

**Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE — SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 25 OCTOBER and 15 DECEMBER 2017

**Department of Defence**

QoN	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Hansard page	Group	Date rec'd
1	Carr	Shipbuilding	<p>a) ...when the shipbuilding plan was announced in May 2017, the government stated 60 Australians were currently in France learning design skills as part of the future shipbuilding program. I wanted to know the number of Australians in France at that time, and how many more would be going over to France. Of the 60, where did they come from? Did they come from a particular industry? Were there any particular recruitment processes? Admiral, perhaps you can give me the information—which is the other part of the process. So, there were 60 Australians in France as of May? Is that the case?</p> <p>b) And you will be able to tell me how many there are now? It may well have been to 60 in May and a different number now?</p> <p>c) The 60 that were referred to—are you able to tell me where they are to be drawn from? The question actually asks companies or industry—where have they been recruited?</p>	9-10	CASG	25 October
2	Carr	Naval Architects	So for the six naval architects, it was \$6 million, was it?	12	CASG	25 October
3	Question answered on the day					
4	Carr	Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board	Could I get a breakdown of what the \$3.6 million was spent on? I mean, an advisory board that costs \$3.6 million?	15	SP&I	25 October
5	Carr	Naval Shipbuilding Plan	<p><b>Mr Ablong:</b> There were also a number of studies conducted by the RAND Corporation to support the development of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan, as well as a couple of other consultancies on specific areas of workforce development and the like.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> I see. You know I'm going to have to seek information on what those consultancies were.</p>	15	SP&I	25 October

6	Question answered on the day					
7	Lambie	Philippines Deployment	I have one more question. It's more about the personnel that will be involved in that. I'm assuming that they are probably going to be part of some sort of training team and they would have been in the Middle East. I don't need their names, but what I would like is if it's soldier A or if it's Air Force A. So I don't need the names; I just want to know what groups they're coming from, whether they're soldiers, sailors or airmen and how many tours they've done during their lifetime and how long they been in the armed forces. Do you think you can provide that to me, please?	20	ADFHQ	25 October
8	Question answered on the day					
9	Question answered on the day					
10	Kakoschke-Moore	Transition Support	<p><b>Senator KAKOSCHKE-MOORE:</b> I may need to come back to you on this if there is time later today, but I thought there was a policy that said accessing tertiary education could include university education and not just vocational education and training. If there is time today, I'll come back with the wording from the policy that I'm thinking of.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> If you wanted to raise that matter further with me, we could certainly discuss that and look at some of the examples or concerns that may have been raised with you.</p> <p><b>Senator KAKOSCHKE-MOORE:</b> I would appreciate that, thank you.</p>	28	DPG	25 October
11	Carr	Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board	I see. Can we get a breakdown of the payments made to each member of the board? I'd like a statement for the payments made to each member of the advisory board and the purposes for which those payments have been made. Since this board was only established last year, it seems to me an extraordinary amount of money they're being paid. Senator Carr requested a table format for the response.	29	SP&I	25 October

12	Question answered on the day					
13	Xenophon	Custom services panel	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> You may want to take this on notice: as a general principle, a rule of thumb, how often do you use the Defence services panel compared to, say, the Customs services panel?</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Sammut:</b> I wouldn't know as a rough rule of thumb, but there have been many occasions over the past years where Defence as a whole has used other panels.</p>	34	CASG	25 October
14	Rhiannon	PFAS – Non-litigated claims	<p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> There are currently 25 non-litigated claims that have been received by Defence: 16 in relation to Williamstown, eight in relation to Oakey and one in relation to Katherine.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> When did they commence and when do you think they'll be resolved?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> The first of those claims probably would have been received in the order of 12 months ago. Some of them were received, or at least one was received, quite recently. I can't give a forecast for when settlement may occur.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> But that's probably one of the most important questions for you to be clear on, because, with the stress this is putting people under, they just don't know what their future is. You would be aware that some people have now walked out of their homes and walked off their land. Surely you can give them some indication of when this will be finalised—I mean, you've got a whole department.</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> The claims are being dealt with by a legal team. I don't have personal visibility of most of those claims and I have no information about likely settlement times for those claims.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Can you take it on notice so that some clarity can be provided on this important question and people can have an understanding of what the future holds for them?</p>	38	PFAS	25 October
15	Rhiannon	PFAS – epidemiological study/community engagement	<p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> For those areas where the epidemiological study is in place, managed by the Department of Health, which includes blood tests, the eligibility criteria to be part of that process are the same for people whether they be members of the ADF or members of the public. For example, for Williamstown and Oakey, it's for people who've lived or worked within the investigation area, be they ADF people or members of the public.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Is that the same at all other bases where you have this problem?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> We generally try and provide the same information and the</p>	38	PFAS	25 October

			<p>same response mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> You just used the word 'generally', which always sets alarm bells off. Would you take it on notice to list the bases where the contamination has occurred? Are the blood tests provided? Are there drop-in centres? Are the measures you're offering in Williamstown offered in other areas for both workers and residents?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> In terms of community engagement, it's absolutely the same wherever we go. In terms of providing information to members of the community and members of Defence on the base, it's absolutely the same wherever we go. However, we do not do necessarily exactly the same things at each place we're investigating because the circumstances are different. We're running investigations now at 23 separate sites.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Can you provide on notice what's different? Thank you very much. My final question, which I'm sure can be quick, is about Shoalwater Bay. I understand there are two bases there, and they don't appear to be on the government's current list of investigation sites. Is that the case? If so, why?</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

