

Additional Estimates 2021-22 – Department of Defence QON Index

Department	Portfolio Q No	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Department of Defence	1	David Van	310 St Kilda Road	<p>Senator VAN: Can I just go back to some of the questions that I put both in the estimates hearing but also on notice? It's my firm opinion that the answers to those questions were anything but full or complete, and I'll just go through some of them quickly-more as highlights of what I'm talking about. I put 11 questions on notice, all dealing with an estate at 310 St Kilda Road, where we established in the last estimates that it's been vacant for 30-odd years, has not been used and has been left to fall into disrepair over those 30 years. It was put on the list of properties to be disposed of, I think eight or nine years ago now. Is that correct, Ms Perkins?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: Yes, the property at 310 St Kilda Road was first placed on our surplus list in 2015.</p> <p>Senator VAN: In question 6, 7, 8 and 9, I asked how this building had been left to fall into disrepair, leaving it now with a repair bill of some \$15 million, which, if it hadn't been left, would have been disposed of already, most likely via a sale to another level of government.</p> <p>First, it was negotiated with the state government of Victoria. Those negotiations were frustrated. It was then negotiated with City of Melbourne, and, again, those negotiations were frustrated, mostly by your division allowing this building to fall into disrepair. I put some clear questions to you on notice, but the answers are anything but clear. In fact, the answer to questions 7, 8 and 9 was just:</p> <p>See answer to question 6. When I asked: This 2011 report from your own department gave strong recommendation to fixing the damage, why was this ignored? All you talked about on that was: Defence also continues to preserve the security integrity of the building ... Yet it's clear from your own reports that the integrity of the building has failed and is failing. How do you not espond to my questions more fully than that?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I have in front of me the answer to that question. The security integrity of the building hasn't failed, but we have certainly had a good look at the property after the third failed sale attempt. We have commenced a range of works to make the building safe for broader repairs to be undertaken. That work has commenced in the last few weeks. I'm happy to step you through that.</p> <p>Senator VAN: No, I'm more interested in this, because there has been a clear failure-certainly over recent years. Are you familiar with both your 2011 report and the Defence Heritage Toolkit?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: Yes, I am.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Are you aware of the part-and I will table this-that says: Regular inspections and maintenance are essential, and save time and money down the track.</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I think the more important point to establish first is the way in which we deal with surplus</p>	Hansard	24-25

			<p>properties and those properties we have deemed to no longer be of use to the estate. I'm happy to talk through where we've gotten to with this particular property. The estate is vast, and I think it's important for the committee to understand that. The estate is almost three million hectares, with 70 bases and 637 properties-</p> <p>Senator VAN: I'm not interested in all of those. Can we stick to 310 St Kilda Road, please?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: and 30,000 structures, which gives us a very substantial job every year to maintain the operating function of the estate, primarily to support ADF capability. We take our heritage responsibilities very seriously but, once we declare a property surplus, it has been common practice over many decades to cease investing in it, other than the minimum standards necessary to maintain safety and integrity. In the case of 310 St Kilda Road, work has occurred over the years around safety. There were roof repairs done at some point.</p> <p>Senator VAN: I'm aware of what has been done. What I'm talking about is what hasn't been done.</p> <p>Ms Perkins: My point is that once we declare a property surplus and we move towards disposal of that property it has been practice to cease investing in that property, because we're investing in the properties we are using.</p> <p>Senator VAN: But that does not excuse you from your heritage obligations, am I correct?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I think that is correct, and that is why I have worked with my team to provide advice to the minister and to start a process to do a detailed assessment of how we remediate that property and care for it into the future.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Ms Perkins, as you're aware, prior to coming into this place, and certainly since, I have been talking about this property-its heritage value for all Australians but for Victorians and Melburnians in particular. All of my concerns have been ignored over this time. Why, over last few weeks, have you been now looking at this? You do realise you have obligations to report any heritage damage to the environment minister. Has that been done?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I don't believe there is any heritage damage to the property.</p> <p>Senator VAN: I totally disagree with you and would happily walk you through and show you where there is damage. You have obligations under the law to protect this building.</p> <p>Ms Perkins: Certainly. We take our obligations under the law very seriously.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Well, why is it in such disrepair such that it's now left with a \$15 million repair bill?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I can't speak to the decisions that were made before the time I was in this role. I took on this role in August. But we are now looking at how we-</p> <p>Senator VAN: Okay. Would you take on notice a detailed explanation of why this building has been left in disrepair?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: We would be happy to take it on notice, but-</p> <p>Senator VAN: Let me finish please, Ms Perkins. I'll let you finish after this, but please let me finish. I also asked for detailed amounts of what money has been spent on it in my questions on notice. You totally ignored those. Will you now undertake to provide me with the information I asked for in the last estimates</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>and I'm now asking for in this estimates?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: We can certainly attempt to, and we'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator VAN: You would run a-</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator Van, please let Ms Perkins finish, as you asked her to do before.</p> <p>Ms Perkins: What I would have to ascertain with my team when we look at the way that we undertake maintenance across Melbourne generally and the Victoria Barracks site separately, is whether we would have that fidelity of detail over the years. But we will certainly have a look at that for you.</p> <p>Senator VAN: I'm sure the department's CFO can provide that detail. Would that be correct, Secretary?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We'll ask the CFO to work with the right group to see what amount of information is available.</p>		
Department of Defence	2	Eric Abetz	Anglesea Barracks	<p>CHAIR: This is a very convenient time. Thank you, Senator Van. I've just finished a bit of paperwork. In relation to the Anglesea Barracks, can you give us a brief explanation of the good funding announcement that was made recently? Can I take that funding announcement in relation to Anglesea Barracks as an indication that Defence has finally thrown away the idea of selling the barracks-something which was being scoped from as early as when the good Dr Brendan Nelson was the Minister for Defence? I've been fighting a rearguard action against that for many years. Now that we see reinvestment in Anglesea Barracks of a considerable amount of money, can I have the assurance that the sale of Anglesea Barracks is now off the political agenda? I don't think any defence minister has ever supported it. Certain elements in the bureaucracy of defence continually did scoping studies and valuations preparing for a sale, despite the fact that every Minister for Defence from Dr Nelson onwards was against it. Can I have an assurance that it's off the sale list, for a start?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: Thank you for your question. I'm going to see if I have been outfumbled by my colleague Dan Fankhauser to get to the details of the new investment.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I can assure you that it isn't on the divestment list at the moment.</p> <p>CHAIR: What do you mean 'at the moment'? That's the sort of language that I do not want to hear, so let's try again.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: If I could repeat that, Anglesea Barracks is not being divested.</p> <p>CHAIR: Full stop!</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: Full stop.</p> <p>CHAIR: Thank you.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: We are investing in the property. For your information, more broadly across Tasmania this financial year we've \$17.5 million of new infrastructure investment across a range of sites.</p> <p>CHAIR: And on Anglesea Barracks do you have the split?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I don't have that figure. I can get it for you and provide it on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: If you could, so this bracket of questions can finish on a happy note at least from this senator. Thank you very much.</p>	Hansard	26-27
Department of Defence	3	Kimberley Kitching	High Level Frigate Capability	<p>Senator KITCHING: I'm just going to ask a few questions on frigates. I think Ms Lutz, or maybe it was Mr Dalton, mentioned 23 high-level requirements. Could you let me know what they are?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: These are the 23 high-level capability requirements defined during the initial procurement stages, I believe.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Yes. Did you mention them, Ms Lutz, or was it Mr Dalton?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I think Mr Dalton did, but I'll try to go from here. The 23 high-level requirements are largely around combat system performance and performance of the ship and what is expected in terms of the</p>	Hansard	37

				<p>equipment that we have added on and that performance. Without going into the technical-</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Can you give me all 23? I'm happy for them to be on notice.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I'll have to take them on notice.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: That's fine. I wouldn't be surprised if you knew them off the top of your head.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I know some of them, but not all of them.</p>		
Department of Defence	4	Timothy Ayres	Office of Defence Industry Support	<p>Senator AYRES: We're just doing a bit of scheduling-another example of cross-parliamentary cooperation to make these proceedings as useful and in the public interest as we can. I have a set of questions about the Office of Defence Industry Support, the announcements that have been made there and the gap between of course what the government's announced and what's been delivered. I want to explore that for a little while. Minister Price announced the creation of this office on 29 November and said there will be an Office of Defence Industry Support within each state and territory. Are you in a position to tell me how many currently operating Office of Defence Industry Supports there are? Mr Fraser, welcome-I think you were being called out earlier in the day but didn't get to the front table.</p> <p>Mr Fraser: I'll be shortly joined by Ms Fran Rush who is First Assistant Secretary Australian Industry Capability.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Good afternoon, Ms Rush.</p> <p>Mr Fraser: Actually, I'll defer to her now to announce the numbers as we've been recruiting them.</p> <p>Ms Rush: From what I heard it was current numbers?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: The commitment the minister made in the announcement was an Office of Defence Industry Support in each state and territory. How many currently operating offices are there?</p> <p>Ms Rush: As of today, about 59 across-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: That's 59 offices?</p> <p>Ms Rush: Sorry; are you asking how many officers or offices?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Offices-without the 'r', if that makes any sense.</p> <p>Ms Rush: That does make sense.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: If there are 59 offices, I'll do a run around Lake Burley Griffin for the committee!</p> <p>CHAIR: Please make it 59!</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I think the minister's commitment was for one in each state and territory.</p> <p>Ms Rush: There is at least one in each state and territory.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Currently operating?</p> <p>Ms Rush: Currently operating</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Open?</p> <p>Ms Rush: Yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Can you table for me, later in the day, where those offices are-a schedule of the offices and their addresses.</p> <p>Ms Rush: What I can tell you is that most of the offices outside of the ACT are currently within Defence establishments, so they'll be on bases. I can give you a list.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And will that be the permanent arrangement?</p> <p>Ms Rush: No. There is work underway with our Security and Estate Group to establish different offices right throughout the country, including in regional areas.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes, because the commitment was to have offices that were there for industry, wasn't it?</p> <p>One, as I understand it, has been opened.</p> <p>Ms Rush: Yes.</p>	Hansard	38-39

				<p>Senator AYRES: What you're telling me is that, in the other territory and in the states, the staff who have been allocated to that are currently operating out of Defence bases-</p> <p>Ms Rush: Co-located within Defence bases, yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: When will physical offices be established?</p> <p>Ms Rush: Over time, once we identify some different locations. I don't have that specific information. I'll have to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Mr Fraser: I'll assist. The first of those separate ones is about to be established. We're in the process of sorting that with Estate and Infrastructure. If it might assist you and the committee, I can read in the numbers that are in each of the state locations.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: These are on bases, aren't they?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: It's a combination of bases and co-located-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I think your colleague said 59 staff.</p> <p>Ms Rush: That's right.</p> <p>Mr Fraser: That's correct, but they're also co-located in other facilities-not necessarily just in Defence bases but in facilities that assist industry. As you would be aware, the forming of the Office of Defence Industry Support was as a single interface with defence industry, and we're progressively moving these new offices into locations that will afford that.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: As for the offices themselves-the premises-we have one premise?</p> <p>Mr Fraser: Yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: The others are not delivered yet. We're still waiting. So it's a total of seven to go-is that right?</p> <p>Ms Rush: There'll be more than seven ultimately.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: There'll be some regional footprint?</p> <p>Ms Rush: Yes. Over time, there'll be the regional offices in Western Australia and Queensland and also in New South Wales, so there'll be more than seven.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Let's go to 'over time'. How many premises have been identified?</p> <p>Ms Rush: We're focusing at the moment on Western Australia, and we do have some existing-again, colocated- premises in South Australia. At the moment, I think there are two or three, but I'd have to get that detail and take that on notice.</p>		
Department of Defence	5	Jordon Steele-John	ADF Recruitment	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: That's okay. I thought that that might be the case. In relation to the first question, how many people were recruited by the ADF in 2021?</p> <p>Ms Greig: How many in total?</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes.</p> <p>Major Gen. Stothart: We normally cut our data by financial year. We can cut that data for the calendar year to give you that specific answer, but for financial year 2020-21 the ADF recruited across the permanent reserve forces plus our gap-year program a total of 7,057 personnel.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Out of that 7,057, how many that were recruited were under the age of 21?</p> <p>Major Gen. Stothart: We will have that data. We will need to go back in and cut the age bracket to give you that specific information. If I could take that on notice, we will return with that.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Okay. I'm just trying to get any kind of age range data that you've got. Out of the overall recruits in the last financial year, do you have anything around average age or ideas of that nature that you could give us?</p> <p>Major Gen. Stothart: I couldn't at the moment. I could let you know our target range audience.</p>	Hansard	42-43

				<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes, that would be useful.</p> <p>Major Gen. Stothart: Noting that we take Australians of all ages, within reason, 17 to 24 is our target audience for recruitment.</p>		
Department of Defence	6	Jordon Steele-John	ADF School information Sessions	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Lovely. In terms of your school recruitment sessions-because I understand that's an active part of your recruitment program-do you collect information as to how many public schools run those recruitment sessions versus private schools?</p> <p>Major Gen. Stothart: I understand that, again, we do have that data. We record which schools we go to to run information sessions. I do not have that with me now. I can take it on notice. That process normally runs through contact with the school careers adviser, in agreement with the principal, and then an education team will go out and brief students on potential careers in the Australian Defence Force. I could say that in the last financial year- the last two years-physical school tours and education sessions have not occurred to a great degree, due to public health orders and restrictions on gatherings.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes, of course. Thank you for that. That section of your recruitment program that engages with schools, both public and private-is that a particular section of the recruitment program that is focused on that area of recruitment?</p> <p>Ms Greig: Perhaps I could jump in there. We call it attraction: how do we attract members to the Australian Defence Force? As part of attraction, there are a number of interdependent activities: engagement with schools, trying to educate in terms of what the ADF offers as a career in Army, Navy and Air Force. That's one element. Other elements include engaging through social media, advertising and so forth. We also have liaison officers who are engaged in local communities.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: In terms of just that top-line number, regardless of the breakdown of public and private, for the financial year 2020-21, for this school based attraction sessions, if that is your terminology-</p> <p>Ms Greig: In terms of the school engagement, in usual circumstances we often talk about 'visits'. That is one aspect. I think your question was how many?</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Greig: As General Stothart said, in the last two years, in the COVID environment-</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: They've dropped off.</p> <p>Ms Greig: But we have done virtual engagement. We'd be keen to share, perhaps on notice, what that virtual engagement is. Defence Force recruiting has been particularly innovative in looking at the different ways in which we can engage with the potential candidate community. And the next stage of recruitment, post engagement and attraction, is selection. So, we've done a lot to put our processes and our approaches into a virtual environment.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Do you have the number of virtual visits conducted in the financial year?</p> <p>Ms Greig: We could see what we can provide to you in response to that. I think we can. I'm just not sure of the fidelity, but we can, on notice.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Thank you. But it would be in a rough range of-hundreds? Or would it be smaller than that?</p> <p>Ms Greig: Given the virtual nature, I'd rather take that on notice-</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Of course.</p>	Hansard	43-44
Department of Defence	7	Jim Molan	ADF Suicide Rates	<p>Senator MOLAN: Very simply, and please take it on notice: could I have the number of ADF members who have committed suicide who were aged between 17 and- was 25 your upper limit?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Seventeen to 24 was the target range that was spoken of.</p> <p>Senator MOLAN: Thank you. Could I please have the number of suicides in that target range, say, from</p>	Hansard	47

				<p>Senator Steele-John's period, 2001 to 2019. Thank you.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If you could include in that those who left between that age and have committed suicide, that would be great too.</p> <p>Senator MOLAN: Sorry, what was that? I missed it.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If you could include the ones who left between 17 to 25 who actually committed suicide as well. That's going to be difficult, because they don't keep records.</p>		
Department of Defence	8	Jacqui Lambie	ADF Suicide Rates	<p>Senator MOLAN: Very simply, and please take it on notice: could I have the number of ADF members who have committed suicide who were aged between 17 and- was 25 your upper limit?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Seventeen to 24 was the target range that was spoken of.</p> <p>Senator MOLAN: Thank you. Could I please have the number of suicides in that target range, say, from Senator Steele-John's period, 2001 to 2019. Thank you.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If you could include in that those who left between that age and have committed suicide, that would be great too.</p> <p>Senator MOLAN: Sorry, what was that? I missed it.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If you could include the ones who left between 17 to 25 who actually committed suicide as well. That's going to be difficult, because they don't keep records.</p>	Hansard	47
Department of Defence	9	Jacqui Lambie	RMC Duntroon	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I'd like to ask about the inquiry into the goings-on at RMC-Duntroon between 2009 and 2011.</p> <p>Mr D'Amico: That's not something that's in my bailiwick, unfortunately.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Would you like to talk to me about them?</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: I think you're referring to an IGADF inquiry, and there is no witness here in Defence who is in a position to speak to that. And, if it's an ongoing inquiry, the IG won't speak to it either.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. I think there are a few people in here that are very aware of that inquiry. I'd like to know, first of all, whether the doctor that was there at that time has now been referred to AHPRA for the damage that was done to those recruits.</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: Because it is an inquiry that, as I understand, is ongoing, undertaken under the authorities of the Inspector-General of the Australian Defence Force, we cannot make any comment.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: It's actually not ongoing. It's finished. I know that because I have the letters here. That is now finished. It's not an ongoing inquiry.</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: Then we'll find out what we can say.</p>	Hansard	47
Department of Defence	10	Jacqui Lambie	Medical Record requirements	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Is Defence considering whether the loss of medical records is a breach of any legislative or regulatory requirements with regard to keeping medical records?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sharkey: I'm not sure I really understand. Are you asking if we are considering it in relation to that particular IGADF inquiry?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: No, I'm asking you to consider it altogether, for anybody. When the loss of medical records from Defence is a breach, is there any chance of legislative or regulatory requirements with regard to keeping medical records-</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sharkey: There are extant legislative and regulatory requirements that Defence complies with with the management of all records, including our health records.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So, back in 2010, the loss of records would have been a breach of those requirements, yes? If you lost medical records back in 2010, at Duntroon, that would have been a breach of the requirements, whether they were your regulatory requirements or legislation. You would have breached your own rules, correct?</p>	Hansard	49

