 The project consists of reconfiguration, refurbishment and remediation of five leased residential housing lots constructed in the 1960s and 70s. While the buildings are structurally sound, they are in need of extensive repair/refurbishment and increased security features.<sup>12</sup>
- 4.19 The first part of the project relates to residential accommodation on a 934m<sup>2</sup> site. This will involve reconfiguring and refurbishing the three-storey house adjacent to the chancery as well as upgrading infrastructure

---

9 DFAT, submission 1, p. 3.

10 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 2.

11 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 2.

12 DFAT, submission 1, p. 5.

and security measures including a safe room. The accommodation building will be integrated with the existing chancery compound through a common boundary wall which will facilitate staff movement and also provide alternative means of evacuation in case of emergency.<sup>13</sup>

4.20 The second part relates to dining, representation, recreation and staff amenities and involves four houses. The aim is to demolish and rebuild parts of the complex to provide a consolidated, self-sufficient compound for communal embassy use. The combined site is approximately 2890m<sup>2</sup>.<sup>14</sup>

4.21 The amenities will include common and private dining areas, a commercial kitchen capable of serving 90 meals three times a day, representational and meeting spaces along with other internal and external landscaped relaxation areas, a safe room, facilities management workshops, storage, covered parking for official vehicles, a generator power plant plus associated new services infrastructure.<sup>15</sup>

4.22 Controlled secure vehicle and pedestrian entries will be provided at the boundary, all located within a secure perimeter. The staff amenities facility will be located across a public road directly opposite the chancery compound greatly reducing the need for secure vehicle transportation.<sup>16</sup>

4.23 DFAT has told the Committee that reconfiguring and upgrading the complex will achieve the following:

- A consolidated property footprint that creates a contiguous security Embassy zone for the first time.
- Improved security access between Embassy properties, particularly for access, including by road, to and from the Chancery, residences and amenities within the secure Embassy zone.
- Reduced and simplified daily escorted staff movements to and from the Chancery and other properties and amenities.
- Lessened constraints on staff movements, which to date are subject to guard schedules and related workload demands and commitments.
- Improved physical and operational mitigation security measures.
- Reduced risks to staff being isolated during complex and other terrorist threats and attacks.
- New and refurbished accommodation and amenities with enhanced work, health and safety standards.

---

13 DFAT, submission 1, pp. 5-6.

14 DFAT, submission 1, pp. 5-6.

15 DFAT, submission 1, pp. 3-6.

16 DFAT, submission 1, p. 6.

- Reduced project scope and budget over what was previously approved in the NPP.<sup>17</sup>

4.24 At the public hearing, the Committee heard that additional security measures would be in place during the construction phase, so as not to expose Embassy staff to increased risk.<sup>18</sup>

### Leasing arrangements

4.25 At the public hearing, the Committee sought assurance regarding the security of leasing arrangements. DFAT told the Committee:

We have leases executed. They are written leases. They provide for occupation of the land referred to as the American properties on a five-year initial term, with an option for a further five-year period. We have entered into a number of leases, over a number of years, in maintaining our presence in Kabul. We are satisfied that the leases provide validity to occupation of the land for the periods contained therein.<sup>19</sup>

4.26 Subject to Parliamentary approval of the project, work is expected to commence by late-2015 and be completed by mid-2016.<sup>20</sup>

4.27 The Committee finds that the proposed scope of works is suitable for the works to meet its purpose.

### Cost of the works

4.28 The estimated cost of the project is \$23.25 million.

4.29 At the public hearing, the Committee asked DFAT to explain how the complex security environment in Kabul might impact costs of the project:

Essentially we have looked at the major risks that we face there, and we built up the contingencies based on those risks primarily around the logistics of getting in the equipment and the building materials that we cannot get in-country. There is also the logistics of the transport of contractor personnel to and from site. Essentially we have run a risk analysis across all of those, and we have built the contingencies up to allow for those in the construction.<sup>21</sup>

---

17 DFAT, submission 1, p. 4.

18 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 4.

19 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 1.

20 DFAT, submission 1, p. 15.

21 Mr Keith Harmsworth, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 2.

- 4.30 The Committee was also interested in how consolidating the existing properties will affect cost savings. DFAT was confident that cost savings would result from reducing the number of vehicle movements between current sites.<sup>22</sup>
- 4.31 DFAT identified further savings as a result of consolidation:
- Then there are some properties that we will vacate and consolidate back to this location. There will be savings, of course, from those properties that we vacate from a day-to-day repairs and maintenance perspective. We will seek to minimise the future exposure to costs in maintenance through the design and the use of typically available materials or elements of equipment in the delivery of these works.<sup>23</sup>
- 4.32 The Committee sought assurances that chosen contractors would provide good value for money. DFAT told the Committee they had engaged a quality surveyor as part of their consultant team, which would assist with cost planning and gauging value for money.<sup>24</sup>
- 4.33 Additionally, DFAT stated:
- Most other missions in recent periods have undertaken a level of work – be it security enhancements and upgrades or some element of new construction renovation. We are pretty open with them and they are pretty open with us to give an indication of which contractors perform better than others and also the unit rates or the out-turn costs of works to give us a level of benchmarking that we can undertake.<sup>25</sup>
- 4.34 DFAT provided further detail on the project costs in the confidential submissions and during the in-camera hearing.
- 4.35 The Committee considers that the cost estimates for the project have been adequately assessed by DFAT and the Committee is satisfied that the proposed expenditure is cost effective.