16	Gallacher	PFAS – investigations	<p>a) Can we get on notice the 'virtually complete' and the stage of the investigations?</p> <p>b) Is Defence able to provide a timeline that outlines when you expect the different investigation components, preliminary report, detailed environmental investigation, human health, risk assessment and so on? Can you do that for each of the 23 bases?</p>	39	PFAS	25 October
17	Gallacher	PFAS - remediation	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I didn't see any evidence of it when I was on the Cox Peninsula and asbestos was blowing around there, and we don't see any evidence of it at Oakey or Williamstown or any of the other hot spots that have come out. Do you have one and can you produce it on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> I do, and I can provide that on notice. Just a reminder that the issues we are dealing with from PFAS date back to the 1970s and 80s, and things may have been different in those times. But we certainly take our environmental responsibilities very seriously.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You have also stated that you're talk talking to in excess of 30 companies about remediation strategies to clean water and clean soil. Could you provide a list of all the companies you've been speaking to and the details of the proposed remediation strategies?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> We can certainly provide a list of the companies we are speaking to. It may be difficult for us to provide the details, because some of the companies have come to us with commercially sensitive information. They</p>	40	PFAS	25 October

			have techniques that they think are patentable and world-leading and they wouldn't want us to put that into the public domain. But certainly we can come to you with the list of companies we've been in contact with over the last couple of years on this journey.			
18	Gallacher	PFAS – properties in investigation area	How many homes or businesses are located in the PFAS investigation area?	41	PFAS	25 October
19	Question answered on the day					
20	Gallacher	PFAS – Heart Morass	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do we know the level of contaminant entering Heart Morass from the defence base?</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> We do have, through our environmental investigation, levels of PFAS based upon the sampling and modelling that we've done under the investigation.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the level?</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> There are various levels. Each time you take a sample, you get a different level. We can provide that information to you on notice. The investigation reports to date are available on our website.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> That'll be fine.</p>	46	PFAS	25 October
21	Gallacher	PFAS – Community Reference Group	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Did Defence provide any feedback on the membership of this new group?</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> Of the steering group?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> No—the newly formed Community Reference Group.</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps you could take on notice whether you've provided feedback and whether you were asked to provide feedback on the membership of the group.</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> Yes.</p>	47	PFAS	25 October
22	Gallacher	PFAS – map of Williamstown investigation zone	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are you able to table the most recent map of the Williamstown investigation area showing the contamination plume?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> We'll be able to make that available once that report is finalised, which I think is a bit later this year. We're very close to that. As I said earlier, we're planning on going to the community probably towards the end of November, so we would be in a position to have the latest information at that time.</p> <p><b>Mr Birrer:</b> And that's information about the contamination plume and our understanding of it. You mentioned a map of the investigation area. That investigation area was set by the New South Wales EPA and is available on their website and also on ours.</p>	47-48	PFAS	25 October

			<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay, but I think what we're trying to track here is—there's a map available. Mr Grzeskowiak stated that the spread of the contamination is constantly under review. We're asking you whether it has changed over time, the ways in which it has changed and whether you have a more definitive map of the contamination. That's all we're asking.</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> And we will have in November, and that will be made available; it will be on our website. But we can make it available to the committee via a question on notice.</p>			
23	Leyonhjelm	Defence procurements	<p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> My understanding is that we, for Defence, buy some equipment off the shelf, already in production, and we also have platforms that are designed specifically for us—'bespoke' is the term that I've used. My question is: can you roughly estimate what the percentage is of Defence procurements involving simply buying off-the-shelf platforms and what percentage is bespoke?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> To give you an accurate answer I will take that on notice, because the clarity between something which is purely off the shelf and something which has a minor modification can vary. I will try to give you as much detail as I can.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> While you're taking questions on notice, I am interested in what has been the relationship between off the shelf and bespoke—and I accept it's not always black and white—over the last 25 years. Can you give a rough estimate of the ratio or proportion of each category?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> That's an even more complex answer. I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> I anticipated that would be the case. This will almost inevitably be a more complex one again. Of the percentage of equipment that is bespoke, I'd like to know what proportion of it has been delivered on time and what percentage of it was significantly over budget? You can decide what 'significantly' means. Clearly, the air warfare destroyer is an example, but I'm looking at a 25-year pattern here. Is that doable?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> We can take that on notice. In the shorter term, we do an annual major projects report, which does give you an essence of that data about schedule, budget and their performance et cetera. That's been done since about 2007, so you're looking at about a 10-year data span.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> I don't think anyone will disagree. There is a trade off between buying off the shelf—in terms of cost—and having it designed specifically for our requirements, both in availability and cost.</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> That's assuming that an off-the-shelf product exists that</p>	52-53	CASG	25 October