				<p>Senator Birmingham: You're now outside the general handling of medical records and into-</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: No, because Defence has rules and regulations on these. Have they gone outside their own rules and regulations? That's what I'm asking.</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: We'll have to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Oh, okay. You do that.</p> <p>Gen. Campbell: We can't give you a clear answer today.</p>		
Department of Defence	11	Jordon Steele-John	Reference Accidents	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Thank you. This question in relation to modelling may be for Navy but it may be for the department. With the increased tempo of rotation that is expected as part of the AUKUS agreement framework, has there been any modelling undertaken as to the environmental or public health impact of what we might term a 'critical accident' or any other incidents in relation to nuclear material on relevant populations?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Not within Navy. I suspect that might be directed towards ARPANSA or ANSTO, unless Admiral Mead has some information on that.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: ARPANSA, which is the regulatory body in Australia, is the organisation that has the very deep-level skills in modelling. I have been up there several times to talk to the CEO and officials of ARPANSA. I've spoken to the modellers. They have been doing work. We are working with ARPANSA at the moment. ARPANSA are deeply engaged. We have an ARPANSA person in the task force. I can take your specific question on notice, if you like, but we have had deep engagement with ARPANSA. They are helping us in our engagement with US and UK officials as we look to implement the highest level of safety and security safeguards for our nuclear powered submarine program.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: If you could do that, that would be wonderful.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: Absolutely.</p>	Hansard	58-59
Department of Defence	12	Kimberley Kitching	NPSTF Staffing	<p>Senator KITCHING: No, and I understand that. I was going to ask you about the relevant clauses, but I won't ask you that because I understand how you'll have to negotiate. I'm back on the Nuclear-Powered Submarine Taskforce. Is the task force fully staffed yet? If not, how many places or what percentage needs to be filled?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: As of this morning we have 201 people working on the task force. We were 200 yesterday morning, but a female midshipman joined the task force yesterday, fresh-faced and excited-</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Congratulations.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: Yes, I know it's terrific. She's about to transfer over to a logistics officer. She is uberexcited to be part of the task force and to see Navy's, the Defence Force's and this nation's future nuclear-powered submarine begin to develop. So we have 201 people working on the task force. We're growing all the time. I think in previous hearings I have spoken to you before. At the first time we were about 130. We continue to grow. We continue to flex as well, depending on the bodies of work we have to do. We bring in other people from other government departments. We have a very heavy footprint from DFAT. We have people from the Attorney-General's Department, ARPANSA, ANSTO and education departments. As bodies of work begin to development and we need those extra resources as a whole-of-government department we draw upon other areas and that, but we will continue to grow. Particularly over the next couple of months and into the next year and beyond, the task force will grow as well.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet is involved in co-chairing some of the joint steering groups, so PM&C is very heavily involved because it's a leaders level initiative, so it's very appropriate that PM&C is involved. Because of the whole counterproliferation safeguards issues DFAT is absolutely involved. We've had DFAT people travelling with us on some of these visits. They will be</p>	Hansard	66-67

				<p>involved as well in engaging with our UK and US visitors who are here at the moment. So it is genuinely a whole-of-government effort. We see that in the composition of the task force and in the way in which the governance arrangements are being exercised.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: There are multiple committees. PM&C are co-chairing some. Is Defence the other co-chair? Is it done under the eight key areas?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: Absolutely. Each of those eight areas is a working group. There is an Australian footprint, a UK footprint and a US footprint, and those three footprints work together. The Australian footprint will bring in representatives from other government departments in order to specialise in expertise. A good example would be the working group on non-proliferation. We bring in experts from ASNO, ARWA, legal people, non-proliferation experts in DFAT. DFAT have been generous in providing us people. We engage with ambassadors of DFAT, so it is very much whole-of-government in Australia and working with our partners to solve a very complex problem.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Is it possible to get an organisation chart of the task force?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: We can do that. We can give you an organisation chart of the task force. You will see pretty quickly that the way we are structured very much is harmonised and synthesised to these working groups so we can effectively and efficiently deliver what government and the people of Australia are expecting us to in a timely manner.</p>		
Department of Defence	13	Kimberley Kitching	Independent Chairs	<p>Senator KITCHING: I have some questions about the ship acquisition surface combatants engineering team's report on the frigates program. This is a report revealed by Mr Packham in The Australian earlier this month. The ship acquisition surface combatants branch is the CASG branch responsible for the Hunter class frigates program-that's correct?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: The covering minute says, 'The report provides the engineering team's appraisal of the state of the Hunter class frigate technical and process issues in support of system definition review exit.' Are you able to explain the system definition review process?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes. The system definition review follows on from the system requirements review when high-level requirements are set. The purpose of the review is to determine that you are able to set your functional baseline- your mission system requirements, which are your performance requirements-and that you have sufficiently progressed in terms of design to progress to the next stage, which is preliminary design, followed by detailed design. That period was commenced in March of 2021 and completed for the mission system in November of 2021. The system definition review is also overseen by two independent chairs. So, decisions to progress to the next stage are made by those independent chairs.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Who are the independent chairs? Ms Lutz: They are appointed: one was appointed from industry; and one was appointed from Defence.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: And what are their names?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: One was Commodore Rob Elliott. Sorry, I don't know the person from BAE Systems-we'll get that for you.</p>	Hansard	5
Department of Defence	14	Timothy Ayres	Visit Policy	<p>CHAIR: Senator Ayres. Minister, as we approach the election, could you tell me what the government's policy is and perhaps what Defence's policy is on candidate visits to defence bases? If there's somebody in the department who can tell us what the policy is, would that be better?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'm sure the department can talk about how they handle visits in different</p>	Hansard	53

			<p>circumstances at different times, including during a campaign environment.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: There is policy. I don't have it with me at the moment. We'll see if we can get that quickly. But, in terms of-</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I note that the Liberal candidate for Macquarie recently visited a base there with the Prime Minister and took part in his press conference. Requests from Labor candidates to visit have been denied by the minister's office before. I just want to understand what the actual policy framework is. Mr Yannopoulos, I think you're about to tell me.</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: The policy for the upcoming election is not yet settled. The normal convention is that the Leader of the Opposition and Deputy Leader of the Opposition can visit bases and sites and the Prime Minister and the defence minister can continue.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I was about to come to what happens during the election. I was wondering what the policy is now, and perhaps that could be provided later on during the day. But what you're saying is that it is not settled at this stage but the current understanding of Defence is that it is the leader and deputy leader, the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister-</p> <p>Mr Yannopoulos: And the defence minister.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And the defence minister.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: My understanding, and we will seek clarity, is that if the Prime Minister is visiting a defence establishment in normal times then the composition of the Prime Minister's party is a matter for the Prime Minister and that, outside that caretaker period, it would be inappropriate, I would suggest, for the department to have a view about who the Prime Minister, or the minister, wanted to take with him when he was travelling.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: We have had discussions about red carpets being provide and trumpets and all sorts of things at prime ministerial visits. I'd just gently say-as gently as I can, because I'm not a very-</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: You're not renowned for your gentle observations, Senator Ayres.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I'm really trying to grow as a person, Minister, and be more gentle. But, in this environment, I reckon it's pretty important to treat defence, and Defence as an institution, with some respect and care during this election. Given what has occurred this week, I reckon a little bit of thought ought to go into that. So that'll be communicated to the parties, I assume, and I'll see the policy afterwards.</p>			
Department of Defence	15	Jordon Steele-John	Modelling	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I do. Thank you for giving me that context. On 29 October, we had the visit to HMAS Stirling, I believe, by a Royal Navy nuclear powered submarine?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: It was on 29 October. Had that vessel suffered a reactor and hull breach, for instance, or in any way a reactor incident that required venting of nuclear material, what would've the plan been in response to that quite serious event?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: As part of the diplomatic clearance that is provided by government to visiting ships, obviously there's a period of notification. Typically, for a visit, it's around 42 days. In this case, HMAS Astute's visit, it was shorter than that, which did mean that we had to accelerate the requirements with respect to approval. That was done. The requirements that need to be met are in terms of the ability of the host port-in this case, HMAS Stirling-to provide the necessary security, logistical support and, ultimately, safety around that vessel. This was done as part of the broader contribution by the state government. They need to be able to demonstrate against a reference accident that there are the facilities</p>	Hansard	59

				<p>in place, within the state, to deal with any medical requirements that might result from a nuclear leak. With respect to infrastructure, we need to be able to demonstrate that we could, if need be, remove or tow the nuclear powered warship away from the wharf and to a place of safety. Ultimately, with respect to any approvals or actions that need to be taken by ANSTO-the authority that would look to coordinate any response from a nuclear accident, in terms of release of nuclear material into the atmosphere-they would then coordinate the necessary actions that we as Navy or other agencies might need to take.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I understand that. Just to give you a flavour of the specifics I'm looking for, from your answer I take it that there is a circumstance under which towing of the vessel away from the wharf is an action that may need to be taken. Is that correct?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: That's correct. There are a set of procedures, that we would need to be able to demonstrate, that we could take in the event of a nuclear accident.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: In this specific circumstance, only because my point of reference is that area of Western Australia, where would you be towing the vessel to?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I'd need to refer that question to the panel. There would be options based on the reference accident. It may not need to be towed at all but, in terms of the various scenarios, potential inter-gauge roads, potentially past Rottnest Island, I'd need to come back to you with detail against a specific reference accident.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I understand. If you could take that on notice? What I would be particularly interested in as well is what you can tell me, on notice, in relation to the creation of the reference accidents that you refer to. What data inputs were used for the creation of those reference accidents?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: It's only because I think this needs to be an informed discussion on the potential impacts of these vessels, and one of the ways we can weigh that up is knowing how the risk assessments have been done in relation to population impacts and environmental impacts. Could you also take on notice the threshold for the scenarios that would require the removal of the vessel from the wharf. I imagine that, depending on the incident, it could be removal to locations A, B and C. If that is the case, would you be able to provide that to us on notice.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Yes, I will take that on notice.</p>		
Department of Defence	16	Jordon Steele-John	Afghanistan	<p>The Department of Defence Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Plan indicated that a plan for compensation of Afghan victims would be in place by the end of the 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was the plan not published by end of 2021? • When will the plan be published? • Which other government departments have been involved in drafting the plan? • Which government department will be in charge of implementing the plan? • What is the implementation timeline? • Will the plan allow for compensation to be paid in other cases that may come to light, beyond those cases for which compensation was recommended by the IGADF report? • Will the plan allow for other forms of reparation beyond compensation, as called for last year by civil society groups from Afghanistan and Australia? • How many reports have been provided to date by the Afghanistan Inquiry Implementation Oversight Panel to the Defence Minister? • Will those reports be published at any stage? What measures have been taken to strengthen oversight of legal services on operations? 	Written	

				<p>The Department of Defence Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Plan indicates that the "Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Overview" will be updated quarterly to reflect progress. Have any quarterly updates been published to date? If not, why not?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Department planning to publish progress updates in Dari and Pashto to make information more accessible to people from Afghanistan? If yes, when will updates in these languages be published? If not, why not? If yes, is there provision for audio format of this information? <p>The Department of Defence Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Plan states that force preparation training in relation to Law of Armed Conflict will be updated and that 'personal experiences' will be leveraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have those updates been made to training? • What is the nature and content of those updates? • What has been done to address the IGADF Inquiry report's recommendation around education on the causes of war crimes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the occupation in Afghanistan at an end, does the military have any plans on conducting a thorough study of the critical impacts of its presence in civilian spaces? • Who will conduct this research? • How will its findings feed back into military's operations in the future? • Will this report be communicated to the public? 		
Department of Defence	17	Jordon Steele-John	Sri Lanka	<p>What is the detail of any training/ cooperation or program that the ADF, or Australian Navy has with the Sri Lankan Navy?</p> <p>Who has ADF/Defence engaged with in the Sri Lankan Navy, when and for what reasons?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	18	Jordon Steele-John	Kimberley Mineral Sands	<p>Kimberley Mineral Sands</p> <p>1. Given the possible military applications of some of the products from the Thunderbird mineral sands project, e.g., zirconium or titanium, has NAIF consulted with the Department of Defence over the application of the Defence and Strategic Goods List to the project? If not, why not?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	20	Peter Whish-Wilson	UAS & UFO	<p>During the last Supplementary Budget Estimates (in response to a question on notice), the Department of Defence advised that there is no protocol for reporting or recording Unidentified Aerial Phenomena or Unidentified Flying Objects.</p> <p>In a scenario that an airforce pilot, or airforce personnel on the ground (such as monitoring radar), detects or sights an aircraft over Australian airspace, or in their sphere of operation, but is unable to identify the nature of the craft, what is the process/protocol for pilot and/or personnel to report their observation?</p> <p>If there is an existing protocol – how many such observations or sightings have been made in the past 10 years?</p> <p>If there is no protocol – by what means does the air force maintain the security of Australian Airspace in dealing with unidentified craft?</p> <p>What encouragement is given to pilots to make reports of aircraft they cannot identify?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	21	David Van	Previous QoNs 310 St Kilda Road	<p>1. In reference to the previous Question's on notice I put to the Department of Defence (Question No. 107) on 5 November 2021, from the Supplementary Budget Estimates</p> <p>- Who in the Department approved the responses to these questions?</p>	Written	

				<p>- What process was followed in responding to these questions? - Did the Ministers office sign off on these responses?</p> <p>2. In reference to the same set of questions (Question 2) I asked "Can Defence provide the Senate its detailed assessment of the property that concluded it should be disposed of?" and was not provided a detailed assessment. Can Defence provide me with this detailed assessment?</p> <p>3. In reference to the same set of questions (Question 3) I asked "Can Defence provide details of its correspondence to the Department of Finance to list the property on the Commonwealths internal register, I believe called "Clearing House", offering it to other departments prior to it being declared surplus to Commonwealth needs?". I was not provided with this correspondence. Can the department provide the Senate this correspondence?</p> <p>4. In reference to the same set of questions (Question 8) I requested "How much money has Defence saved by not maintaining the site?" and was not provided a dollar figure. Can the Department provide the Senate with a figure on how much money, in dollar figures, was saved by not maintaining the site?</p> <p>5. In reference to the same set of questions (Question 9) I asked "In Estimates the officials said there had been maintenance of the external parts of the building. Please provide detailed accounts on what has been spent on the building and on what?" I was not provided with a detailed account. Can the Department provide me with a detailed account of exactly what maintenance has been performed on the building, on what dates this occurred and how much these maintenance operations cost in dollar figures?</p> <p>6. In reference to your response to question 11, Can the Department provide me with information on exactly what studies are being undertaken, what options are being assessed and how much these studies will cost?</p>		
Department of Defence	22	Jacqui Lambie	<p>Findings of "Widespread Unacceptable Behaviour" and "Significant Long-Lasting Negative impact"</p>	<p>These questions relate to the IGADF Inquiry into allegations of unacceptable behaviour and medical mismanagement at RMC Duntroon, and matters relating to the library fire in March 2011, which was commissioned on the 16th of October 2020 by the Chief of Defence Force, and delivered to the Chief of Defence Force and the Chief of Army in December 2021.</p> <p>I have viewed the outcomes letters sent to Mr Matthew Smith and Mr Jason Atley from the Director of Inquiries and Investigations, Catherine Wallis, on the 5th of January 2022, with their permission.</p> <p>For clarity, the quotations contained in the following relate to statements made in relation to the IGADF inquiry in the letters that were sent to Mr Smith and Mr Atley.</p> <p>Findings of "Widespread Unacceptable Behaviour" and "Significant Long-Lasting Negative impact"</p> <p>2. Given the findings that the "widespread unacceptable behaviour" was witnessed by number of other RMC-D Cadets candidates who felt "disempowered" to complain, what further recommendations, if any, have been made by Defence or the IGADF to remind the RMC and ADF Chain of Command that Staff Cadets should feel 'empowered" to complain when they experience or witness "unacceptable behaviour"?</p> <p>i. Please provide relevant Defence Instructions, and any other pro forma documents email or phone contact however described, to assist RMC Cadets to act on and complain when they experience or witness "widespread and unacceptable behaviour", following the outcomes of the inquiry.</p> <p>3. What direct response has the Chief of Army, Chief of Defence and the relevant Minister determined is</p>	Written	