## Committee comments

- 4.36 The Committee did not identify any issues of concern with DFAT's proposal and is satisfied that the project has merit in terms of need, scope and cost.

---

22 Mr Luke Williams, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 3.

23 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 5.

24 Mr Keith Harmsworth, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 3.

25 Mr Kevin Nixon, DFAT, transcript of evidence, 11 May 2015, p. 3.

- 4.37 The Committee is aware of the difficulty in coordinating a project in a high-risk international environment, especially with regard to lengthy negotiations and complex security and logistics.
- 4.38 Nevertheless, the Committee reminds DFAT to provide timely advice on any changes scope, time, cost, function or design for the project. The Committee requires that a post-implementation report be provided within three months of completion of the project. A report template can be found on the Committee's website.
- 4.39 Having regard to its role and responsibilities contained in the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, the Committee is of the view that this project signifies value for money for the Commonwealth and constitutes a project which is fit for purpose, having regard to the established need.

#### **Recommendation 4**

- 4.40 **The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.**

**Senator Dean Smith**

**Chair**

**26 May 2015**







## Appendix A – List of Submissions

### Cox Peninsula Remediation Project

1. Department of Finance
  - 1.1 Confidential
  - 1.2 Department of Finance
2. Department of the Chief Minister, Northern Territory Government
3. Northern Land Council

### Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory

1. Department of Defence
  - 1.1 Confidential

### Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan

1. Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
  - 1.1 Confidential





## Appendix B – List of Hearings and Witnesses

### Cox Peninsula Remediation Project

Wednesday, 22 April 2015 – Darwin

#### Public Hearing

For Department of Finance

Mr John Edge, Acting Deputy Secretary, Business, Procurement and Asset Management, Department of Finance

Ms Tooey Elliott, Acting First Assistant Secretary, Property and Construction Division, Department of Finance

Mr Adrian Kirk, Project Director, Remediation, Property and Construction Division, Department of Finance

For Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet

Mr Wayne Beswick, Acting Assistant Secretary, Land Branch, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

Mr Mark Stoyles, Senior Adviser, Land Rights Policy and Management Section, Land Branch, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

For Northern Territory Government; Department of the Chief Minister and Department of Land Resource Management

Mrs Hannah Feneley, Director, Pursuing Economic Development on Indigenous Land, Department of the Chief Minister

Mr Alastair Shields, Chief Executive Officer, Department of Land Resource Management

**For Northern Land Council**

Mr Robert Dalton, Policy Adviser, Northern Land Council

Ms Kirsty Howey, Legal Adviser, Northern Land Council

Ms Leanne Liddle, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Northern Land Council

**For Larrakia Nation Aboriginal Corporation**

Mr James Pilkington, Acting Chief Executive Officer

**Private Individuals**

Mr Peter Jolly

Mr William Risk

**In-Camera Hearing**

Three witnesses

**Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility, East Arm, Darwin, Northern Territory**

Thursday, 23 April 2015 – Darwin

**Public Hearing**

For Department of Defence

Brigadier Michael Ashleigh, Director General, Strategic Logistics, Joint Logistics Command, Department of Defence

Brigadier Noel Beutel, Director General, Capital Facilities and Infrastructure, Department of Defence

Mr Shane Dahlhelm, Project Director, Department of Infrastructure, Northern Territory Government

Mr Timothy Keane, Project Director, Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility Project, Capital Facilities and Infrastructure, Department of Defence

Mr Andrew Kirkman, General Manager, Land Development Corporation, Northern Territory Government

Mr Andrew Thiele, Project Manager, Multi-User Barge Ramp Facility Project, Point Project Management Pty Ltd

Commodore Braddon Wheeler, Director, General Navy Capability Transition and Sustainment, Department of Defence

**In-Camera Hearing**

Four witnesses

## **Residential Accommodation and Staff Amenities at the Australian Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan**

**Monday, 11 May 2015 – Canberra**

### **Public Hearing**

For Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Mr Peter English, Director, Financial Management Section

Mr Richard Feakes, Acting Assistant Secretary, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Central Asia Branch

Mr Keith Harmsworth, Assistant Secretary, Project Management Branch

Mr Kevin Nixon, Executive Director, Overseas Property Office and Services

Mr Luke Williams, Assistant Secretary, Diplomatic Security Branch

### **In-Camera Hearing**

Five witnesses