			would meet our requirements, so there's another dimension to this. <b>Senator Payne:</b> We can put all that together for you. <b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> If you want to send me a copy of the relevant sections of the joint standing committee on defence procurement, then that might do it if it answers the question. I'm not sure about the time scale.			
24	McCarthy	PFAS – Katherine and Darwin	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When did you consider Katherine and Darwin as places you needed to look at? <b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> That would have been as a result of our desktop analysis looking at the sites where these chemicals would've been used. <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What year was that? Would you like to that on notice? <b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> To be sure, I'd have to come back on that, yes.	55	PFAS	25 October
25	McCarthy	PFAS – Engagement with Katherine residents	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Defence wrote to Oakey residents in 2014. When did you write to the Katherine residents? <b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> The issue was publicly put out in connection with the preliminary site investigation. The first engagement would have been, I think, in late 2016—we'll just check that one.	56	PFAS	25 October
26	Roberts	PFAS – Oakey town water	<b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> No, and I should make it quite clear that the town water in Oakey has no PFAS in it. It comes from sources which are not contaminated. The people who are potentially most exposed are those people who've been drinking bore water. We're providing clean water to 43 of those people. We're also working with Toowoomba Regional Council to have as many of those properties as can be connected to town water connected to town water. That project is ongoing. I think we're paying around \$3.7 million to Toowoomba council. They are then managing the contract to put in place those water connections. That's ongoing. <b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> The physical work has started on that? <b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> I'm not sure that it's actually started. I know that there is a contract in place. It's either started or it's about to start. I'm just not sure exactly where that's up to. <b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Would it be possible to find out? <b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> Yes, we can find that out, possibly in the next three minutes.	57	PFAS	25 October
27	Question answered on the day					
28	Question answered on the day					
29	Kitching	BAE Systems	How many contracts does Defence have with this contractor?	69	CASG	25 October
30	Question answered on the day					
31	Moore	SNAFU	<b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is it possible, on notice, to find out what they told you?	72	ADFHQ	25 October

			<p>This is part of a much wider debate about these kinds of issues being on Facebook and the difficulty in having things taken down. So I'm putting that question to see whether you can take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We'll certainly attempt to get that...</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> I think our focus at the moment has been on trying to identify how many, if any, are serving members. There have been a number of claims made. We are not sure yet, and we're still looking to understand that. I do take your point.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Has anything happened such as putting something out to current personnel?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> No, I don't believe so.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Should there be? Is that a discussion of whether you will or you won't, or you've made the discussion not to do it?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> No, we'll take that on board.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Thank you. Can we—the committee—be advised; is that possible?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> Yes</p> <p>Partially answered on page 84.</p>			
32	Rice	Defence Site Maribyrnong	How many other unsolicited expressions of interest have you had?	74	E&IG	25 October
33	Lambie	Gender Dysphoria	<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> How many of them do you have on the front line right now that are serving with a weapon in their hand? How many of them are combat soldiers?</p> <p><b>Air Vice Marshal Smart:</b> I wouldn't have that information, Senator; we can take that on notice. But it is not an area that I would be across. But certainly, once their condition is resolved, then they would be treated like anybody else and are able to be deployed or employed in any particular role.</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell:</b> I just want to note, Senator Lambie: all soldiers are trained and able to conduct operations, and to defend themselves and their teams, no matter what their job or employment status on operations.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Yes, and I'm very aware of that. But they can't if they're not a certain med class; you know that as well as I do.</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell:</b> So every person who is a deployable member of the army—</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Are they deployable?</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell:</b> is a soldier able to conduct operations.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Are they deployable? That's what I'm asking you.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> That question was taken on notice, Senator Lambie.</p>	77-78	JCG	25 October



			<p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> I haven't finished my questioning, actually. I've got other questions on this, so may I have my 15 minutes, please?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sure. Sorry, I thought you had concluded.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Thank you; no, I haven't concluded. I want to know: what risk assessment did the military do when you introduced gender dysphoria into the Defence Force? And may I see that assessment?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We didn't introduce gender dysphoria. As a result of the changes to the law in 2013, we developed a policy, which was finalised in 2015, to manage a change to the law.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> Did you do a risk assessment on it? A risk assessment is done on everything else in the Defence Force. Have you got a risk assessment to evaluate that? You've obviously agreed with it. You're not fighting against it, from where you are—the hierarchy.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> It's the law.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> Let's put this into the bigger context. You're a valuable advocate for veterans' health and particularly mental health issues. This is a mental health condition, and it's really important that we remember that. What is the main thing we've been trying to do in terms of veterans' mental health? It is to reduce stigma. When we have discussions like this, what we're doing, frankly, is reinforcing the stigma of one strand of the mental health spectrum, and I don't think it's particularly helpful.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> No, that's not what I'm doing, so please don't patronise me.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> I am not patronising you.</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> I'm more worried about the morale of the troops. When did you do a survey and ask the diggers what they thought about it? Did you go in and fight for those diggers? I'm telling you: there are thousands out there that are not happy about this. How does their morale stack up, and what do they think about the decision that's been made? Did you feed that decision back to the people that make the laws up here? What did you do? How much did your people—how much did the Defence chiefs—play in this? What part did they play in this? What information did they provide? That is all the stuff I'm looking for.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> There are about eight questions, Senator Lambie. I think it will assist proceedings—</p> <p><b>Senator LAMBIE:</b> They can take them on notice.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> They're taken on notice.</p>			
34	Gallacher	Fuel Supply	a) <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Didn't the white paper actually flag a figure of investment over those multiple areas?	78-79	JCG	25 October