				appropriate when regarding the findings of "widespread unacceptable behaviour", and that "Defence provided no mechanism, encouragement or empowered the opportunity to complain"?		
Department of Defence	23	Jacqui Lambie	Medical Treatment	<p>These questions relate to the IGADF Inquiry into allegations of unacceptable behaviour and medical mismanagement at RMC Duntroon, and matters relating to the library fire in March 2011, which was commissioned on the 16th of October 2020 by the Chief of Defence Force, and delivered to the Chief of Defence Force and the Chief of Army in December 2021.</p> <p>I have viewed the outcomes letters sent to Mr Matthew Smith and Mr Jason Atley from the Director of Inquiries and Investigations, Catherine Wallis, on the 5th of January 2022, with their permission.</p> <p>For clarity, the quotations contained in the following relate to statements made in relation to the IGADF inquiry in the letters that were sent to Mr Smith and Mr Atley.</p> <p>4. Regarding the Inquiry with respect to the "questionable" medical treatment by an RMC doctor and the response, if any from Duntroon Health Centre, to complaints raised, did the IGADF Inquiry officer consider it reasonable to request independent medical advice to review the concerns raised at the time by the Member's medical specialist on 20 November 2010 to determine if the treatment received and concerns raised indicated that it was sub optimal, reasonable or otherwise, done in accordance with best practice, may have or was likely to have caused a permanent aggravation or worsening of the condition? If not, why not?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	24	Jacqui Lambie	Commendation – RMC Library Fire 12 March 2011	6. If the IGADF Inquiry considered the Commendation complaint and noted that some RMC- Cadets were not "formally recognised for their important contribution during this terrible incident", why did the Inquiry limit itself as to whether the Commanding Officer was "present at the fire" as opposed to the further and substantive issues and questions raised by the RMC-D cadets as to whether the Commanding Officer's contribution during this terrible incident "was worthy of the commendation"?	Written	
Department of Defence	25	Jacqui Lambie	Restorative Justice	7. Did the IGADF Investigation consider or make representations prior to and following the release of the IGADF Report on 03 February 2022 that recommendations would be made, to the effect that given the IGADF Findings with respect to Unacceptable behaviour, questionable "Medical treatment" and missing medical records, that the RMC-D cadets, in particular Mr Atley and Mr Smith would be offered the opportunity to engage directly with the Defence with respect to "restorative justice"?	Written	
Department of Defence	26	Jacqui Lambie	Medical Treatment	<p>These questions relate to the IGADF Inquiry into allegations of unacceptable behaviour and medical mismanagement at RMC Duntroon, and matters relating to the library fire in March 2011, which was commissioned on the 16th of October 2020 by the Chief of Defence Force, and delivered to the Chief of Defence Force and the Chief of Army in December 2021.</p> <p>I have viewed the outcomes letters sent to Mr Matthew Smith and Mr Jason Atley from the Director of Inquiries and Investigations, Catherine Wallis, on the 5th of January 2022, with their permission.</p> <p>For clarity, the quotations contained in the following relate to statements made in relation to the IGADF inquiry in the letters that were sent to Mr Smith and Mr Atley.</p> <p>5. With respect to the Defence "lost records of medical treatment from 2010" does Defence acknowledge the loss constitutes a breach of any extant legislation, Defence Regulations or any other requirements under law or Regulation to ensure the appropriate and safe record keeping of RMC-D cadets' personal medical information? If so, what are Defence's obligations and under what Statutory or any or Regularity Authority are Defence required to maintain safe custody of individuals medical records?</p>	Written	

Department of Defence	27	Jacqui Lambie	DPN	<p>Questions for Defence / the Minister about the misuse of the Defence Protected Network (DPN) on the 15th of November 2021:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On 26 Dec 21, there was a media article published by the Daily Telegraph ("Defence force Wikipedia clean-up operation to rid internet of army scandals", Anton Rose) that alleges that Defence cyber employees were engaged in a Wikipedia cleanup operation where all references to media articles of the allegations at the Sydney University Regiment (SUR) were removed from the SUR Wikipedia page. Is Defence investigating the allegations in the article, or has an investigation been completed? 2. Did Defence authorise any operation to clean up the SUR Wikipedia page? If so, who authorised this operation? 3. There was content uploaded to the SUR Wikipedia page which alleged that I said several things in the Senate chamber which I have never said, as is verifiable by the Hansards. It also alleged that a male cadet from the Regiment is under investigation for sexually assaulting 50 other male cadets. It further alleged that the Chief of Army had removed this cadet from training and the Army. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Was the dissemination of misinformation about comments allegedly made by me authorised by Defence or the ADF? b. Is the ADF investigating a cadet for sexually assaulting 50 male officer cadets at SUR? c. Did the Chief of Army remove a cadet at SUR from training and the Army? 4. The Sydney University Regiment's Wikipedia page audit history shows that this occurred from the IP address 203.6.77.2 that appears to belong to the Australian Defence Organisation and is connected to the hostname web02.defence.gov.au. Does Defence own or utilise this IP address and hostname? 5. Does the upload of this material to the regiment's Wikipedia page from a Defence network breach Defence policy and/or constitute a service offence? 6. Did Defence remove the comments from Wikipedia after it became aware of the matter, or did Defence direct their removal? If so, when did this occur? Who authorised/directed this removal to occur? 7. Does Defence know the identity of the individual who uploaded this content from a Defence Network to the SUR Wikipedia page? If so, has this individual been suspended from their position? 8. Has any member received administrative or disciplinary action for using the DPN to post this content on Wikipedia? 	Written	
Department of Defence	28	Jacqui Lambie	Public Interest Disclosures	<p>Questions for Defence / the CDF about Public Interest Disclosures made to the Department of Defence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Between June to August 2021, was the Chief of Army's office (including SSIM-A), forwarded an email that provided an update to members who had made Public Interest Disclosures to a superior officer concerning the Sydney University Regiment? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If yes, did the Chief of Army, the Chief of Army's Office, or any individual within Army Headquarters show or otherwise further disclose this email to any other person? If so, who? and; b. Did any member of the ADF use the PID update email for any reason, including, but not limited to, use in a fact find or investigation, disciplinary action, or administrative action? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. If yes, did HQ 2 Div use the PID update email as part of a fact-finding investigation and subsequent administrative action against the individual who submitted the PID? 2. Was the Chief of Army, the Chief of Army's office or Army Headquarters notified by the Defence Public Interest Disclosure Cell at the Department of Defence that they had assessed that reprisal was likely occurring against the officer who submitted the Public Interest Disclosure? 3. Is Defence currently investigating alleged unauthorised sharing of Public Interest Disclosure(s) relating to unacceptable behaviour at SUR? 	Written	

				a. If so, would such allegations, if substantiated, constitute a breach of Defence's obligations under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013 (Cwth)?		
Department of Defence	29	Jacqui Lambie	Comcare Reporting	<p>1. Is Defence aware that Comcare reportedly only found out about the matters at the Sydney University Regiment in 2021 due to media reporting on the matter by the Guardian?</p> <p>2. If any, what date did the ADF notify Comcare of the matters at the Sydney University Regiment before being served a Sect 155 notice by Comcare?</p> <p>3. Why did the ADF fail to make notifiable reports to Comcare, as per Army's legislated obligations under Part 3 of the Work Health Safety Act 2011?</p> <p>4. What date/s has the ADF received Sect 155 notices from Comcare?</p> <p>5. Is Defence cooperating with the Comcare Investigation into the Sydney University Regiment?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	30	Jacqui Lambie	Investigations at Sydney University Regiment	<p>1. I understand that the terms of reference for the IGADF inquiry only include GAP Year and Full-time cadets and do not include directions to investigate the mistreatment of cadets who were at SUR on Army Reserve Training Days, yet I am aware that allegations have been made by some of these cadets. How are Defence investigating these allegations, seeing as they do not fall within the scope of the IGADF inquiry?</p> <p>2. Is maladministration by the regiment included in the IGADF Directions for Inquiry into the Sydney University Regiment? If not, is Defence investigating allegations of maladministration?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	31	Jacqui Lambie	Sydney University Regiment Military Justice Issues	<p>Questions for Defence / the CDF about military justice issues in the Sydney University Regiment matter: I'm aware that about 45 out of the 53 GAP year cadets were given C1 infringement charges for untidy rooms. This includes cadets who were charged because they had 'smelly bed sheets' or had 'one droplet of water on the screen of their shower'. Cadets who had broken legs were charged for not cleaning their ceiling fans. Multiple cadets made complaints that they received unfair charges and were coerced by staff into pleading guilty to the charges otherwise they'd be removed from the course and would not be commissioned as officers. They all received a loss of pay. Despite these serious allegations of unlawful conduct and injustice, these cadets had the loss of pay processed nearly 2 months after they had made the allegations. Why did Defence process the fines before the completion of an investigation into the matter?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	32	Jacqui Lambie	Fact Finding Sydney University Regiment	<p>Questions for Defence / the CDF about the 8 May 21 Fact Finding into the Sydney University Regiment:</p> <p>1. Was Major General (MAJGEN) Kathryn Campbell, the now Secretary of DFAT, the Commander of the 2nd Division in May 2021?</p> <p>2. Was MAJGEN Campbell an Officer Commanding of ANU Company at SUR before she then became the Commanding Officer where she was awarded a Conspicuous Service Cross for her service to the regiment?</p> <p>3. How many times did MAJGEN Campbell visit the Sydney University Regiment between Jan – July 2021?</p> <p>4. In response to questions on notice from the last estimates, Defence stated "the recommendations of the fact-finding of 08 May 21 were not accepted by the Commander of the 2nd Division". This was the fact find that recommended an independent investigation into the allegations. While the Chief of Army's office made referrals for an independent investigation only a month after those recommendations were not accepted by the commander, do you believe that MAJGEN Campbell's decision to reject the recommendations, noting her extensive history within the Regiment, was unbiased, proper and in line with the Army's Good Decision-Making Policy?</p> <p>5. Did Major General Campbell formally disclose her potential bias or conflicts of interest in a statement of impartiality or conflict of interest disclosure when she rejected the 08th of May fact find recommendations?</p>	Written	

Department of Defence	33	Jacqui Lambie	Event Attendance - SUR	<p>1. Major General Paul Brereton, a Judicial Inspector-General of the ADF, was a keynote speaker and to handed out awards at an event at the Sydney University Regiment on the 27th of November 2021, while the IGADF is actively investigating the unit for substantial and serious misconduct. With reference to this:</p> <p>a. Does the Minister consider MAJGEN Brereton's attendance at the event satisfactorially reflects the independence of the IGADF as a statutory authority?</p> <p>b. Is the Minister concerned that MAJGEN Brereton's attendance at the event may create the perception that the IGADF is not independently investigating the allegations raised about unacceptable behaviour at SUR?</p> <p>c. Was the Inspector-General of the ADF, Mr Jim Gaynor, aware that MAJGEN Brereton planned to attend this SUR event?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	34	Jacqui Lambie	Supplementary Estimates SUR QoNs	<p>Questions for Defence / the CDF about Questions on Notice from 2021-22 Supplementary Budget Estimates:</p> <p>1. I refer to a Question on Notice from Supplementary Estimates about how many cadets who made complaints about SUR have been provided with a support officer. Defence answered that there were 7 cadets provided with support officers. I have advice that there are only 3 cadets who have been given support officers in relation to abuse from SUR staff and that the numbers have been inflated with cadets who were given support officers for other unrelated matters. Can you please confirm whether all 7 of these cadets were provided with support officers due to making complaints against the conduct of SUR staff, as I asked?</p> <p>2. The Chief of Army directive on support officers directs that those individuals who are subject to administrative processes such as an inquiry or have made complaints should be provided with a support officer. Assuming 7 cadets were provided with support officers for making complaints against SUR staff, why were the other 41 cadets who made complaints not given support officers as per the Chief of Army's directive?</p> <p>3. In response to Question on Notice 53 from Supplementary Estimates, I asked the Chief of Army whether he or his office had received any emails about reprisal action going on in the SUR matter. Defence responded to this question, over 2 months past the due date, with "No, emails containing reprisal action have not been sent to the Chief of Army's office".</p> <p>I have a copies of Defence Ministerial Complaints (MC21-002953 & MC21-004687) which the Minister forwarded to the Chief of Army's office. On 13 Jan 21, the CA's Chief of Staff, Brigadier David Kelly, replied to this complaint where he said "I note your comment concerning reprisal action against your daughter. I have taken the liberty to refer these concerns to the IGADF". I am then aware of an email from an Assistant Inspector-General where they state that they were forwarded a copy of this letter from the CA's Chief of Staff.</p> <p>I am aware of an email sent by the Department of Defence Integrity Branch in September 2021 which states that they spoke to the CA's office, including by email, about what they had assessed as reprisals against an individual who made public interest disclosures about SUR.</p> <p>I am also aware that in December 2021 Senator Andrew McLachlan made enquiries with the Minister for Defence Personnel, Minister Gee, who in turn made enquiries with the CA's office about reprisal action against individuals in the SUR matter. The CA's office provided information to the minister.</p> <p>I was copied in on emails to and from the Chief of Army's office on 14 Jun, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14 Sep, 22, 25, 26</p>	Written	

				<p>Oct and 15, 16, 19 Nov, about reprisals going on in the SUR matter. The emails from the Chief of Army's office were sent by his Chief of Staff, legal officer, incident manager, executive assistant, and his director of sensitive issues management. These emails quite clearly detail reprisal action going on and include evidence of such conduct. The Chief of Army's office describes the conduct as extremely disturbing in one of the emails and details how his office referred these matters to the IGADF, Military Police and the Directorate of Army Administrative Inquiries. The Chief of Army's office states in correspondence that the Chief of Army is personally aware of the matters.</p> <p>This committee was also included in a letter dated 03 Nov 21 to the Chief of Army that included copies of email communication to his office and directly to him after he denied receiving emails at the previous estimates.</p> <p>How does the Chief of Army and his office fail to recall sending and receiving these emails from the Department, Senior Army Officers, IGADF, Military Police, Directorate of Army Administrative Inquiries, Government Ministers, Senators, and other concerned parties including distraught mothers and legal firms?</p> <p>Did Defence provide false and misleading information in response to the Question on Notice?</p>		
Department of Defence	35	Jacqui Lambie	ADF Investigator Courses	1.How many ADF Investigator Courses (ADFC) were conducted at the Defence Force School of Policing (DFSP) / Defence Police Training Centre (DPTC) between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	36	Jacqui Lambie	Service Police Investigator Courses	How many Service Police Investigator Courses (SPIC) were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	37	Jacqui Lambie	Close Personal Protection	How many Close Personal Protection (CPP) courses were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	38	Jacqui Lambie	Service Police Basic Courses	How many Service Police Basic Courses (SPBC) were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	39	Jacqui Lambie	Special Police Officer Basic Courses	How many Service Police Officer Basic Courses (SPOBC) were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	40	Jacqui Lambie	Regimental Officer Advanced Courses	How many RACMP Regimental Officer Advanced Courses (MP ROAC) were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	41	Jacqui Lambie	Sergeant Corps-specific Subject Courses	How many RACMP Sergeant Corps-specific Subject courses were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	42	Jacqui Lambie	RACMP Warrant Officer Corps-Specific Subject Courses	How many RACMP Warrant Officer Corps-specific Subject courses were conducted at DFSP / DPTC between January 2014 and December 2018?	Written	
Department of Defence	43	Kimberley Kitching	MRH-90 helicopters	<p>1. How much has the Government spent to date on acquiring the 47 MRH-90 helicopters under the capability acquisition project AIR 9000, Phases 2, 4 and 6?</p> <p>2. How much has been spent to date on sustaining the Army and Navy's fleets of MRH-90s?</p>	Written	

				<p>3. Minister Dutton's media release of 10 December 2021 says the Government is seeking advice from the US Government on the acquisition of up to 40 Blackhawk helicopters to "potentially" replace the MRH-90. What advice is being sought from the US regarding the acquisition of up to 40 Blackhawk helicopters?</p> <p>4. Why is the Government considering options to replace the MRH-90s?</p> <p>5. Has the Government made a decision to replace the MRJH-90s?</p> <p>6. If yes, what are the details of that decision?</p> <p>7. If no, when is the Government going to make a decision?</p> <p>8. When are the ADF's MRH-90s scheduled to be withdrawn from service?</p> <p>9. Would withdrawing the MRH-90s from service earlier than 2027 involve terminating contracts with Airbus or any other industry partners?</p> <p>10. If yes, what contracts with what partners would need to be terminated?</p> <p>11. Are there any break fees or other termination costs to the Government?</p> <p>12. How many private sector Australian jobs are involved in sustaining and operating the MRH-90 helicopters?</p> <p>13. Where are those jobs located?</p> <p>14. How many jobs would be lost if the Government withdrew the MRH-90s from service early?</p> <p>15. Has a decision been made to acquire new Blackhawk helicopters?</p> <p>16. If yes, how many new Blackhawk helicopters will be acquired, what is the approved budget for the acquisition and what will be the timing of the acquisition?</p>		
Department of Defence	44	Kimberley Kitching	Naval shipbuilding	Defence has previously stated "the implications for future workforce demand are currently being assessed by the Department of Defence" post-AUKUS. Who is conducting that assessment and when will the assessment be completed? Will it be completed in or before May 2022?	Written	
Department of Defence	45	Kimberley Kitching	Sovereign Shipbuilding Talent Pool	With respect to the Sovereign Shipbuilding Talent Pool, provide the most recent figures on the number of applications received, number of offers made, and number of offers accepted?	Written	
Department of Defence	46	Kimberley Kitching	Land Simulation Core 2.0	<p>1. Has Defence recently finalised the tender for Land Simulation Core 2.0 Tranche 1 despite it being the subject of an active and ongoing investigation by Defence Integrity Division?</p> <p>2. Is it appropriate for the Department to award a contract to a business when it is being investigated by Defence Integrity Division for a conflict of interest in the same tender process?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	47	Kimberley Kitching	NT Base upgrades	<p>1. What is the status of the NT training bases upgrades?</p> <p>2. Has work commenced?</p> <p>3. When are the upgrades due to be completed?</p> <p>4. When was it first announced that these bases would be upgraded?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	48	Kimberley Kitching	Harold Holt Facility	<p>In an answer to House of Representatives question in writing number 697 regarding security at the Harold E. Holt Naval Communication Facility, the Minister stated: "Defence continually reviews security assets and the Defence estate."</p> <p>1. Are there plans to further outsource security for defence installations?</p> <p>2. Can Defence confirm that the Australian Federal Police (AFP) will continue to provide security for this facility as well as other defence assets in the Exmouth area and that there are no plans to outsource the security of this facility at some future date?</p> <p>3. Is private security currently being used to replace either the Australian Defence Force (ADF) or AFP security at any defence bases or other defence facilities/assets; if yes, which ones?</p> <p>4. Is the Commonwealth liable for costs incurred by Wilson Security due to the decision to maintain</p>	Written	