			<p><b>Air Vice Marshal McDonald:</b> It did—over those multiple areas and specifically.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So what is that figure?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We'll get that number. It's an aggregate of several elements, so we'll get that number on notice.</p> <p>b) <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So how much fuel do you currently have in reserve in Defence's control?</p> <p><b>Air Vice Marshal McDonald:</b> I will take that on notice, but we spend \$455 million a year on fuel.</p> <p>c) <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I accept all of that and I accept that you haven't had a problem up till now, but my real question is: how many days of fuel do you have on site? What's your storage capacity?</p> <p><b>Air Vice Marshal McDonald:</b> I'll get back to you on that, Senator—</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> Some of that is classified, so we'll give you what we can, Senator.</p>			
35	Question answered on the day					
36	Gallacher	Credit Card Use	It's still \$100,000. Was it 20 instances of \$20,000?	81	CFOG	25 October
37	Gallacher	Fraud	Do you have any idea of the number of claims or cases that underpin the \$500,000? Can we get both the number and the amounts, on notice?	81	ASSOC SEC	25 October
38	Gallacher	Credit Card Limits	What is the highest level credit card we now have in the Defence Force?	81	CFOG	25 October
39	Gallacher	Budget for Contractors	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> A very broad question: what percentage of Defence's budget goes to expenditure on contractors?</p> <p><b>Mr Prior:</b> The budget for contractors for Defence in the current year is \$97 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How does that compare with this time last year?</p> <p><b>Mr Prior:</b> We have been declining in our expenditure on contractors as a result of ongoing efforts to contain costs in that area.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So it's less than last year?</p> <p><b>Mr Prior:</b> Yes, less than last year.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we get a comparison from 2013—the line item up and down?</p> <p><b>Mr Prior:</b> We can do that.</p>	82	CFOG	25 October
40	Gallacher	Leidos Contract KPIs	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> There appeared to be some changes after we asked questions at estimates. It's noted that six of these changes involved price variations. What was the total value of the 18 changes you made? Is that quantified?</p> <p><b>Mr Mohan:</b> I will take that on notice. Since the last estimate, there has not been any price change, to the best of my knowledge.</p>	85-86	CIOG	25 October

			<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So would you break down the value of those changes?</p> <p><b>Mr Mohan:</b> Yes, I will. And I will get back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are any of the changes as a result of delays in the project deliverables?</p> <p><b>Mr Mohan:</b> No. As I said, there has been no change or price increase since the last estimate. That's my understanding. If there is, I will take that question on notice and get back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> On notice, perhaps if we could just get a description of the nature of the penalties. Does Mr Jack Walker still work at Leidos?</p> <p><b>Mr Mohan:</b> I'm sorry, Senator, I'm not aware of the employees of Leidos and who works and who doesn't work at Leidos.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> That's probably something to take on notice. This is probably to the minister: have any ministerial staff moved from the Defence minister's office or the assistant minister's office to Leidos, Minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> I can only answer for my own office, and the answer is no.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you take on notice if any of Minister Pyne's people have moved?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> If you wish.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Did Mr Walker work in Minister Pyne's office?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> I believe so.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I understand Leidos Australia won a database deal in the Falkland Islands this year. Has Defence awarded Leidos or any of its subsidiaries any new work since May of this year?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is Leidos or any of its subsidiaries currently bidding for any new work with Defence?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We'll take that on notice.</p>			
41	Roberts	Mefloquine	<p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> One of the things we did in response to concerns raised about mefloquine was to examine—because we don't have the ability to examine the data of former serving members who have tragically committed suicide—or to analyse, up until recently, 129 ADF members who had committed suicide between 2000 and August this year, so about 16½ or 17½ years. Out of that 129, only two of those are recorded to have taken mefloquine, and both of those circumstances were at least 15 years prior to their death. What we were looking for, as we were responding to these concerns that were being raised, was: was there any evidence in the data set that we had that could point to a connection between mefloquine and suicide? We don't believe on the data that we've been able to analyse that anyone can</p>	91	JCG	25 October

			<p>make that claim.</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Would we be able to look at the data?</p> <p><b>Air Vice Marshal Smart:</b> The suicide database is confidential because it lists the people's names.</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> I didn't mean the raw data; I mean the aggregated numbers that Vice Admiral Griggs was discussing.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Senator Roberts, are you nearly finished?</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Yes, nearly. I've got another two series of questions here. We might come back once we've seen that aggregated data.</p>			
42	Gallacher	Landing Helicopter Docks	<p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> In gross terms, we've got to the cause of it. That said, we have taken a cautious approach since, and we will monitor both vessels over a period of time. As I said, there are other issues that we would seek to look through with the ship during this test and evaluation period to confirm that we have resolved all the issues we need to—noting that this is two years into a 30-year life.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you been able to quantify the cost of the resolution of this problem?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> I might ask Rear Admiral Grunsell to answer.</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Grunsell:</b> I can take that on notice. I don't have the figure of the total cost, and in fact it's still under negotiation with industry as to what the split of those costs will be.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So that's the next question: are you able to recover any or all of the costs through the warranty?</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Grunsell:</b> We're in negotiation with industry, and our intent is to recover some of the costs from industry.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> If you would, take on notice the costs and what proportion would be covered by warranty.</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Grunsell:</b> Yes.</p>	95	NAVY Redirected to CASG	25 October
43	Gallacher	Landing Helicopter Docks – Landing Craft	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you tested the landing craft over the last couple of months?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> We have—under conditions such as Talisman Sabre but also in a series of tests that were done outside of Talisman Sabre. At the moment, we still have a number of vehicles that we need to test. But I would stress that we're also testing a thing called a Mexeflote, which is a large platform that is held within HMAS <i>Choules</i>. It is motorised. You can place larger vehicles on that and still drive it to the beach. Where we have not been able to prove a capability in the LHD watercraft, we've proven it in the Mexeflote. To demonstrate that we retain our amphibious capability there are several ways we can achieve that.</p>	97	NAVY	25 October

			<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So you have tested it under heavy seas?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> We know the capability at certain weights. But I would draw to your attention that the intent was never to be able to take a tank ashore in heavy sea states. It was always what we would classify as an administrative move. That is, to some extent, you can choose the time of landing it—because you will not land a main battle tank as part of your initial assault force. So the issue around having the capability available only in the LHD watercraft is in my view not correct. We have demonstrated other ways that we can take the tank ashore in different sea states.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I appreciate that you have mentioned the Mexeflote. We have tested it in heavy seas and we've tested the vehicles. What vehicles have we tested and how much do they weigh?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> I have a list which is long and drawn out. It is probably best if I provide that on notice.</p>			
44	Moore	UN Resolution 1325 - Women	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> From your understanding, is there an interdepartmental committee that's working on this? I've got this question on notice.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> I'm not sure of the detail.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I'll put that on notice as well in terms of the process.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> So you don't mean specific to the Defence perspective; you mean more broadly?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Yes, more broadly. Defence is such a key player in the whole-of-government response in this space, even though the primary responsibility is with the Office for Women. The normal structure is a kind of IDC that pulls the people from each of the responsible departments together. I will find out, because we're deeply in the stage of developing our new plan.</p>	97	DPG	25 October
45	Question answered on the day					
46	Moore	ASEAN Special Working Group	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is there anything available on that ASEAN special working group? I haven't heard of that before and it seems to tick all the boxes in terms of cooperation and working together.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> The working groups are extremely powerful. We spent the previous three years co-chairing the counterterrorism working group with Singapore. I will certainly provide you with some information on that—I'd be very happy to do that.</p>	98	SP&I	25 October
47	Moore	Australia Marriage Postal Survey	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Do you have any numbers—and I know they can't be absolutely accurate, because of the range in the time period—about how many Defence personnel were on deployment or in remote areas at the time? Do you have any figures that are indicative of the impact on the Defence forces?</p>	99	DPG	25 October

			<p><b>Ms Kelley:</b> No, I don't, but we can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I was just checking. Could I get an indication of that geographical spread and how much you covered.</p> <p><b>Ms Kelley:</b> Yes.</p>			
48	Moore	Social Media - Snapchat	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> We'll be talking with ABS also after it's all over about the take-up from different methodologies of promotion. We've done the Sex Discrimination Act. The use of social media and SnapChat—I feel a certain ignorance in asking this, because I have no idea what SnapChat is; nonetheless someone is using it. What social media does the department's PR section use to engage with the community?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> How long do you have?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> We could take some of this on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Did you hear about the work of our imagery specialists?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is that what the PR group are called, or is that a subgroup of PR?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Our photographers and videographers are called imagery specialists—and they are specialists.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> We use most of the key social media channels.</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell :</b> I'm going to take that on rapid-fire notice and get back to you before we close.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Don't you dare give it back to me on SnapChat. Don't put your answer on SnapChat.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> No-one would see it.</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell :</b> 'Does Army use a SnapChat filter?'</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is the department aware of the Army's use of a SnapChat filter? Is the department able to advise how much funding was spent on this filter? Was the filter geofenced for a particular area?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Is that a question to the department?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I would think so.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Is the department aware?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> Obviously the short answer to that is 'no-one at this table' but we will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> There are a number of questions that go on about SnapChat, and I will put these on notice, but one particular motivation for the questions may make this clearer: is the department aware that the Rising Sun badge was also on the filter? Was the use of the Rising Sun badge approved by the department? Does the department believe the use of the Rising Sun badge is in line with Army guidelines? Does the department believe the use of the Rising Sun badge is in line with section 83 of the Defence Act 1903, and</p>	99-100	ARMY/M ECC	25 October

			<p>was this filter used as a recruiting tool? That gives you a sense.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> We'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I'm happy with that.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> There is some advice that Defence Force Recruiting may in fact use SnapChat, but we will check in that context.</p> <p><b>Lt Gen. Campbell :</b> Authorising authority for the use of the Rising Sun badge?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Can I get some idea about the number of requests for authorisation for use of that symbol?</p>			
49	Moore	DART	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is the department aware of whether the government has made any formal response to significant reports through questions on notice in the past?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> Would it be ironic if we said we'd have to take that one on notice?</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> No, it would not be. This is a complementary question: is the department aware if it's consistent for the government to respond to significant reports through questions on notice? I would think they would go together; it's about the process for response.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> The DART itself was wound up following the report, so we proceeded with implementation based on the recommendations and requirements. There was no specific location to respond to in that context, and now certain other matters are proceeding through the Defence Force Ombudsman.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is the department aware if the government's response to the DART recommendations has been published somewhere other than in responses to questions on notice? Has the department's response been published on the website?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> We published it ourselves—I'm not sure; I'll ask—other than that, I can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> That'll be fine.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> I can take that on notice and see what further information there is.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Have the people who were involved in the DART process—I would imagine they were the people who came and gave evidence to the extensive inquiry—been advised of the government's response?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> I don't believe so. I will take that on notice.</p>	101	ADFHQ	25 October
50	Moore	Defence Force	<p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Our announcement of the expanded Defence Force Ombudsman role was part of that response. You will have heard me reply to</p>	102	ADFHQ	25 October