				<p>current security arrangements; if so, how much?</p> <p>5. Does the US Navy require that any security force for this facility must be armed and have powers of arrest?</p> <p>6. Was the US Navy or any other relevant US Government agency consulted before the decision was taken to privatise the security of this facility?</p> <p>7. When was the US Navy informed of the decision to use Wilson Security?</p> <p>8. Did the Pentagon raise concerns about the proposed use of security contractors?</p> <p>9. Was the original decision to privatise or outsource security at the facility made because the AFP were going to close the Exmouth station?</p> <p>10. Who made the call to reverse the decision to outsource the security of the facility?</p> <p>11. Why was the decision to outsource security reversed?</p>		
Department of Defence	49	Kimberley Kitching	Afghan Locally Engaged Employees	<p>1. What is the most recent figure of how many Afghan Locally Engaged Employee (LEE) applications have been processed?</p> <p>2. What is the number of applications certified as eligible?</p> <p>3. How many have been certified as ineligible?</p> <p>4. How many applications were closed because applicants declined to continue?</p> <p>5. What is the number of applications not finalised?</p> <p>6. How many LEE applications were received since August 2021?</p> <p>7. How many LEEs have been certified since 31 August 2021?</p> <p>8. How many of the 4,618 people evacuated from Afghanistan by Australian personnel were Defence LEEs?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	50	Kimberley Kitching	Grey Zone	<p>1. How does Defence define grey zone activities?</p> <p>2. What strategic guidance or doctrine has been issued by Defence in relation to grey zone activities since the publication of the 2020 Defence Strategic Update?</p> <p>3. What actions has Defence undertaken to expand its capabilities to respond to grey-zone activities?</p> <p>4. What specific new measures have been adopted to address grey zone activities since the release of the Defence Strategic Update in 2020?</p> <p>5. What is the total envelope of funds allocated for these measures this financial year and over the forward estimates?</p> <p>6. How much of these allocations has been expended in each of 2019-210, 2020-21 and 2021-22?</p> <p>7. What part of the Defence organisation has primary responsibility for grey zone activities?</p> <p>8. In terms of the outcomes and programs structure set out in the Portfolio Budget Statements, which Defence programs are involved in grey zone issues?</p> <p>9. How many Defence staff have been dedicated to these measures?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	51	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page B-4: "The HCF design has not yet reached a stable baseline ... The RSD is not proven and changing continuously as shown by the lack of control of the RSD weight and program performance aspects ... "</p> <p>1. Has the Hunter Class Frigate design reached a stable baseline?</p> <p>2. If yes, when did Defence conclude that the design had reached a stable baseline?</p> <p>3. If no, when does Defence expect the design to reach a stable baseline?</p> <p>4. What was the Engineering Team report referring to when it said there was a lack of control of the Reference Ship Design weight?</p>	Written	

				<p>5. What are the reasons for the lack of control of the Reference Ship Design weight? 6. Has the issue of a lack of control of the RSD weight been resolved?</p>		
Department of Defence	52	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page A-3: "HCF is substantially heavier than the T26 and has a modified hull form. The additional displacement and draught has materially increased the amount of installed power required to propel the vessel and this means a corresponding decrease in range." 1. How much heavier will the Hunter Class be than the T26 frigate? 2. How much additional displacement will the Hunter Class exhibit compared to the T26? 3. What has been the impact of the Hunter Class frigate weight increase on the amount of installed power required. Provide details of the additional power required due to the weight increase? 4. What was the Engineering Team report referring to when it said there was a decrease in range for the Hunter Class frigate? 5. How is the issue of reduced range being addressed?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	53	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page B-8: "The change in hull, due to HCF being deeper in the water than Reference Ship Design testing, means that performance of the vessel cannot be expected to be reliably represented by the previous hydrodynamic model testing." 1. What is being done about the Engineering Team's concerns that the previous hydrodynamic model testing is not reliable due to the changes in the hull form? 2. Has further hydrodynamic model testing been carried out? 3. If yes, what were the results of that testing? 4. If no, will further hydrodynamic model testing be carried out?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	54	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page B-8: "In some cases, above water hull form can have a significant impact on seakeeping (i.e. slamming and whipping)." 1. What is the Engineering Team referring to when it says above water hull form can impact the ship's seakeeping performance? 2. Is this a risk with the current design of the Hunter Class frigates? 3. If yes, what is being done to address this risk?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	55	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report), the Engineering Team report identifies problems with the physical integration of the combat system into the Hunter Class frigates and states at page A-4 that the combat system hardware has been located in a compartment "however, space, weight, power and cooling margins remain at their limits" and "significant potential risk remains." 1. How is the combat system integration affecting space, weight, power and cooling systems? 2. What was the Engineering Team report referring to when it said significant potential risk remains? 3. Have these risks been resolved? 4. If no, how are these risks being addressed?</p>	Written	

Department of Defence	56	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statements on page A-10 that the combat system requirements and design immaturity have significantly affected the design of the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system and further HVAC challenges are "almost guaranteed."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How have the combat system requirements and design immaturity affected the design of the HVAC system? 2. Have these issues been resolved? 3. If no, what is being done to resolve these issues with the HVAC system? 4. Have further challenges with the HVAC system emerged since the Engineering Team report was prepared? 5. If yes, what are the details of those additional challenges? 	Written	
Department of Defence	57	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statements that the design changes will degrade the performance of the Hunter Class frigates, including speed, range and endurance and the statement at page B-6 that the vessel maximum speed: "... will be substantially lower than comparable RAN surface combatants, which can all achieve in excess of 27 Knots."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the Hunter Class program considering ways of increasing the vessel maximum speed? 2. If yes, what are the details of measure being considered to increase maximum speed? 	Written	
Department of Defence	58	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page B-6: "Vessel range has been affected adversely by a number of factors, including increase in platform size, weight, displacement and electrical ship services load ... the degraded range figures become problematic at speeds above 12 Knots."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Engineering Team's assessment of the vessel's range at speeds above 12 knots? 2. How much has the vessel range at various speeds been reduced by the design changes? 3. Is the Hunter Class program considering ways of increasing the vessel range? 4. If yes, what are the details of measure being considered to increase range? 	Written	
Department of Defence	59	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statements on page B-3 that the Government's announcement of an 18-month extension to the schedule for the Hunter Class program indicates limited control over the schedule by BAESMA and that "More schedule delays are expected as the Reference Ship Design production schedule is not yet on firm ground, and details behind the build and production scope are not robust enough to give confidence in the schedule accuracy."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Engineering Team report referring to when it said more delays were expected? 2. Who has formed that expectation? 3. Has Defence provided advice to the Minister or to Government about risks associated with the current planned date for commencing construction? 4. If yes, when was that advice provided? 	Written	
Department of Defence	60	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>With reference to the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) and the statement on page B3: "The Australian supply chain development is currently less than the Commonwealth of Australia anticipated with this methodology."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Engineering Team report referring to when it said Australian supply chain development 	Written	

				was currently less than the Government anticipated? 2. Is Australian supply chain development still less than the Government anticipated?		
Department of Defence	61	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	With reference to the statement by BAE Systems Australia's managing director Mr Lockhart about the finalisation of the Hunter Class frigate System Definition Review: "After closing out the actions identified in this review, the Hunter program will progress to the next major engineering review, the Preliminary Design Review ..." (BAESMA media statement, "Hunter program delivers major engineering milestone", 9 February 2022) and also with reference to Mr Dalton's evidence on 17 February 2022 that "We have moved through the systems definition review. There were 11 major actions that we needed to close before we finally exited. Nine of them are closed. The final two will be closed this week or next week, and that will allow us to issue the exit certificate to BAE for systems definition review." (FADT, Hansard, 17 February 2022, p 16): 1. What was the number of actions needing closure that were identified in the SDR? 2. What are the details of each of these actions? 3. Which of these actions have achieved closure? 4. When was the exit certificate for System Definition Review issued to BAE?	Written	
Department of Defence	62	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	When is the Preliminary Design Review for the Hunter Class Frigate program expected to commence and when is it expected to be completed?	Written	
Department of Defence	63	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	With reference to Ms Lutz's evidence on 17 February 2022 that the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report (the Engineering Team report) "listed potential problems, but it did not list actions and solutions that were already underway" (FADT Hansard, 17 February 2022, p 8), provide the Committee with details of each of the actions and solutions under way to address the issues raised in the Engineering Team report.	Written	
Department of Defence	64	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	With reference to Ms Lutz's evidence on 17 February 2022 regarding the Hunter Class frigates: "The speed and range will meet the requirements as per the mission system specification that has been agreed." (FADT Hansard, 17 February 2022, p 9): what is the factual basis for Ms Lutz saying that the speed and range requirements "will" be met given the risks identified by the November 2021 SASC Engineering Team Assessment of Hunter Class Frigate Technical and Process Issues at SDR Exit report and given that design work has not been completed?	Written	
Department of Defence	65	Kimberley Kitching	Offshore Patrol Vessel	In March 2021 the Australian Financial Review reported that there were problems integrating the Offshore Patrol Vessel's main weapon, the 40 mm gun, with its combat systems ("Gunning for trouble: patrol boats face delay", Andrew Tillett, AFR, 24 March 2021). At Senate Estimates on 1 June 2021 Senator Kitching asked whether there were any integration issues with the OPV weapons and combat systems. Ms Lutz said: "There are no anticipated problems at this stage." (FADT Hansard, 1 June 2021, p 170). The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet on the OPV says: "In June 2021 due to technical certification concerns by Navy, a revised threat assessment and a requirement for commonality, Luerssen Australia was directed to terminate the main gun contract with Leonardo Australia" (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 174). Please explain the apparent discrepancy between Ms Lutz's evidence in June 2021 that there were no anticipated problems with the OPV weapons integration and the ANAO's report that the OPV gun contract was terminated in June 2021 due to issues including a requirement for commonality.	Written	
Department of Defence	66	Kimberley Kitching	Offshore Patrol Vessel	The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet on the Offshore Patrol Vessel program says: "In June 2021 due to technical certification concerns by Navy, a revised threat assessment and a requirement for commonality, Luerssen Australia was directed to	Written	

				<p>terminate the main gun contract with Leonardo Australia." (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 174).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why was the decision taken to terminate the main gun contract with Leonardo Australia? 2. The ANAO says the reasons included a requirement for commonality. What does the requirement for commonality involve and how was it that the contracted main gun was not able to meet that requirement? 3. Does commonality relate to integration of the weapons systems and integration of those systems with other critical systems on the OPV? If no, what does commonality involve? 4. The ANAO says the termination of the main gun contract was also due to technical certification concerns by Navy. What are the details of the certification concerns? 5. How could a contract be awarded for the OPV's main gun if there were certification issues? 6. The ANAO says the termination of the gun contract was also due to a revised threat assessment. What are the details of the revised threat assessment? 7. The ANAO Major Projects Report says an interim solution for the OPV using one of the Navy's existing 25 mm guns is being investigated until a replacement gun is identified. What is the status of the work to investigate replacements for the 40 mm gun? 8. What impact have the issues with the weapons system had on the project's schedule? 9. Will there be a cost to the Australian Government from the decision to scrap the main gun contract? If yes, what will be the cost? 		
Department of Defence	67	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter sustainment costs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the sustainment costs incurred for the Joint Strike Fighter fleet in 2019-20 and 2020-21? 2. Defence told the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit in 2021 that the initial JSF sustainment budget that had been approved in 2014 was for \$4.6 billion over 10 years to 2024-25 (JCPAA, Defence Major Projects Report Inquiry, 27 May 2020, Question Number 13). Is that still the approved sustainment budget to 2024-25? 3. If no, what is the current approved sustainment budget to 2024-25? 	Written	
Department of Defence	68	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter sustainment budget to 2024-25	<p>Defence told the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit in 2021 that the initial JSF sustainment budget that had been approved in 2014 was for \$4.6 billion over 10 years to 2024-25 (JCPAA, Defence Major Projects Report Inquiry, 27 May 2020, Question Number 13). Is that still the approved sustainment budget to 2024-25? If no, what is the current approved sustainment budget to 2024-25?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	69	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter sustainment budget to 2024-25	<p>Air Marshal Hupfeld gave evidence to Budget estimates that Defence would be returning to government to seek approval for the remaining life of type sustainment costings for the F-35s (FADT Hansard, 1 June 2021, 157). Defence's response to 2020-21 Budget estimates Question on Notice 390 says Defence is compiling and refining the life of type sustainment cost estimate that will be submitted for consideration in late 2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the life of type sustainment cost estimate been finalised by Defence. If yes, when was the estimate finalised? 2. Has Defence sought approval from government for a life of type sustainment budget for the Joint Strike Fighters. 3. If no, when will approval be sought for the life of type sustainment budget. 4. If yes, what is the approved Joint Strike Fighter life of type sustainment budget in out-turned dollars? 	Written	

Department of Defence	70	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter deficiencies	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet for the Joint Strike Fighter program says: "The Capability Manager declared IOC on schedule acknowledging a number of known acceptable deficiencies with the aircraft and support systems" (ANAO 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 131).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the details of the known acceptable deficiencies with the aircraft? 2. How are these deficiencies being addressed? 3. What are the details of the known acceptable deficiencies with the support systems? 4. How are the deficiencies with the support systems being addressed? 	Written	
Department of Defence	71	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter availability	<p>With reference to the Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet for the Joint Strike Fighter program which says: "Aircraft availability remains a concern, however, the fleet is currently able to generate sufficient flying hours to achieve all essential tasking." (ANAO 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 131): what are the concerns with aircraft availability referred to by the ANAO?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	72	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter flying hours	<p>What were the number of flying hours delivered by the ADF's F-35A fleet in each year from 2015-16 to 2020-21 (please provide actual outcomes for each year rather than budget estimates or revised estimates).</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	73	Kimberley Kitching	Joint Strike Fighter flying hours – forward estimates	<p>Defence's 2021-22 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements revises down the Joint Strike Fighter fleet's estimated flying hours for each year of the forward estimates from 2021-22 to 2024-25 (Table 31, p 42). Table 31 on page 42 of the 2021-22 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statement, says at note (q): "F-35A Forward Estimates figures are based on maturing understanding of F-35A and subject to ongoing review across the Air Combat program" (p 42).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is Defence now expecting significantly less flying hours from the F-35A fleet across each year of the forward estimates? 2. What are the details of Defence's "maturing understanding" of the F-35A? 3. Why are the F-35A forward estimates of flying hours "subject to ongoing review"? 4. How much of the downward revision in estimated flying hours across the forward estimates is due to issues with the aircraft, how much is due to issues with maintenance and sustainment, how much is due to Defence workforce issues, how much is due to decisions by Government to reduce tasking for the Joint Strike Fighters and how much is due to other issues? 	Written	
Department of Defence	74	Kimberley Kitching	Capability acquisition – performance reporting	<p>With reference to Defence's Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group Project and Sustainment Report dated February 2021:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have any CASG Project and Sustainment Reports been produced since the February 2021 report? 2. If yes, what are dates of each CASG Project and Sustainment Report produced since February 2021? 3. If no, when will the next CASG Project and Sustainment Report be produced? 4. Also if no, has Defence decided not to produce CASG Project and Sustainment Reports in the future and, if that is the case, when and by whom was that decision taken. 	Written	
Department of Defence	75	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue Capability	<p>With reference to the Submarine Escape and Rescue Capability program (SEA 1354 Phase 1):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the cumulative expenditure on this program to date? 2. Have the settlement negotiations with Phoenix International been concluded? 3. If yes, what are the details of the settlement including any payment to be made by the Commonwealth to Phoenix International and/or any payment to be made by Phoenix International to the Commonwealth? 4. If no, when are the settlement negotiations expected to be concluded? 	Written	

Department of Defence	76	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue Capability	<p>In question on notice 71 from Supplementary Budget Estimates, Senator Kitching asked Defence to provide the Committee with a copy of the report by Professor Winter on the Submarine Escape and Rescue Capability project. Senator Kitching asked that the report be provided with any necessary redactions for reasons of national security or the Commonwealth's commercial interests. Defence refused to provide a copy of the Winter report on grounds of commercial and legal sensitivities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why were those commercial and legal sensitivities not able to be addressed by making redactions to the report? 2. Will Defence provide the Committee with a copy of the Winter report when the settlement negotiations with Phoenix International have been finalised? 	Written
Department of Defence	77	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue Capability	<p>Defence's response to Question on notice 73 from Supplementary Budget Estimates said Defence and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet had been directed by Government to conduct a comprehensive investigation into this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When did that investigation commence? 2. Which officials from Defence and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet conducted that investigation? 3. What were its terms of reference? 4. Has the comprehensive investigation been completed? 5. If yes, what were the findings of the investigation? 6. Also if yes, provide the Committee with a copy of the report of this investigation with necessary redactions for reasons of national security and the Commonwealth's commercial interests? 	Written
Department of Defence	78	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles (LAND 400, Phase 2)	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report Project Data Summary Sheet for the Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles program (LAND 400, Phase 2) describe an emergent risk with the Immersive Tactical Trainer Containerised Design. The ANAO report says says at page 157 that there is a risk the Immersive Tactical Trainer Containerised Design is not feasible. The report says: "There is a risk that when operated the ITT-C will create too much heat in the confined container, resulting in a system that does not meet safety requirements and is not fit for purpose."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Immersive Tactical Trainer 2. What is the Containerised Design for this capability? 3. What are the details of the risk that the system will create too much heat in the container 4. What is the status of this risk? 5. If this risk has been resolved, what changes were made to the Immersive Tactical Trainer design or capability to resolve this risk? 	Written
Department of Defence	79	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report Project Data Summary Sheet for the Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles program (LAND 400, Phase 2) says at page 157: "There is a risk that the budget for Contractor Support approved at Second Pass (\$46.805 million) will not be sufficient to fund the required contracted workforce for the life of the Project."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the status of this risk? 2. If this risk has been resolved, how was the risk of the contractor budget running out resolved? 3. Will there be a need to use contingency funding or to increase the budget? 	Written

Department of Defence	80	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report Project Data Summary Sheet for the Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles program (LAND 400, Phase 2) says at page 157: "There is a risk that RDA's [Rheinmetall Defence Australia's] reporting of a current VAC [Variation at Completion] of \$109 million is an early indicator of cost, schedule and performance challenges."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is Variation at Completion – is it an estimate of the final budget variance for the project? 2. When did Rheinmetall report a budget Variation at Completion of \$109 million? 3. What were the reasons for that variation? 4. What is the current situation with the risk that the project's Variation at Completion will exceed the budget allocated cost? 	Written	
Department of Defence	81	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report Project Data Summary Sheet for the Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles program (LAND 400, Phase 2) says at page 157: "There is an issue that the batteries in the C2 and JFS variants of the CRV are unable to be charged whilst in a static mode, leading to an impact on the operation of vehicle systems."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the C2 and JFS variants of the Boxer vehicles? 2. Has the issue with charging the batteries been resolved? 3. If yes, how was the problem resolved? 4. Was there a cost for resolving this issue – if so, how much and who bears the cost, Defence or industry? 	Written	
Department of Defence	82	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report Project Data Summary Sheet for the Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles program (LAND 400, Phase 2) says at page 158 that Initial Material Release was declared with three exceptions relating to: completion of functional and physical configuration audits; integration of electronic counter-measures; and transportability studies including air transportability and integration with other Army vehicles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the details of each of these exceptions 2. Will these exceptions be remediated. 	Written	
Department of Defence	83	Kimberley Kitching	Boxer Combat Reconnaissance Vehicles	<p>Table 64 on page 82 of Defence's 2021-22 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements shows Defence is now expecting to spend \$291 million less on the Boxer project in 2021-22 than originally budgeted. The PAES says this is due to later than expected achievement of milestones in the Rheinmetall Defence Australia acquisition contract. What are the details of the contractual milestones which are being achieved later than expected?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	84	Kimberley Kitching	Overlander Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2019-20 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet on the Overlander vehicle project (LAND 121 Phase 3B) said there was a risk of State and Territory authorities delaying certification or not issuing permits for the Overlander vehicles to access public roads (ANAO, 2019-20 Defence Major Projects Report, p 216):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has this risk been resolved? 2. Have all the necessary State and Territory government certifications and permits been issued? 3. If no, what are the details of State and Territory government certification and permits that have not been issued? 4. Also if no, what impacts are these certification delays having on Defence's operation of the vehicles? 	Written	
Department of Defence	85	Kimberley Kitching	Overlander Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet on the Overlander vehicle project (LAND 121 Phase 3B) said Initial Operational Capability was declared in December 2019 with an air certification caveat (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 186):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the air certification that was required for Initial Operational Capability? 	Written	

				<p>2. What was the nature of the caveat around air certification when IOC was declared?</p> <p>3. Has this issue been resolved?</p> <p>4. What is the currently forecast date of Final Material Release for Land 121 Phase 3B?</p>		
Department of Defence	86	Kimberley Kitching	Overlander Vehicles	<p>The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report's Project Data Summary Sheet on the Overlander vehicle project (LAND 121 Phase 3B) says there is an emergent risk of hazards from carrying ammunition on communications-enabled Gun Tow Vehicles. In terms of the emergent risk, the Major Projects Report says: "The Gun Tow Vehicle (GTV) is fitted with a communications node. Some ammunition components are sensitive to electromagnetic radiation emitted by the communications node. There is a chance that designing to reduce the risk that the fitted communications node will damage or initiate ammunition components on the GTV, may delay MGA design, incur unidentified/unbudgeted costs and constrain or lessen desired capability." (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 187-88):</p> <p>1. Are the gun tow vehicles covered by an existing contract or are they subject to a further request for tender under Land 121?</p> <p>2. Has this risk been resolved?</p> <p>3. If yes, how was the risk resolved?</p> <p>4. Also if yes, did the resolution cause any schedule delays or have any impacts on cost or capability?</p> <p>5. If no, what is being done to resolve this risk?</p> <p>6. Also if no, is resolving this risk expected to cause any schedule delays or have any impacts on cost or capability?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	87	Kimberley Kitching	Battlefield Airlifter	<p>Senator Kitching has asked three questions on notice (QONs) seeking the forecast date of Final Operational Capability (FOC) for the Battlefield Airlifter project (AIR 8000, Phase 2). In August 2020, the Minister for Defence responded to Senate chamber QON 1821 by not providing the forecast date of FOC for reasons of national security (QON 1821, table 1, serial 31). In May 2021, Defence responded to 2020-21 Additional Estimates QON 138 by not providing the date for reasons of national security (QON 138, Table 1, serial 31). In July 2021, Defence responded to 2021-22 Budget Estimates QON 386 by not providing the date, again for reasons of national security (QON 138, Table 1, serial 31). However, the Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report released in December 2021 published a forecast date of FOC for this project of June 2022 (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 216). Why was the forecast FOC date for this project not able to be provided to Parliament for reasons of national security if it was able to be published in the 2020-21 Major Projects Report?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	88	Kimberley Kitching	Battlefield Airlifter	<p>1. On what date was the decision taken to change the role of the C-27J Spartan aircraft being acquired under AIR 8000, Phase 2 from a battlefield airlift to a light tactical fixed wing capability?</p> <p>2. The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report says the budget for AIR 8000, Phase 2 was \$1,156 million at second pass approval and the current approved budget is \$1,426 million (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 211). Will any savings be made in the cost of this project as a result of the decision to change the capability from battlefield airlift to light tactical fixed wing?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	89	Kimberley Kitching	CMATS	<p>With respect to the Civil Military Air Traffic Management System project (AIR 5431, Phase 3):</p> <p>1. In 2021-22 Budget Estimates QON 386, Defence said Final Operational Capability was forecast for April 2026, a delay of 34 months on the originally approved FOC of June 2023 (QON 386, Table 1, serial 5). The Australian National Audit Office's 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report says the forecast delay in Final</p>	Written	

				<p>Operational Capability is now 46 months (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 251). Why are the delays in this project getting longer?</p> <p>2. Provide the Committee with an overview of the problems that have arisen with this project and what is being done to manage the risks to schedule and capability.</p> <p>3. The ANAO's 2020-21 Major Projects Report shows the approved budget was \$731.4 million at second pass and is now \$974.5 million. The MPR shows a real cost increase of \$247.5 million was approved in February 2018 (ANAO, 2020-21 Defence Major Projects Report, p 248). What were the reasons for the real cost increase?</p> <p>4. What is the breakdown of the real cost increase between additional capabilities that were not included in the second pass budget, and increases in the cost of delivering the capabilities that were approved under the second pass budget?</p>		
Department of Defence	90	Kimberley Kitching	Estate and Infrastructure – Budget estimates	<p>Estate and Infrastructure – Budget estimates</p> <p>Table 9 on page 18 of the Defence 2021-22 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements (PAES) shows estimated expenditure on the Enterprise Estate and Infrastructure Program in 2021-22 has been revised from \$3,444.1 million to \$2,761.6 million, a variation of -\$682.5 million. Table 66 at page 105 of the PAES shows total estimated expenditure on approved Enterprise Estate and Infrastructure Program projects by state and electorate in 2021-22 has been revised from \$1,201 million to \$1,794.7 million, a variation of +\$593.7 million. Please explain the differences between the two sets of figures for estimated expenditure on the Enterprise Estate and Infrastructure Program contained in Table 9 and Table 66.</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	91	Kimberley Kitching	Defence Industry Plan documents	<p>Defence Industry Plan documents</p> <p>1. Why has there still not been an update to the Defence Industrial Capability Plan since its release on 23 April 2018?</p> <p>2. Why has there still not been an update to the public Integrated Investment Program since its release on 25 February 2016?</p> <p>3. In relation to the Integrated Investment Program (IIP), Defence's response to Question on Notice 131 from the Senate Economics Reference Committee's manufacturing inquiry says: "Changes to the Defence force structure and IIP are considered by the National Security Committee of Cabinet and are classified or sensitive as PROTECTED: Sensitive Cabinet." This makes it sound like changes to the IIP are sensitive Cabinet documents and won't be communicated publicly. But in the IIP itself, it states: "To ensure industry has access to current information, an online version will be periodically updated to reflect changes in the program." Why isn't the IIP being "periodically updated" as the Government promised?</p> <p>4. Why has there still not been an update to the Naval Shipbuilding Plan since its release in 2017?</p> <p>5. Given industry's need to rely on the Defence Industrial Capability Plan, the Integrated Investment Program, and the Naval Shipbuilding Plan, how can industry keep up to date with Defence plans when these documents aren't updated following announcements such as AUKUS, OPVs, Hunter Class Frigates, and the 2020 Defence Strategic Update?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	92	Kimberley Kitching	Defence Industry Grant Programs	<p>Defence Industry Grant Programs</p> <p>1. Why did the Government not renew the Sovereign Industrial Capability Priority Grants program's funding after its 3 years in late 2021?</p> <p>2. Has the funding for the Skilling Australia's Defence Industry (SADI) Grants program been exhausted for the 2021-22 financial year?</p>	Written	

				<p>3. What was the total quantum of funding remaining in the SADI Grant Program at the point at which the SADI Grant program ceased being administered by the Centre for Defence Industry Capability (CDIC)?</p> <p>4. Was all the remaining SADI Grant program funding transferred to the Office of Defence Industry Support (ODIS) at the point at which ODIS assumed responsibility for this program?</p> <p>5. How many SADI Grants have been awarded, and to what total value, since the launch of ODIS on 26 November 2021?</p> <p>6. Will the SADI Grants program be extended or renewed into the 2022-23 financial year?</p> <p>7. What funding will be available specifically for defence industry businesses in the 2022-23 financial year?</p>		
Department of Defence	93	Kimberley Kitching	Naval Shipbuilding Plans	<p>Defence's Shipbuilding in Western Australia Factsheet details all projected shipbuilding in WA including the Arafura Class Offshore Patrol Vessels, Guardian Class Patrol Boats, Evolved Cape Class Patrol Boats, sustainment of the Anzac Class, Future Mine Warfare and Hydrographic Vessels, and Future Army Water and Landing Craft. The first three of those projects are behind schedule: Guardian Class (Pacific Patrol Boats) – at least 6 months delay, Offshore Patrol Vessel (Arafura Class) – 6 months delay, and evolved Cape Class Patrol vessels – 5-9 months delay.</p> <p>1. Is that correct?</p> <p>2. Why are none of these programs running on time?</p> <p>3. Are any of these shipbuilding projects running to-budget or have there been cost blowouts?</p> <p>4. If Yes to 3, what is the magnitude of these cost blowouts by each of these three projects respectively?</p> <p>5. The September 2021 AUKUS announcement, the 2020 Force Structure Plan, and the 2020 Defence Strategic Update have all impacted the Naval Shipbuilding Plan. Where is the up-to-date Plan articulated that supports the necessary growth of a core shipbuilding workforce to execute the Force Structure Plan in Australia today and into the future?</p> <p>6. Will the update to Naval Shipbuilding Plan provide a level of commitment and certainty to industry that will facilitate investment in people, facilities and innovation?</p> <p>7. How will the Plan focus on ensuring we have an enduring Sovereign Capability in Australia?</p> <p>8. Given previous history, is Defence considering that even if these projects are awarded to WA, the construction work may occur in other States?</p> <p>9. The answer to 2021-22 Supplementary Budget estimates QoN 106 states that two significant shipbuilding projects are proposed to conclude in 2023. It also states that the contracts for the "ice-rated replacement for the Navy's Ocean Protector, a new large Salvage and Repair Vessel, and up to four support ships for the enhanced Undersea Surveillance System" will not be awarded until the mid-2020s. What steps is Defence taking to ensure that there is no loss of skilled workforce between the completion of existing shipbuilding projects in Western Australia and the commencement of new projects?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	94	Kimberley Kitching	Office of Defence Industry Support (ODIS)	<p>Office of Defence Industry Support (ODIS)</p> <p>1. Can Defence advise where every ODIS office will be located, including all regional offices and when they opened, or are anticipated to open?</p> <p>2. How do the services that ODIS offers differ from the services of CDIC?</p> <p>3. How will ODIS enhance or improve on the services that CDIC provided to defence industry businesses?</p> <p>4. The CDIC review noted that, in relation to CDIC's business advisory and industry facilitation services, "less satisfied clients cited inconsistency or relevance of advice provided, being generic and transactional in nature". How will ODIS optimise the services it offers defence industry businesses in relation to this</p>	Written	

				<p>feedback specifically?</p> <p>5. Is it correct that to engage with ODIS, defence industry businesses are encouraged to complete a 100-question survey - the Defence Business Readiness Tool (DBRT) - online?</p>		
Department of Defence	95	Kimberley Kitching	Dry Dock for WA	<p>Dry Dock for WA</p> <p>1. When and where will a new graving dock or large vessel dry berth or similar infrastructure for Defence will be built?</p> <p>2. When in the 2020s will the existing the existing large vessel dry berth facility, Captain Cook Graving Dock, close for significant maintenance and for how long?</p> <p>3. The need for a new dry dock has been identified in the 2020 Force Structure Plan. What is the Government waiting for in relation to confirming this project of urgent strategic importance?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	96	Kimberley Kitching	Buying a Pacific Support Vessel 'off-the-shelf'	<p>Buying a Pacific Support Vessel 'off-the-shelf'</p> <p>At Senate Estimates in October 2021 the Department of Defence revealed that plans for the local construction of a Pacific Support Vessel had been scrapped in favour of an overseas purchase, which was not publicly announced by the Government. Has the Government made any further decisions to purchase vessels "off the shelf" or from foreign sources rather than build them in Australia?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	97	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS submarine visit to WA	<p>AUKUS submarine visit to WA</p> <p>1. In reference to an article in The Australian on 15 February 2022 entitled "West Australian ban thwarts AUKUS submarine tour", can Defence advise whether any of its personnel or others associated with the visit applied to enter WA via the WA Government's G2G system?</p> <p>2. Did Defence reach out or make contact with anybody in the WA Government or WA Police to enquire about how such a visit could occur with exemptions or variations or in any way at all?</p> <p>3. Did the Government speak to journalists at The Australian about this matter, instead of actually trying to organise this visit with the WA Government?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	98	Kimberley Kitching	SEA 129 Phase 5	<p>1. Is the SEA 129 Phase 5 program currently behind schedule?</p> <p>2. If yes, what are the reasons for this?</p> <p>3. Why is Navy pursuing use of the RQ-21A Blackjack, when the U.S. Marine Corps who use this system have been dissatisfied with the performance of the RQ-21A Blackjack UAV and are seeking to retire it?</p> <p>4. Given the difficulties in progressing this program currently, is Defence considering seeking an alternate platform for SEA 129 Phase 5?</p> <p>5. If no, why not?</p> <p>6. If yes, what are the details of Defence's consideration of alternatives?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	99	Kimberley Kitching	Ministerial Office	<p>Ministerial office</p> <p>In relation to the office of the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Defence Personnel:</p> <p>1. How many Defence Department staff and/or ADF personnel are currently in the Minister's office?</p> <p>2. Have all positions in the office been filled, including senior policy and media advisor roles?</p> <p>3. How many Defence Department staff and/or ADF personnel - as advisers, DLOs and Aide-de-Camps (ADC) - have been posted to the Minister's office since he was appointed to the Ministry?</p> <p>4. Does the Minister's office have an Aide-de-Camp (ADC)?</p> <p>5. Has Defence experienced a higher than usual turnover of staff in the Minister's office?</p> <p>6. Has any staff member returning to the Department of Defence and/or the ADF expressed any concerns</p>	Written	

				as to how they were treated in the Minister's office? 7. Has anyone returning to the Department of Defence and/or ADF written a formal complaint in relation to their experiences in the Minister's office?		
Department of Defence	100	Jacqui Lambie	Restorative Justice	8. Will a process of "Restorative Justice" commence for cadets affected by the matters raised in the IGADF investigation or any PIDs or substantiated complaints made in relation to these matters? If so, who is the responsible point of contact i.e. Defence Litigation, Dispute resolution and Litigation, AGS?	Written	
Department of Defence	101	Kimberley Kitching	DHA Homes	In previous years Defence Families of Australia (DFA) has reported that families living in the northern suburbs of Adelaide have expressed concerns for their safety and have requested the fitting of security screens and sensor lighting to their DHA homes. This resulted in Defence retrofitting security screens on hundreds of homes in the location. Families in this region, and several others around the country have also expressed concern for their safety in their homes. In some posting locations the requirement for security screens for external and accessible windows only provides for deadlocks and not security screens, with all Service Residences currently only having security screens on external doors. 1. Is Defence expanding their retrofitting program for the remaining homes to be fitted with security screens in Adelaide? 2. It is understood the Director of Relocations and Housing in Defence was supposed to process a Contract Change Proposal to the Service Agreement to ensure all new homes are fitted with additional security screens on the windows. Is this happening?	Written	
Department of Defence	102	Kimberley Kitching	Home-Based Business	Some defence families have raised the desire to operate a home business but commented on the cost of moving it in comparison to how much the business actually earns (particularly if it has not reached a taxable income level). In response, it is understood that Defence was going to establish a working group to assess the feasibility of offering financial assistance to move a home-based business. 1. Has this happened? 2. Has any work been undertaken on this?	Written	
Department of Defence	103	Kimberley Kitching	Defence Families Australia	Families continue to tell Defence Families of Australia (DFA) about the importance of access to reliable and reasonably priced internet. Firstly, this is not listed in policy as a standard inclusion for Defence homes. Secondly, the time lags in the delivery of the NBN are creating gaps in provision. Thirdly, in some locations there are limited ports at the Telstra exchange for access. When a Defence member moves out of a location, their port access is returned to the general pool of availability rather than remaining allocated to a Defence home. DFA has advocated for a standard in policy for internet connectivity in DHA homes. 1. What have Defence and DHA done in response to this? 2. Are Defence and DHA investigating options?	Written	
Department of Defence	104	Jacqui Lambie	Findings of "Widespread Unacceptable Behaviour" and "Significant Long-Lasting Negative impact"	These questions relate to the IGADF Inquiry into allegations of unacceptable behaviour and medical mismanagement at RMC Duntroon, and matters relating to the library fire in March 2011, which was commissioned on the 16th of October 2020 by the Chief of Defence Force, and delivered to the Chief of Defence Force and the Chief of Army in December 2021. I have viewed the outcomes letters sent to Mr Matthew Smith and Mr Jason Atley from the Director of Inquiries and Investigations, Catherine Wallis, on the 5th of January 2022, with their permission. For clarity, the quotations contained in the following relate to statements made in relation to the IGADF inquiry in the letters that were sent to Mr Smith and Mr Atley. Findings of "Widespread Unacceptable Behaviour" and "Significant Long-Lasting Negative impact"	Written	