		Ombudsman	<p>questions from Senator Kakoschke-Moore on other aspects in relation to reparation payments, and that will again be a further part of the response process.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Were there particular media releases about the wind-up and the response?</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Yes, a wide range of information has been published. If you like, we can point you in the right direction for that through an answer to a question on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Yes, that'd be great. The next round of questions cover the concern, from a report by Brigadier Woodward, as reported in the news—again, with the general proviso about the media—about spikes in sexual misconduct. Is the department able to advise if this report was made public?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> In fact it was the subject of questions earlier today.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Sorry, I must have been out of the room.</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> When we were talking about the annual report of the Director of Military Prosecutions, we had a series of question from Senator Kakoschke-Moore.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I will put these on notice. If they've already been answered, I won't waste the time of going through what has been heard before.</p>			
51	Moore	Gender Balance on Boards – AICD Company Directors Course	<p><b>Ms Kelley:</b> A number of people within the department have done that course and they've been funded by the department to do it.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> That's a significant advantage.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Please give me, on notice, how many women have done that; that would be great</p>	105	DPG/MEC C	25 October
52	Question answered on the day					
53	Gallacher	JP2048 Phase 3	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. What is JP2048 Phase 3?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> That's the provision of the LHD capability.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we talk about that?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, forgetting about the contracts and the important procurement activities that are underway, what has been forecast there in our operational capability? What was the original budget for the JP2048 Phase 3? What was that all about?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> I don't have the original budget on the top of my mind. We can get that information to you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the approved budget now. The note I have here is that, according to the <i>2015-16 Major projects report</i>, it was \$237.9 million?</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Grunsell:</b> Right. I don't have those answers to my fingertips. I</p>	111-112	CASG	25 October



			<p>will have to take that on notice, I'm afraid.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The supplementary question is: how is the project tracking against that budget? Do you need to take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Grunsell:</b> Yes, I need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Recognising that comment, perhaps if we could find the major project's report, which stipulates the \$237.9, and just give an answer to that specific?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Barrett:</b> All right. I think we can do that.</p>			
54	Gallacher	QoN 131 – Tiger Helicopter	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you done any costings on that?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Tim Barrett:</b> I think we did at the early stages.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice you could tell how much it would've cost.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Did you also evaluate how long it would take, if you did purchase those, to fit them to the fleet?</p> <p><b>Major Gen. Andrew Mathewson:</b> We did that analysis and we can take that on notice.</p>	113	NAVY redirected to CASG	25 October
55	Gallacher	Greenback Training Area – Queensland	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you received any expressions of interest in this small pocket of land?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> I think I am aware that there's been some interest in possible alternative uses for that land, but I wouldn't be able to go into the detail of that without taking it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes, and, perhaps on notice, if there was an expression of interest in acquiring that land, is the purpose able to be disclosed?</p> <p><b>Mr Grzeskowiak:</b> I can take the question on notice and see what we can provide.</p>	118	E&IG	25 October
56	Kakoschke -Moore	SEMPRO - 1	Has SEMPRO seen an increase in the number of victims seeking assistance between the last two years?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
57	Kakoschke -Moore	SEMPRO - 2	How many people sought assistance from Sempro between July 2016 and October 2017?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
58	Kakoschke -Moore	SEMPRO - 3	<p>Has an evaluation of Sempro been conducted?</p> <p>a. If not, why not?</p> <p>b. If so, can we receive a copy of those results?</p>	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
59	Kakoschke -Moore	SEMPRO - 4	Since SEMPRO commenced operations, for each year including this year to date:	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17

			<p>a. On how many occasions has SeMPRO accepted a restricted disclosure of an alleged sexual offence:  (i) within 72 hours of the incident; and  (ii) within 7 days of the incident?</p> <p>b. On how many occasions has SeMPRO assisted or advised a victim of an alleged sexual assault on preservation of forensic evidence?</p>			
60	Kakoschke -Moore	YourSay Survey - 1	When will the next set of YourSay results be released?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
61	Kakoschke -Moore	YourSay Survey - 2	From the YourSay results it is clear that neither male nor female employees take advantage of documented flexible work arrangements. - How is this issue being addressed?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
62	Kakoschke -Moore	YourSay Survey - 3	YourSay results show only 66% of women in the army have confidence in their supervisor, and are satisfied with their supervisor's leadership compared to 74% and 73% of men. a. How is the Army addressing this concern? b. What policies have been put in place to address this issue, noting that this survey is from August 2016? c. What changes have been made since this issue was identified?	Written	DPG redirected to Army	6 Nov 17
63	Kakoschke -Moore	Assault matters raised outside of the DART – Question reference number 44, Budget Estimates 29-30 May 2017	Please provide an updated answer for all data provided in the answer to question number 44 from May Estimates 2017. This includes updates on the number of current serving members who have been accused of sexual assault outside of the DART process to the present day, and an update on matters under the provided headings of 'Navy', 'Army', and 'Air Force'.	Written	ADFHQ	6 Nov 17
64	Kakoschke	MPAR – Sexual	<i>Sexual Offences and Sexually-Related Conduct</i>	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17