				1. Given the findings that an RMC- D Staff cadet was the subject of "widespread unacceptable behaviour" that had a "significant long lasting negative impact", why is there no reference in the outcomes letters to the RMC-D cadet receiving a formal apology from the ADF, including a recommendation for the loss and damage sustained to be recognised and a payment made, whether as an Ex Gratia, Act of Grace or however described to recognise this unacceptable and widespread unacceptable conduct with "significant long lasting negative impact"?		
Department of Defence	105	Janet Rice	Arms Exports	Given that a Saudi-led coalition has recently been responsible for the deaths of at least 80 people in Yemen, and the Australian government continues to approve arms exports to Saudi and the UAE despite their continual violations of human rights laws and humanitarian law, has the government considered a review of its arms exports to Saudi Arabia and UAE?	Written	
Department of Defence	106	Kimberley Kitching	Puckapunyal housing trial	As a direct result of Defence Families of Australia (DFA) raising the concerns of families posted to Puckapunyal, Defence launched a flexible housing trial in the area. During the trial, ADF members have been able to reject a suitable offer of a Service Residence in the Puckapunyal Military Area based on: spouse/partner employment, spouse/partner study, or access to professional support for recognised dependants with special needs. What is the status of this trial? Are there any results or findings at this stage? Is it assisting families with their employment, study and special needs requirements? Can DHA provide an update on trials in other areas?	Written	

Additional Estimates 2021-22 – Australian Signals Directorate QON Index

Agency	Portfolio Q No	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Australian Signals Directorate	1	Kimberley Kitching	Cyber Training	Senator KITCHING: Have we provided training to any other countries in the same vein as we would with the Ukraine or we have with the Ukraine?	Hansard	73
Australian Signals Directorate	2	Kimberley Kitching	Log4J Attribution	<p>Senator KITCHING: Is the Australian government in a position to attribute this attack publicly? I'll ask Minister Duniam.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: I would like to take that on notice, I think, just to be absolutely safe.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Also maybe on notice, is there an intention to attribute it?</p> <p>Senator Duniam: Thank you for foreshadowing that I will take that on notice, because I will.</p>	Hansard	71

Additional Estimates 2021-22 – Defence Housing Australia

Agency	Portfolio Q No	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Defence Housing Australia	1	Kimberley Kitching	DHA planning for housing location	<p>Based on feedback from Defence Families of Australia (DFA), one of the biggest concerns of defence families relates to the quality and location of defence housing. In relation to location, a particular concern is when housing is located on the fringes of a community in a lower-socio-economic area. Feedback from defence families, including through DFA, in recent years covers such things as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced security, with families in several locations around the country asking if security screens could be a standard inclusion. • Being housed in the catchment for lower performing schools. • Being housed in a catchment where there are not enough Defence children in the local school yet for it to be eligible for a Defence School Transition Aide or Mentor. • Being separated from other Defence families if housing is scattered rather than being in clusters, affecting connectedness within the Defence community of that region. • Having to invest in a second car when public transport is limited or non-existent. • Limited access to partner employment. <p>In terms of these issues, what planning does DHA do in terms of location of housing?</p>	Written	

Additional Estimates 2021-22 – Australian War Memorial

Agency	Portfolio Q No	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Australian War Memorial	1	Jordon STEELE- JOHN	Australian War Memorial - Redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Memorial's 2011 Heritage Management Plan required the Memorial to 'conserve, manage and interpret the ANZAC Hall as a part of the AWM main building'. That Plan still applied in 2021 as the bulldozers moved in to destroy Anzac Hall. • How can we be sure that the 2022 Heritage Management Plan will not be disregarded in the same way as the 2011 one was? • Won't the heritage aspects of the Memorial still be subject to depredation, Plan or no Plan? • Isn't it rather misleading for the Memorial to say 'the Heritage Management Plan was conditionally approved by the Australian Heritage Council' when the Council's conditions were essentially the same as those that Minister Ley attached to her EPBC Act approval in December 2020? • The DAWE website describes the Australian Heritage Council as 'the Australian Government's independent expert advisory body on heritage matters'. • Isn't the Memorial letting people think it has an approval from an 'independent expert' body, when the AHC is simply recycling approval conditions that were cooked up in DAWE and signed off by the Minister? • Will the findings of the Brereton Report and the lessons from those findings be reflected in the collection of the Australian War Memorial? 	Written	
Australian War Memorial	2	Kimberley KITCHING	Australian War Memorial - Redevelopment	<p>In November 2021, the National Capital Authority (NCA) approved the Main Works Packages, which includes approval to proceed with three separate Main Works Packages for the Memorial's Development Project, meaning the project has secured all necessary approvals to proceed with delivering the new Southern Entrance, the CEW Bean Building extension, and the new Anzac Hall. It is understood the Memorial will need to work with the NCA to comply with conditions noted in the decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Memorial advise what those conditions are and how it intends to meet them? 2. This approval came after six weeks of public consultation, from 31 July - 10 September 2021, hosted by the NCA. Can the Memorial advise on the key outcomes from the public feedback received on the architectural designs of the project plans through that process? 	Written	

Australian War Memorial	3	Kimberley KITCHING	Honours and Awards Database	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Memorial provide an update on its Honours and Awards Database? 2. Is the Memorial working and coordinating with Defence, DVA and any other relevant agencies on this? 3. Some veterans have raised concerns about the accuracy of the database and that veterans of more recent conflicts are not being appropriately recognised. What is the Memorial doing to address this? 4. For example, the Opposition has received representations regarding the case of Corporal Sarah Longshore, whose Nursing Service Cross, awarded for her service in Iraq, has not been included in the Memorial's online database, the Roll of Honours and Awards. Can the Memorial provide an update on the progress and the timetable for the updating of the Roll to include Sarah Longshore's Nursing Service Cross, and the more than 1,000 others who hold this award, as well as other contemporary veterans? 5. Previous responses to QoNs have noted that in 2021 Memorial staff and volunteers have been indexing the publicly available data held within the Commonwealth of Australia Gazettes, and that these will be progressively published to the Memorial's website in the coming months. Can the Memorial provide an update on the progress of this? 	Written	
-------------------------	---	--------------------	-----------------------------	---	---------	--

Additional Estimates 2021-22 – Department of Veterans' Affairs

Department	Portfolio Q No	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Department of Veterans' Affairs	1	Jacqui LAMBIE	Claims Processing - Transition by Medical Discharge	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Can I just clarify that. What you're telling me now is that, before anyone leaves Defence, all their claims are done?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: No, I didn't say that. I said: with those who may be medically discharging, you will see that with a lot of them—not all of them—we work with Defence to make sure their claims have been prepared before they leave. In a lot of cases—I won't say all—their claims are ready, when they are leaving through transition, for medically discharged—not for all discharged. It's about 20 per cent at most.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Of those medically discharged?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So you've got 20 per cent of those claims fully done?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: No, sorry. Of those that transition—about 5,500 to 6,000 a year—about 20 per cent are medically discharging; that's roughly the figure. Of those that are medically discharging, we work with Defence and our veteran support officers work with them to make sure their claims are prepared and ready before they leave.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: They're not completed but they're prepared; is that what you're telling me?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We try to get them completed.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: How many out of that 20 per cent have been completed?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Cole: There are some legislative reasons why not all claims can be done before the person discharges. For example: if a person is seeking incapacity, while we can have that claim ready to go and their initial liability claim sorted we aren't able to actually grant and pay incapacity until they are no longer employed by the ADF. We try to make that happen within a very short period and have all the prep work done, essentially, before the person leaves, so that they have some continuity of income.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Similarly with permanent impairment, it would take some time after they leave. So their liability for permanent impairment—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I get that. Could you break that down into numbers and provide that to the committee, please?</p> <p>Ms Cole: We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Thank you.</p>	Hansard	96, 97
Department of Veterans' Affairs	2	Timothy AYRES	Claims Processing - As at September and December	<p>Senator AYRES: I just want to get a sense of how we're going in terms of some of these issues. Can you tell me the number of claims that were on hand in September and December last year?</p> <p>Ms Cole: I have on me—</p> <p>Senator AYRES: We can do this on notice, if you like, but if it's possible to go through them now I think it would be useful for the committee. Are you in a position to tell me the number of claims on hand in September and December?</p>	Hansard	97, 98

			<p>Ms Cole: We've gone through the number of claims that were on hand as at 31 December 2021. I have with me as at 31 December 2020—the 12 months prior, noting that on hand is always point in time. Would you like those?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes, please, thank you.</p> <p>Ms Cole: VA disability pension is 6,617; war widows is 127; MRCA initial liability is 25,035; MRCA permanent impairment is 4,852; DRCA initial liability is 6,112; and DRCA permanent impairment is 6,124. I believe they are the main categories I gave you previously.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: What is that, as a total?</p> <p>Ms Cole: As a total, including incapacity, it is 49,481.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If someone puts in 10 claims for 10 different injuries, does that count as 10? Because they're close claims, if they've got three different ones for a knee, that is one claim?</p> <p>Ms Cole: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So they're not true figures. If someone has got 10 different claims in, and you say, 'No, there's three relating to the one area with the same problem', that's one claim, yes? So that's not quite true.</p> <p>Ms Cole: No, it doesn't quite work like that. How we count them is in terms of conditions and claims, if you see what I mean. A person might put in one claim with one condition—say, for example, they have a knee issue, which is a very common claim—or, under MRCA or DRCA, they may put in two claims in MyService—one for a knee condition and one for a shoulder condition. We count those as two claims when they're registered, but we combine them into one claim—this is the difference and why we talk about gross and net claims—and we say that's one net claim. We do that because then one delegate is dealing with that individual rather than two delegates. It's a client service initiative, basically. If that person subsequently comes back later, three months later and puts in a third claim—say, for lumbar spondylitis or similar—we try to give that back to the original delegate but we count it as a separate claim.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So if you have alcohol abuse, major depression and some other mental illness then that goes to one delegate and it's one claim—is that what you're telling me?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: It's one net claim and three gross, is it?</p> <p>Ms Cole: It's one net claim but three in terms of the applications.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Thank you.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: And the numbers that we're talking about our gross claims?</p> <p>Ms Cole: Yes, we're talking about gross claims.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I might ask you to take these on notice for September and December, just given the time and that I'm keen to get to some other issues. I'd like to know, as of September and December last year, the number of claims on hand? I think you've started to answer that very well. And I also want to know the number of unallocated claims on hand; the average time for a claim to be allocated; the median time taken for a claim to be allocated; the average processing time for claims; the median processing time for claims; and the number of claims on hand not processed within 100 days. I think those are pretty similar to the sort of material we've sought before.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Department of Veterans' Affairs	3	Timothy AYRES	Recruitment - ASL by Division	<p>Senator AYRES: I want to deal with some staffing questions. We've traversed these a few times and over the course of some of the other parliamentary processes a series of different figures have been provided to the parliament. I think the number of uplifting ASL positions was 447. That's right, isn't it?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: That's correct, 447.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: How many of those positions have been filled?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Mr Harrigan will help me with that. Since we received the uplifting in our ASL, particularly in Ms Cole's division, the first step was identifying the number of additional ASL for her division, which I think was around 270. Initially, Ms Cole looked at all of the labour hire we had on board to see who we could convert to non-ongoing, which I think we talked about at the last estimates, and going through recruitment with those to see who could be recruited into ongoing positions. There's been a steady increase. We have faced some challenges with recruiting, particular in Melbourne and Sydney with lockdowns, a few workforce pressures and a little bit of attrition. But we are seeing a bit of an uptick in our ASL, and I am pleased to report that the percentage of labour hire to ASL has come down. Mr Harrigan may be able to give you some actual numbers, if that is helpful.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes, please.</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: The recruitment of the additional 447 that we received in the budget is progressing well. Around 360 of those additional positions have been filled. Most of those are in the targeted areas of claims processing, case coordination, on-base supports, rehab services and our Veteran Access Network. These are APS positions, as we've previously discussed.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: How many in each of those categories?</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: I will have to give you the splits on notice, but most of them were designed for the client areas. In terms of claims processing, it was around 250 of those.</p>	Hansard	101
Department of Veterans' Affairs	4	Timothy AYRES	Recruitment - Ongoing vs Non-Ongoing	<p>Senator AYRES: Just so I understand this, how many of the 360 additional positions are now on non-ongoing contracts and how many have now been transitioned into permanent APS roles?</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: That is a split I'll need to take on notice.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Is it 50-50?</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: At the moment, I'd say 50-50 is probably a close estimate, because we have explained previously that the initial step was to lock in investment in our labour hire staff, convert them to non-ongoing and then run a series of recruitment processes to, ideally, allow those individuals to become permanent APS staff. But, as the secretary has mentioned, the last six months has presented some challenges, in terms of the speed of our recruitment, caused by tight labour markets. It's a very competitive market in most of our locations where we have client-facing staff, and the lockdowns in a couple of states have made it difficult to progress recruitment at the rate we would like.</p>	Hansard	102
Department of Veterans' Affairs	5	Timothy AYRES	Contracts	<p>Senator AYRES: I think in questions on notice at the last round of estimates you indicated that contractor expenditure, including fee-for-service and labour hire arrangements, for 2020-21 was \$69.7 million. And I think you indicated the period 1 July to 31 October 2021 was \$24.2 million. Can you provide a figure for that 1 July to 31 December 2021 period?</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: Yes. For 1 July 2021 to 31 December 2021 the figure is \$37.3 million, which is on par to—</p>	Hansard	102-103

				<p>Senator AYRES: It would be about the same.</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: the previous financial year, yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Why is that, if you've transitioned 360 people?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We still need some labour hire to—</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So 360 people have moved from labour hire but the bucket's been filled up by additional labour hire people, has it?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We'd still need some labour hire to—</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I understand that, but I would have thought it would be a smaller number. It's really about the same, isn't it?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: It's dropped a little bit. It's really about the same. As we've talked about, we're always going to have labour hire. But we use them as well for our recruiting pool. So we bring in our labour hire and, if we need them, we can ask them to consider non-ongoing employment and, later, ongoing employment. So we will continue to have labour hire engaged. It has not dropped as much because we still need the labour hire to help us with progressing the claims.</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: And, Senator, there are other budget initiatives where it has been necessary to bring on some labour-hire staff. An example of that is our digitisation initiative. That's a time-limited initiative where it's appropriate to bring on those skills for a short period of time. So that's added to the recruitment in labour hire, too.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So it's essentially the same level of expenditure on labour hire and consultants. We know that \$1.3 million of that is this McKinsey report—</p> <p>Mr Harrigan: Sorry, Senator; that would be separate.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: The consultants are separate, and we are seeing that coming down a little bit.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Could you provide me with an updated list of DVA contracts below \$1 million and above \$1 million and the total value and cost of all of those. How many consultants are currently engaged by the department and what tasks or functions are they engaged in? I think it's a matter of updating what you might have already provided.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	6	Eric ABETZ	Defence Honours and Recognition - 200 Fight	<p>CHAIR: The committee is resumed. I have a bracket of questions on a range of issues. The first one is: is the department aware of 200 flight?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: 200 flight?</p> <p>CHAIR: Yes, that is a group of airmen who were the air support to our Z special group. It was formed to support the operations of Z special group. They have been described as: 'The bravest of the brave.' For the Z Special group: 'Without them we were nothing.' It has been put to me that 200 flight has never received their own outright honour and citation. We still have two of those veterans with us. What's the way forward with this if we do want to provide some recognition to 200 flight? I confess, I wasn't aware of them until Monday 14 February this year. Somebody drew it to my attention via email and I thought it appropriate to raise with you.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Certainly. No, I am not aware, Chair, so I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: Yes, If you could.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: If you wouldn't mind passing the details. We can then follow-up, probably, with our colleagues in Defence as well.</p> <p>CHAIR: Good.</p>	Hansard	105

				Ms Cosson: I'm happy to take that on notice. CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Cosson.		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	7	Jacqui LAMBIE	Anzac Day - Itinerary	Senator LAMBIE: What are they doing? Mr Bayliss: They're doing all the logistics and set-up for the events, and making sure the liaison and tasks with local security forces are arranged. We then have a larger team that comes over, that does all that point-to-point people movement, bus control, transport and escorting, particularly in Turkey, with Turkish security forces, to look after Australians over there. Senator LAMBIE: Would the committee be able to have a look at the itinerary for the trips to France and Turkey that have been outlined? Mr Bayliss: We're still going through the details— Ms Cosson: As I mentioned, we haven't finalised all that, but I don't see any reason why we couldn't share that with the committee. Senator PATRICK: What about drafts? Senator LAMBIE: What about proposals? Ms Cosson: I'll have to have a look at that; I'm sorry.	Hansard	108
Department of Veterans' Affairs	8	Jacqui LAMBIE; Rex PATRICK	Anzac Day - Briefs to the Minister	Senator LAMBIE: Have there been drafts or proposals done already? Ms Cosson: We've certainly briefed the minister on what some options might be, but we're doing some further work on that. Senator LAMBIE: I didn't ask whether you've briefed the minister. I just asked whether you've done drafts or proposals on paper. Ms Cosson: We have provided a brief to the minister. Senator PATRICK: Can you provide that to the committee, please? Ms Cosson: That would be for the minister to decide. It's a brief to him. Senator Duniam: I'll take it on notice.	Hansard	108-109
Department of Veterans' Affairs	9	Jacqui LAMBIE	Anzac Day	Senator LAMBIE: Are any of the staff going to Paris during that period of time? Ms Cosson: A couple certainly would be to visit the embassy. That's where the Australian ambassador is, so there may be one or two that might have to go to Paris to talk to the ambassador to finalise all the protocol and logistics. Senator LAMBIE: Do staff usually stay on afterwards, go off in-between, take days off and do shopping, out of that— Ms Cosson: No, they come back. They might have one day down. Senator LAMBIE: So in the past, before COVID hit, nobody has ever gone to Paris and spent a day or half a day shopping in Paris. Is that what you are telling me? Ms Cosson: I am not aware of it. Senator LAMBIE: No personal leave? Ms Cosson: They are not able to take personal leave after the event; they come home. Senator LAMBIE: And there have definitely been no shopping trips while they haven't taken their leave—no stopovers? Ms Cosson: No, not that I am aware but I can take that on notice, if you like. Senator LAMBIE: That would be great.	Hansard	109

Department of Veterans' Affairs	10	Jacqui LAMBIE	Anzac Day - Costings	<p>Senator LAMBIE: What does it cost these days if you have 30 going to Turkey and then maybe 30 going to France? What does business class cost? Is it about 10 grand?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I would have to take the actual costs on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So you have not done any actual costings on paper either?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I haven't, but Mr Bayliss has.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Have you done any costings, Mr Bayliss?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We can give you some rough costings, noting that we have not locked in any final options yet.</p>	Hansard	109
Department of Veterans' Affairs	11	Jacqui LAMBIE	Anzac Day - Number of Attendees	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I am simply asking: Do you think that passes the sniff test while you are sending those people over there on trips and we have nothing big here going on and you're saying, 'It's nothing to do with us and we do want to be involved.'?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I am delivering on a government commitment for services in Turkey and France; that is my job.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Do we know how many people will be attending?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I told you I will take all of that on notice because we are still finalising the planning arrangements and we are still to provide those options to the minister. We have given him a preliminary brief which, as we said, the minister may wish to share with you. But we are continuing our planning and we have not finalised that at this point.</p>	Hansard	111
Department of Veterans' Affairs	12	Jacqui LAMBIE	Anzac Day - Staff Roles	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I think I'd be asking why you weren't taking Defence for that. Anyway, that would be Defence's pick up. Do you think that as well as providing that draft you could give us a list of the staff you have approached to go, who's planning on going who have said yes, they're available, and what their availability is, on notice, within the department?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'd probably be able to give you the role. We haven't selected the staff yet.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Right. If I could have the roles, thanks.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: The roles I can certainly do and the numbers against those roles.</p>	Hansard	112
Department of Veterans' Affairs	13	Jacqui LAMBIE	Veteran Wellbeing Centre - Tasmania	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. So maybe you, Senator Duniam, can find out where they flaked the \$2.2 million from, and if there was any analysis. If they've said it's \$2.2 million, where's the analysis to say why they are getting \$2.2 million in Braddon?</p> <p>Ms Pope: I can't answer that question. It was a matter for government.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: It was a decision of government.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: I'll take on notice what information we can provide.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: It's because it's a Liberal seat there—marginal.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: When you say it's a decision for government, I break things up into the judiciary, the legislature and the executive. I presume you're saying it was a decision of the executive government, which includes you guys. Or are you saying it's a decision that went to cabinet?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'm not too sure.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: The way it's supposed to work is that ministers generally don't make decisions without receiving a brief of some kind from a department like yours if you are the subject matter experts.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Sometimes they do.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So you're saying that, in this instance, the government received no brief?</p>	Hansard	113

				<p>Ms Cosson: On the— Ms Pope: \$2.5 million. Ms Cosson: No, we did not brief on the \$2.5 million. Senator LAMBIE: Did you provide any advice to the government on that centre in Burnie? Ms Pope: No. Ms Cosson: No. Senator PATRICK: Under what program was it funded—something that's not the responsibility of the department? Ms Cosson: It's a wellbeing centre. Senator LAMBIE: It's a wellbeing centre that we were never told to put in Burnie, but we're deciding to put it in Burnie. That's not what the recommendation said. It never mentioned anything at all about Burnie—nothing on the north-west coast. Senator PATRICK: Minister, did it involve any colour-coded spreadsheets—red and blue? Senator Duniam: While I appreciate your references to matters that are entirely outside this portfolio, I have indicated I'll take on notice all matters related to this and provide information to the committee, when I'm able to, through that process.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	14	Jacqui LAMBIE	Veteran Wellbeing Centre - Tasmania	<p>Ms Pope: In relation to the \$5 million, we have the feasibility study that you've already referenced, and we will conduct consultations with Tasmanian veterans and their families in order to determine who the best lead organisations might be in Tasmania, how many locations might be the optimum and where they might be. That work is still to come. The \$2.5 million is separate to the \$5 million, and it's the \$5 million that the feasibility study related to. Senator LAMBIE: How long do you reckon it's going to take you? How much time are you going to spend with all those families down there? It would be a world record if you actually got all that information in four weeks. Why don't you give me a time line on that. Ms Pope: I can do that on notice.</p>	Hansard	113
Department of Veterans' Affairs	15	Jacqui LAMBIE; Rex PATRICK	Veteran Statistics	<p>Senator LAMBIE: First of all, did you look at where the veterans are and where the need is? Most veterans in Burnie will tell you there are more people who need help in Launnie, to be honest. And that's what your \$120,000 study said too. So where did you get the breakdown? Really, I've asked in the past for the breakdown of veterans and where they are, and you can never give me numbers. Have we got a brand-new person doing all this now, have we? I have never ever been able to get a breakdown from you people as to exactly how many veterans are where in this country. When did this happen? Ms Pope: I didn't say— Ms Cosson: We don't know— Ms Pope: The \$2.5— Senator LAMBIE: Where are your veterans? Ms Cosson: As we've said— Senator LAMBIE: In the five electorates in Tasmania, how many are in each electorate? Ms Pope: I didn't say I knew that information. Senator LAMBIE: That's what I'm asking you. So how do you know where these hubs are going? Ms Cosson: We can have a look broadly at where veterans are located. We do have some data on that, which I'm happy to look at and take on notice for you, in relation to Tasmania.</p>	Hansard	114

				<p>Senator PATRICK: And South Australia.</p> <p>Ms Pope: I can tell you I believe that there are about 8,000 veterans in Tasmania, but I'd have to take on notice their distribution. And I'm taking that off the top of my head. You're looking like I might be wrong, and I may be, but I believe that's roughly—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: If we've lost 4,000 and haven't gained any more in the last six years then that's correct.</p> <p>Ms Pope: That's roughly the number. But it's not just distribution that's taken into account. There are also infrastructure, transport and other considerations, and we would take advice from the representative organisations who may be the leads in determining what the best locations might be for those centres.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can you take that question on notice about numbers and distribution across South Australia as well?</p> <p>Ms Pope: Certainly.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes, we can.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	16	Jacqui LAMBIE	Veteran Wellbeing Centre - Guidelines	<p>Ms Pope: In the cases where a lead organisation wasn't already identified. In the case of Perth, you'd be aware that the RSL already had a program and a project underway, and the funding was allocated to the Western Australian RSL. Where there wasn't a lead organisation—for example, in Darwin—we went through a similar process of identifying a suitable lead organisation through a consultative process.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: When you make a decision, do you have to run through criteria while you're making that decision?</p> <p>Ms Pope: There's a set of guidelines against which the organisations have to put forward their proposals.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Could you please provide them to the committee?</p> <p>Ms Pope: Yes, Senator. They're publicly available, but I can do that.</p>	Hansard	115
Department of Veterans' Affairs	17	Rex PATRICK	Veteran Wellbeing Centre - Caretaker	<p>Senator PATRICK: Secretary, eight weeks from now takes us up to about the time an election will have to be called. Under the caretaker conventions, one of the considerations you must make as the secretary—because a lot of the responsibility then goes back to you—is the dollar value of the commitment and whether a minister has to make a decision. On \$5 million commitment made by a minister, would that be something that would fall within the caretaker convention such that the minister would have to consult the opposition?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Can I take that on notice? I think it would have to with such a significant decision. I believe that the minister would consult with the opposition on that type of decision.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I think they have to as long as it meets your criteria.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Having come from PM&C, when it gets into the caretaker mode, in some respects you then take control over what ought to be decided in the portfolio—more so even than the minister.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Pope: It's likely that we would conduct the consultations and the EOI process because that sort of work can go on during caretaker, and it may be that the decision would be made post caretaker mode.</p>	Hansard	117

				<p>Senator PATRICK: It looks to me like that's what's going to happen— Ms Pope: It could be. Senator PATRICK: on the timing.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	18	Jacqui LAMBIE	DVA Staff Training - Trauma Informed	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Recommendation 4.2 was for you to simplify the claims process, which I know you're working on. Recommendation 4.3 was for all DVA staff who have dealings with clients to be given regular trauma-informed training. When did that start? Ms Cosson: I might have to ask Ms Cameron to answer that one if that's okay. Certainly the trauma-informed training has been underway for a period now. Ms Cameron might be able to give you a bit more detail around that. Ms Cameron: We have implemented ongoing training, particularly around trauma-informed care and support, focused very much on our case coordination staff but also providing information and support to our claims-processing delegates. Certainly that is the basis of a lot of the care that we provide through Open Arms and the training and support that the staff in those teams receive as well. That is ongoing. Senator LAMBIE: But when did it start? Obviously this is a new recommendation. This was not happening, according to Ms Boss, before this was given to you. You had some sort of training beforehand, which obviously was not effective, otherwise she wouldn't have recommended doing regular trauma-informed training. So when did that start? Ms Cameron: We've been providing trauma-informed training for Open Arms staff for a very long time. I would have to take on notice exactly when it started for staff outside of the Open Arms section. Senator LAMBIE: DVA staff—I think that's what you said. It has started, though? Ms Cosson: Yes, absolutely. And I think the point with Dr Boss—and we will take it on notice—was that she was saying that all staff who are working with veterans should have that training, so it's expanding it, which we have been doing. Senator LAMBIE: Can you tell me how you're assessing that if it's started? Obviously, if it only started last week, you're not getting an assessment. I just want to see how you're assessing that that's actually working. Can you also provide the committee with that? Ms Cosson: Yes. We'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	118
Department of Veterans' Affairs	19	Jacqui LAMBIE; Rex PATRICK	Ombudsman	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I have a problem—and he has allowed me to talk about it—with Mr Fewson's issue. He has gone to the ombudsman, and the ombudsman has now been on to you for, I think, over six months waiting for information from DVA so they can move on with handling his case. Why is it taking DVA that long to get that information? Ms Cosson: I thought we had provided a response, but I'll find out who can respond to you on that one. Ms Rundle: Senator, we will need to possibly follow up a little bit more for you in terms of the exact FOI request. We're very familiar with it and we've been working— Ms Cosson: The ombudsman. Ms Rundle: The ombudsman, sorry. Senator LAMBIE: Why are we waiting? Ms Rundle: I'm not clear on your question, Senator. I understand that we have regular communication going between the ombudsman and Mr Fewson. But I would say—</p>	Hansard	119

				<p>Senator LAMBIE: I'm asking about a document, and I'm asking you why you can't provide it. Why is it taking so long to provide that document? They also requested additional information in December and were told it would be forthcoming in February. That's what you told them. So on what date this month do you intend to give that to the ombudsman?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: May I suggest that we take that on notice, and also that we find out what we haven't done? Perhaps you could give us a little more information as well, offline, so that we can find out exactly what he was expecting which we haven't given to him. But I would say that we're working really hard to try to give Mr Fewson all the things he has asked for.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: It isn't him: he had to go to the ombudsman, like I had to go to him so that I could get the stuff out of you people because you wouldn't provide it to him in the first place.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We'll need to take it on notice and find out what the outstanding issue is with the ombudsman—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay, you can do that. How long is it taking—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Could I just ask a question on that?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Yes, sure, please be my guest.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I think it's section 9 of the ombudsman's act which gives an extensive power to get access to pretty much anything, unless the attorney issues a certificate to prevent that. He doesn't exercise that power normally, he simply seeks cooperation. I'm just wondering about turnaround for documents if an ombudsman makes a request: I would have thought that would be relatively quick.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: My understanding is that we've been giving a lot to the ombudsman and that we're working very closely with the ombudsman. That's why we've suggested that we take what's still outstanding and open that the ombudsman is waiting for on notice.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I was going to a general principle: obviously, the ombudsman can exercise a power which is pretty hard to resist but, normally, they look for a cooperative way to do business.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Absolutely, and we always try to cooperate—I don't know of a time where we haven't cooperated with the ombudsman for any request they have for information from us. I'm just not too sure—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What's a typical turnaround time between a request for a document and a response?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I honestly think that would be very hard to answer. We'll try to do that for you on notice, if you wish. I do think it depends upon the complexity of the case; we know that from experience. This is partly why it may have taken us a little while longer with this particular client. We did actually turn around some information reasonably quickly, but I think the ombudsman came back and sought more. Because this is a veteran with considerable needs, it has possibly taken a little while to give them everything they need—but we'll find out.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	20	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commission - notices to give	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. How long is it taking for the DVA to respond to requests for information or documents from the royal commission? What's your turnaround?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: When we receive a notice from the royal commission, they give us a date on which we are to respond. We've made every attempt to respond in the time on most of those notices.</p>	Hansard	120

				<p>If we're unable to then we go back and seek further time to be able to provide that information. But we make every effort to meet the timings of the royal commission.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Could you please supply us with the data about how many requests for information have been asked for from the royal commission—how many have been given to them on time and how many are still outstanding? And, if they're outstanding, how much more time are you requesting for those?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: You'd like me to take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Yes, thank you—and how many of them were extended. I think I asked you that, didn't I?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	21	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commission - delayed response	<p>Senator LAMBIE: How many of the commissioners or staff at the royal commission formally raised concerns about delays in DVA responding to requests for information or documents?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'm sorry; I missed that.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Have you had any complaints from the royal commissioners or the staff working at the royal commission? Have they raised any concerns about delays?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Not directly to me, but I understand that we were non-compliant in relation to one of the requests because we were delayed in providing the response on time.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Can you tell me what that request—</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That's fine. We don't need the names or whatever. Maybe just give us a rough outline of why that was the case.</p>	Hansard	120
Department of Veterans' Affairs	22	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commission - Engaged Lawyers	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Have you engaged anyone external to the Public Service—any private firms, communications groups, public relations, advisors, lawyers or anyone like that—to assist with DVA's response to the commission? Have you specifically put them on?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We've certainly engaged legal support because of the document search we need to undertake. When we receive a notice to produce, we are required to have that legal support. It's a system that's used to provide all the documents, so we have that. We have also engaged some additional legal support to help us in that record retrieval and in supporting witnesses appear before the royal commission. But I'm happy to take that on notice and give you some further details.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Do you know who the law firms that you engaged are? Can you or anyone else here name them now?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I can name the firm that is doing the document search. It's MinterEllison.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Is there another firm doing other stuff, or are they just private lawyers who've been contracted?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We may have some other individual lawyers. We do have some on secondment from the Australian Government Solicitor. I can give you a breakdown on notice. I'd rather not—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That's fine.</p>	Hansard	120
Department of Veterans' Affairs	23	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commission - Contractors	<p>Senator LAMBIE: That's fine. So you haven't put any new contracts out or commissioned any firms to do communications, public relations or those sorts of things? You haven't employed anyone since that royal commission—</p>	Hansard	120-121