	-Moore	Offences - 1	<p>The Annual Report (pg.24) states that the majority of offences dealt with under the Defence Force Discipline Act 1982 (DFDA) are acts of indecency, and the more serious offences are generally dealt with by the civilian authorities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How is a decision made regarding what is a ‘serious offence’?</li> <li>b. What material is used to determine whether a matter should be dealt with by civilian authorities?</li> </ol>			
65	Kakoschke -Moore	MPAR – Sexual Offences - 2	<p>In response to questions put to the Department during May 2017 estimates, Air Chief Marshal Binskin informed the committee that ‘if it is a sexual assault it will go to the civilian police’, and Defence clarified with an answer on notice, number 46, that ‘when appropriate Defence will refer allegations of sexual offences that occur within Australia to the relevant civilian authorities’.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Who determines what is ‘appropriate’ and what material is used to make this determination?</li> <li>b. Is there a policy that is referred to?</li> <li>c. The Annual Report names sexual assaults such as grabbing genitals as being dealt with by the defence tribunals. Has this only occurred when civilian police have decided not to proceed with a matter?</li> <li>d. Is data kept regarding when matters are referred back to the defence tribunals from civilian police?</li> <li>e. If yes, how many matters were referred back in 2016-2017?</li> </ol>	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17
66	Kakoschke -Moore	MPAR – Credibility - 1	<p>In the Annual Report it is noted that ‘as sexual offences are often difficult to investigate, the perceived credibility of the complainant is important’ (page 25).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Is the perceived credibility of the accused also important?</li> <li>c. How is this credibility assessed?</li> <li>d. How is ‘perceived credibility’ different to credibility?</li> </ol>	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17

			e. Why is this language considered appropriate?			
67	Kakoschke -Moore	MPAR -- 2 Credibility	How do prosecutors and investigators take into account the power imbalance between a junior officer and a senior officer when the junior is accusing the senior of indecent and/or obscene conduct?	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17
68	Kakoschke -Moore	MPAR – Complaints - 1	The Annual Report (pg.29) states that ‘there has been an encouraging increase in the number of matters in which complainants have reported matters involving superiors or those in a position of relative authority’.  Has there been a correlating increase in the number of convictions and prosecutions?	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17
69	Kakoschke -Moore	MPAR – Complaints -2	The Annual Report (pg.29) notes that the Director is ‘hopeful that this represents a growing confidence that such complaints will be taken seriously and followed through’. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is it the case that more people are reporting sexual abuse and assault, or is it that a higher rate of sexual abuse and assault is occurring?</li> <li>b. Is the Director aware of any research that has been conducted to confirm the conclusion in the annual report?</li> <li>c. What information has the Director seen that supports this argument, that it is a higher level of reporting rather than a higher number of assaults?</li> <li>d. Why did the Director come to this conclusion, and what evidence was used in making this assessment?</li> </ul>	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17
70	Rhiannon	Expenditure and Jobs	The Government continues to assert that public expenditure on Defence projects such as the Joint Strike Fighter program will create jobs and drive economic growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please provide the business case showing how many jobs and how much regional economic growth will be created</li> </ul>	Written	SP&I (DIP)	6 Nov 17

			<p>by the \$200 billion Integrated Investment Program.</p> <p>b. Please specify the number of jobs and where they will be created as a result of expenditure on the Joint Strike Fighter program.</p> <p>c. Is there any modelling on how expenditure on Defence projects creates jobs or creates economic benefit to Australian regions? If not, why not? If yes, is this modelling publically available?</p> <p>d. Is there any modelling comparing the economic benefit or numbers of jobs created if the same level of expenditure was invested in other public good sectors such as health, education, public transport or environmental remediation?</p> <p>e. How much public funding has been invested into Australia's development and manufacturing of military equipment and weapons over the past 10 years?</p> <p>i. How does this compare to expenditure supporting jobs in the development and manufacturing of civilian goods?</p> <p>Is it valid to promote public spending on Defence as creating jobs and driving economic growth if there is no economic modelling on the same?</p>			
71	Rhiannon	Contamination – Shoalhaven Bay	<p>With regard to PFAS contamination, are any facilities in or around the Shoalwater Bay Military Training Area (SBMTA) to be investigated for PFAS contaminants?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details. If no, please explain why the SBMTA is not on the list of current investigations.</p> <p>What risk assessments or amelioration actions have been taken in relation to the SBMTA in this regard?</p>	Written	PFAS	6 Nov 17
72	Rhiannon	Depleted uranium contamination	<p>Does there exist any possibility or risk that previous or current Defence facilities around Australia might be contaminated by the use or testing of depleted uranium weapons?</p>	Written	E&IG	6 Nov 17

73	Rhiannon	PFAS contamination - Richmond	<p>Please provide details on where the investigation and testing for PFAS contamination is up to around the Richmond RAAF Base.</p> <p>Can it be confirmed that there is no leakage of contamination in surrounding soils or waterways including rivers?</p> <p>How is the local water table considered in the testing or risk assessment process for PFAS contamination testing?</p> <p>Please detail commitments to long-term adverse effects monitoring at all contaminated sites.</p>	Written	PFAS	6 Nov 17
74	Reynolds	Naval projects	How is the Australian Government ensuring that the prime contractors for the naval projects do more than deliver ships and assist the development of Australia's sovereign industrial capability and long-term shipbuilding capabilities?	Written	CASG	6 Nov 17
75	Reynolds	Naval projects	What systems and technologies are being used to ensure that the RAN is able to effectively collaborate with the primes to manage the detailed design of the new ships so they are optimised for Australian requirements?	Written	CASG	6 Nov 17
76	Reynolds	Naval projects	What tools, performance indicators and accountability measures have been included to ensure projects are in scope, within budget and meet the needs of the Australian navy?	Written	CASG	6 Nov 17
77	Reynolds	Naval projects	How can the Australian Government employ Australian innovation and expertise towards these projects?	Written	SP&I (DIP) redirected to CASG	6 Nov 17
78	Reynolds	Naval projects	What systems and technologies are used to ensure experience, expertise and lessons learned during the development of these	Written	SP&I (DIP)	6 Nov 17