				<p>Ms Cosson: We have employed some individuals on contract to support us. The workload has increased, so I have employed additional contractors to support us.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: How many contractors have you—</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'd have to take that on notice, sorry.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	24	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commission - Current Expenditure	<p>Senator LAMBIE: How much money have you spent on that, and what sort of contractors are they? Once again, you've said 'contractors'. Are they communications contractors or public relations ones? You must know what you have.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: There are no public relations ones, but certainly some are supporting communications. Some are supporting legal, as you've already identified. Some are supporting other areas, in bringing together all of the responses that we need to. That's probably about it, but I'd rather make sure that I'm giving you all the facts. We did receive funding in the budget, as you know, of around \$23 million to support the department in responding to the royal commission.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Could you provide whatever you've used so far in relation to that. Could you supply to the committee anything that has been non-legal help, besides what I've asked you to provide about them, that you've used money for, for anything to do with the royal commission.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Okay.</p>	Hansard	121
Department of Veterans' Affairs	25	Jacqui LAMBIE	McKinsey Review - Report	<p>Senator LAMBIE: To finish off, I want to talk about the McKinsey review of your claims processing. I know that Senator Ayres has touched on this. What did you learn from the consultants that you didn't already know?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: The diagnostic was probably the most extensive diagnostic work we've had in relation to our processing in the department. It was very extensive—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That's not what I asked you. I want to know what you learnt—</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I can ask Ms Rundle to—I can't tell you about the recommendations, but we've certainly learnt a few things that McKinsey were asked to have a look at.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: What were they that you didn't already know?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I can talk broadly about this, because otherwise it sort of goes to the content of the report that's being considered at the moment, but what McKinsey did was to look at a range of things. They looked at—and they were asked to do this; this is in the public domain—the end-to-end claims processing across the contemporary claims. They are: DRGA IL and PI, MRCA IL and PI, and VEA disability claims. For each one of those, they mapped the pathway and they looked at the experience of clients—veterans and families—and they identified some of the pain points, which was something we had asked them to do. They reviewed a lot of documentation. During our veteran-centric reform, we had done a lot of engagement with families and veterans, and they looked at all of those and collected up all of that intelligence that the community had given us. They sat down in the claims office, particularly in New South Wales, and looked at the systems and how the systems worked for a delegate making decisions, and they did a lot of discussions with staff and met with them to look at what staff experienced in the end-to-end process, to be able to work out where the improvements were that could possibly be made, with the aim of doing two things: reducing the time taken to do unnecessary things, so that we could make the experience better and faster for veterans; and reducing the backlog. So that's what they did.</p>	Hansard	121

				<p>Senator LAMBIE: So you are telling me that, with all of the consultancy that's been done? I won't name the millions of dollars that you've paid out and who to over the last 10 years; I'll simply ask this question: what did they give you that you didn't already know that the rest of us already know—honestly? Seriously!</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I actually think they did—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay—</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I did; I do. The secretary has already said this, and nothing is truer than the fact that DVA staff are completely focused on trying to reduce the claims backlog. We just did not have the sort of capacity and the skill set that an independent consultant brings to a problem. They bring global expertise, having done similar work elsewhere, which shows you some things and gives you insight into problems that you may not otherwise know.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Once again, Minister, it would be good if that document could be released, please.</p> <p>Senator Duniam: I'll take that on notice.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	26	Jacqui LAMBIE	Royal Commissioner Concerns - McKinsey Review	<p>Senator LAMBIE: We touched on this before, but, just in case, did the veteran suicide royal commissioners or any officials working at the royal commission raise concerns with the department or the minister's office that the McKinsey review may hinder their inquiry in any way?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I think we provided the statement from the commission—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: No, no—I'm not asking about the statement. I'm going to ask beyond the statement. The statement looks pretty; that's lovely. It seems funny that they do this big statement and, 'Oh my goodness, look at all this on McKinsey.' Why would you put that in there? What else was given to you guys or the minister behind closed doors that we haven't got with this? There's no way you would put a statement out of it and the commissioners write that much about McKinsey. They were concerned about it. So somebody has received correspondence. Now, that's either been you, as Veterans' Affairs, or the minister, and we would like to see that, please.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: You do that. Thank you.</p>	Hansard	122
Department of Veterans' Affairs	27	Larissa WATERS	Compensation - Sexual Assault	<p>Are Australian service personnel who are sexually assaulted by a foreign national during active service entitled to compensation?</p> <p>Are their claims assessed any differently from claims relating to sexual assault or harassment perpetrated by an Australian citizen / colleague? If so, has the Department raised this issue with the Minister and requested any legislative reform to address this disparity?</p> <p>If Australian service personnel report being sexually assaulted by a foreign national during active service, does the Department make any contact with the relevant government of the alleged perpetrator's country?</p> <p>Are support services, counselling etc available to Australian service personnel who have been sexually assaulted if the assault was perpetrated by a foreign national</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	28	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims processing	<p>Can DVA please advise on claims processing times as follows:</p> <p>1. What is the average waiting time for MRCA Initial Liability claims and Permanent Impairment claims?</p>	Written	

				<p>2. What is the average time to allocate a file to a delegate?</p> <p>3. Can DVA advise the current backlog of unprocessed Initial Liability claims and Permanent Impairment assessments as of 31 December 2021?</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	29	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims processing	<p>Specifically, in relation to claims processing performance data, as at 30 September 2021 and 31 December 2021, can DVA please provide the following information by claim type:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of claims on hand 2. Number of unallocated claims on hand 3. Average time taken for a claim to be allocated 4. Median time take for a claim to be allocated 5. Average processing time for claims 6. Median processing time for claims 7. Number of claims on hand not processed within 100 days 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	30	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims processing	<p>Can DVA please provide the latest available information, where possible, on compensation claims as per the following tables?</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2020 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing)</p> <p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2021 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing)</p> <p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2020 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate)</p> <p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p>	Written	

				<p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2021 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2020 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2021 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2020 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Dec 2021 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	31	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims processing	<p>The response to a QON from the last round of Senate Estimates (QON 22) showed around 42 per cent of on hand MRCA Initial Liability and 35 per cent of DRCA Initial Liability claims were over 300 days old as at 30 September 2021. This is up from 36 per cent and 24 per cent respectively as reported after the previous Estimates round.</p> <p>1. Can the department confirm this? 2. What measures is DVA taking to address this?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	32	Kimberley KITCHING	Client Databases	<p>Evidence to the Royal Commission into defence and veteran suicides indicated DVA's databases are not well integrated and there was an example cited of a former soldier with significant service-related injuries who was forced to prove he was in the Army. It was reported that the department's IT system made it very difficult and time-consuming to program legislation.</p> <p>1. Can DVA confirm this? 2. Have there been many other instances of this? 3. If so, what is DVA doing to ensure better data and information sharing both within the department and with other agencies, such as Defence and Health? 4. What is DVA doing to improve IT systems to speed up programming legislative changes?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	33	Kimberley KITCHING	ASL Increase	<p>Can DVA advise if there been any impact on claims processing from the additional 447 ASL?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	34	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims processing	<p>A media report from the Townsville Bulletin on 13 January 2022 stated that in the three weeks leading up to Christmas the number of claims finalised increased each week.</p> <p>1. Has this continued? 2. Does DVA expect this trend to continue?</p>	Written	

Department of Veterans' Affairs	35	Kimberley KITCHING	Labour Hire Contracts	<p>1. Can DVA provide an update on the cost of labour hire contracts for the 2020-21 financial year and for the period 1 July to 31 December 2021?</p> <p>2. Is this expected to increase further?</p> <p>3. Has DVA estimated how many permanent staff it could employ using this funding?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	36	Kimberley KITCHING	Contracts	Can DVA provide an updated list of all DVA contracts, including those less than \$1 million and those above \$1 million, and the total value or cost of all of these, for the 2020-21 financial year and for the period 1 July to 31 December 2021?	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	37	Kimberley KITCHING	Consultancies	<p>Can DVA please provide the following advice about consultancies.</p> <p>1. How many consultants are currently engaged by the department?</p> <p>2. What is the total value or cost of those?</p> <p>3. What tasks or functions they are involved in?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	38	Kimberley KITCHING	Claims Resourcing	<p>DVA has previously advised it has the option of returning to government to seek further resourcing dependent on the ongoing claims volumes over the next 1-2 years.</p> <p>1. Has DVA been able to forecast claims volumes over the next few years?</p> <p>2. At this stage, based on current volumes, does DVA anticipate having to go back to government?</p> <p>3. Is the department planning to seek further increases in ASL or labour hire numbers?</p> <p>4. If yes, can the department say how many at this stage?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	39	Kimberley KITCHING	McKinsey Review	<p>Can DVA please provide advice in relation to the McKinsey claims diagnostic audit.</p> <p>1. When is the Government planning to release the McKinsey review?</p> <p>2. Can DVA confirm the Commonwealth lodged a non-publication direction claim for the review and related documents with the Royal Commission into defence and veteran suicide? Why has the Commonwealth sought to suppress the review?</p> <p>3. In a hearing for the Royal Commission, a McKinsey representative advised that their review recommended 133 additional staff for DVA just to deal with the inflow of new claims, and even more to reduce the backlog. Can DVA confirm this recommendation? Does DVA support the recommendation? Has DVA or McKinsey attempted to quantify how many additional staff might be required above the initial 133?</p> <p>4. Were there any recommendations from the review that DVA will be taking to government for additional resourcing in the budget?</p> <p>5. In the last Estimates hearing, DVA noted some preliminary findings McKinsey provided were that the department needed to improve its letters to veterans and that delegates needed to treat veterans more sensitively as people. Has DVA addressed this?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	40	Kimberley KITCHING	Royal Commission	<p>Can DVA please provide advice in relation to its appearance at the Royal Commission into defence and veteran suicide hearings.</p> <p>1. Does DVA believe the current long claim wait times and backlogs are due to poor planning or a lack of resources?</p> <p>2. Does DVA believe the claim volume forecasting was inaccurate in the past, leading to inadequate requests for resources, or that the Government did not provide the resources that were requested, or both?</p> <p>3. Does DVA concur with Counsel Assisting's comments that there is evidence of possible sub-</p>	Written	

				<p>standard processes and significant issues in relation to access to effective and quality care?</p> <p>4. The commission was told progress on claims had been made in 11 action areas identified in a report to the department, including more investment in claims teams, and extra staff training on working with veterans on claims in a “trauma involved way”. Can DVA advise what this report was? What are the key recommendations? Has or will this report be made public?</p> <p>5. In the hearing DVA advised that when veterans made claims they either went into a priority queue or an unallocated queue, with unallocated claimants sent text messages and contacted, sometimes up to 225 days after making their claims, to discuss their circumstances and check in on their mental health. Is this true? Is DVA doing anything to speed up this process?</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	41	Kimberley KITCHING	Royal Commission	<p>Can DVA please provide advice in relation to DVA’s work with the Royal Commission into defence and veteran suicide.</p> <p>1. The commission has received more than 1,100 submissions to date, and this has doubled in the three months since the inquiry began. Does DVA believe the commission is sufficiently resourced to handle such a high volume of submissions?</p> <p>2. Has the department set up a taskforce or secretariat to support its work with the Royal Commission?</p> <p>3. Some stakeholders have raised concerns that this work could be diverting resources from frontline roles and claims processing. What is DVA’s view? How is the department managing this?</p> <p>4. The Commission Chair has said the inquiry has opened up 36 proposed lines of inquiry or topics the Commissioners intend to pursue, including issues around recruitment, military culture and transition from service to civilian life, based on evidence provided. The commission has issued more than 150 notices of urgent action notices to Defence, DVA and other bodies, resulting in more than 320,000 pages of material to review. Has DVA provided some of this material?</p> <p>5. If yes, is there is a risk this could overwhelm the commission?</p> <p>6. Has DVA been issued any notices? If so, can DVA advise what the nature of those are? Has DVA responded yet? What was the nature of the response?</p> <p>7. It is understood agencies will need to respond before the commission will make an interim report by 11 August. Does DVA expect to provide responses before then?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	42	Kimberley KITCHING	Veteran Wellbeing Centres	<p>1. Can DVA please provide an update on the Veteran Wellbeing Centres program.</p> <p>2. In the Budget, the Government announced \$10.7 million over four years from 2021-22 to establish two new Veteran Wellbeing Centres in Tasmania and South East Queensland. We understand the Government and DVA recently ran a consultation process for the South East Queensland centre and is currently consulting on the Tasmanian centre. Can DVA advise where these processes are up to?</p> <p>3. Some stakeholders have raised concerns that the month-long EOI process for a South East Queensland centre was too short and onerous for some smaller ex-service organisations. Has DVA received this feedback too? What is DVA’s response? Did DVA receive a sufficient number of high-quality proposals? Will any of this feedback be reflected in the Tasmanian consultation process?</p> <p>4. The budget information sheet on the measure states that there has been advocacy from a</p>	Written	

				<p>range of stakeholders seeking to establish a Wellbeing Centre in Tasmania. Can DVA advise which stakeholders it has engaged with and what proposals it has received?</p> <p>5. According to the budget fact sheet, implementation for both Veteran Wellbeing Centres would commence in 2021-22, but the South East Queensland centre will be completed in three years by 2023-24 and the Tasmanian centre would be completed in four years by 2024-25. Can DVA explain the difference? Why is there a later completion date for the Tasmanian hub?</p> <p>6. Can the department provide an update on the delivery timeframes for the remaining three centres announced at the 2019 election?</p> <p>7. Some partner organisations have noted the Government's \$5 million funding commitment for each Veteran Wellbeing Centre is for establishment and start-up operational costs only, and there is no commitment to provide ongoing funding support for the operation of centres. Does DVA accept that this may impact some partner organisations' ability to operate centres and manage these recurring costs? Does the fact the Government has had to provide additional seed funding to some partner organisations reflect this? Is this why the Government included some operational funding for the two new centres in the budget?</p> <p>8. Can DVA provide an update on the joint feasibility study with the ACT Government into the potential for a national research centre and tele/digital health hub to be located in the ACT? Can DVA advise on the expected timeframes?</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	43	Kimberley KITCHING	Grants	<p>Can the department please provide information about DVA grant programs.</p> <p>1. What are the current funding allocations for each of the DVA grant programs, and the total for all grant programs, both per year and over the forward estimates from 2021-22?</p> <p>2. What was the funding allocation for each grant program and total funding expended for all DVA grant programs combined for the last three years?</p> <p>3. Can DVA provide the total funding allocated and total funding expended for all DVA grant programs combined for the last three years?</p> <p>4. Can DVA provide a breakdown of grants awarded by electorate for each grant program for the last three years?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	44	Kimberley KITCHING	Alternative Treatments - PTSD	<p>On 7 January 2022, the Minister for Health announced \$15 million for seven clinical trials testing the use of potential breakthrough combination therapies to treat mental illnesses including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and anxiety disorders, as part of the Government's Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF). One of the trials involves Methylendioxyamphetamine (MDMA) for PTSD.</p> <p>1. Were the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Defence Personnel, and DVA consulted on these clinical trials?</p> <p>2. Did DVA provide any advice to the Department of Health on the trials? If so, what was the nature of that advice?</p> <p>3. Does DVA have a view on the merits or otherwise of these therapies and trials?</p> <p>4. Should any of trial results prove encouraging, would DVA consider adopting these therapies into its clinical practice and providing greater support for their use, for example, through subsidies?</p>	Written	

Department of Veterans' Affairs	45	Kimberley KITCHING	Assistance Dogs	<p>Can DVA please provide advice about the Psychiatric Assistance Dog Program (PADP). The Opposition has received representations indicating that approximately 30 veterans have been told they do not qualify for financial assistance to care for their assistance dogs because they received their dogs prior to the introduction of the PADP in 2019. It is understood that these veterans were informed they have to give up their assistance dogs, which they have formed strong emotional bonds with, in order to qualify for DVA's program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could these dogs be transferred back to the provider (on paper), if necessary, be reassessed for their Public Access Test (PAT), and then allocated to the same veteran so the dogs can remain with their existing veterans? 2. Could this be addressed by amendments to the Treatment Principles under section 90 of the Veterans' Entitlement Act 1986 to extend provision of financial support to veterans suffering from PTSD who have received an accredited psychiatric assistance dog from a DVA approved supplier prior to that supplier entering into a Deed of Agreement with DVA for the supply of an accredited assistance dog? 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	46	Kimberley KITCHING	Minister for Veterans' Affairs	<p>In relation to the office of the Minister for Veterans Affairs and Defence Personnel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all positions in the Minister's office been filled, including senior policy and media advisor roles? 2. Are there any DVA staff currently in the Minister's office? 3. Has DVA experienced a higher than usual turnover of DLO staff in the Minister's office? 4. Has any staff member returning to the Department expressed any concerns as to how they were treated in the Minister's office? 5. How often does the Minister meet face-to-face with the Secretary of DVA? 6. Does the department have any concerns with the conduct of staff in the Minister's office? 7. Are any of the former Minister's staff still in the office? 8. Does the Minister's office have an Aide-de-Camp (ADC) for commemorative events? 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	47	Kimberley KITCHING	Minister for Veterans' Affairs	<p>In relation to the office of the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Defence Personnel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many items of correspondence and Ministerial submissions are currently in the Minister's office? 2. In DVA's experience, is this unusually high? 3. What is the average time for a response with correspondence to the Minister? 	Written	