			projects are not lost through regular churn of Defence personnel?			
79	Reynolds	Naval projects	<p>What disruptive technologies<sup>1</sup> are being evaluated and considered to help Australian industry develop skills expertise and knowledge from these Australian naval projects?</p> <p><sup>1</sup> A disruptive technology is one that displaces an established technology and shakes up the industry or a ground-breaking product that creates a completely new industry. Harvard Business School professor Clayton M. Christensen coined the term disruptive technology.</p>	Written	SP&I (DIP) redirected to DSTG	6 Nov 17
80	Reynolds	Exmouth Navy Pier	Can you please provide the past five years actual to budget figures for repairs, maintenance and capital improvements to the Exmouth Navy Pier?	Written	E&IG redirected to CASG	6 Nov 17
81	Reynolds	Exmouth Navy Pier	What is the five year average annual visitation rate and income generation from dive tours at the Navy Pier?	Written	E&IG	6 Nov 17
82	Reynolds	Exmouth Navy Pier	What is the total facility productivity (i.e. cargo throughput as a ratio of total operating cost)?	Written	E&IG redirected to CASG	6 Nov 17
83	Reynolds	Exmouth Navy Pier	What is the five year average annual berthing volume at Navy Pier?	Written	E&IG redirected to CASG	6 Nov 17
84	Reynolds	Fuel	What are the annual fuel volumes purchased for both RAAF Learmonth and HEH Defence Base?	Written	JCG/E&IG	6 Nov 17
85	Reynolds	Fuel	What is the daily fuel usage in litres for RAAF Learmonth and HEH	Written	JCG/E&IG	6 Nov 17

86	Reynolds	Fuel	What is the cost per litre excluding freight for RAAF Learmonth and HEH	Written	JCG/E&IG	6 Nov 17
87	Reynolds	Fuel	What are is the freight cost per litre RAAF and HEH.	Written	JCG/E&IG	6 Nov 17
88	Reynolds	Fuel	What is the cost per litre to dispose of unusable RAAF Jet fuel (Jet fuel that can not be reused in aircraft once drained)	Written	JCG/E&IG	6 Nov 17
89	Griff	Occupational therapists	<p>There are currently no uniformed roles for occupational therapists in Defence. Is Defence considering introducing uniformed roles for occupational therapists across all or any of the services, in a similar capacity as its physiotherapist roles?</p> <p>a. If so, is there any time frame for introduction?</p> <p>b. If not, can you advise why not, given the wide use of the profession in rehabilitation of Defence personnel?</p>	Written	DPG redirected to CJC	6 Nov 17
90	Griff	Occupational therapists	Are there any occupational therapists employed as SSOs (Specialist Service Officers) across the services?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
91	Griff	Occupational therapists	How many occupational therapists are employed by Defence as APS staff (as rehab consultants or similar)? At what cost to Defence in 2016-17 financial year?	Written	DPG	6 Nov 17
92	Griff	Occupational therapists	How many occupational therapists are utilised by Defence as contractors? At what cost to Defence in 2016-17 financial year?	Written	DPG redirected to JCG	7 Nov 17
93	Abetz	Portfolio Questions	Please provide the messages (if any) sent to staff (on the most recent occasions) of Christmas/New Year, Easter and Ramadan by the Secretary of the Department, or agency head, at the relevant time.	Written	Assoc Sec/VCDF	7 Nov 17
94	McAllister	Staff	Please provide as at 30 June 2017:	Written	DPG	7 Nov 17



			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ASL by state</li> <li>2. Headcount of people employed as <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Labour Hire,</li> <li>b. Contractors, or</li> <li>c. outsourced staff,</li> <li>d. and the value of each of these contracts for the 2016-2017 financial year.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The total number of people who have a log in to the departmental IT system, and the breakdown by category of these log-ins (permanent, non-ongoing, casual, labour hire, outsourced, contractors, and any other category that has access to the system).</li> <li>4. The total number of people who have a security/access pass into your departmental buildings, and the breakdown by category of these pass holders (permanent, non-ongoing, casual, labour hire, outsourced, contractors, and any other relevant category).</li> <li>5. A list of organisations/companies that have staff who can log into your departmental IT system.</li> </ol>			
95	McAllister	Service delivery functions	<p>Does any part of your agency/department have a service delivery function, or which has face to face interactions with the public?</p> <p>If yes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do you provide staff with training on how to deal with client aggression or customers experiencing mental illness?</li> <li>2. Please provide the dates and locations that training has been run over the last 5 years.</li> <li>3. How many of your staff have received this training? How many in the last 2 years?</li> </ol>	Written	DPG	7 Nov 17

			4. Who provides this training?			
96	McAllister	Projects undertaken with the Digital Transformation Agency	As at 31 October 2017: 1. What projects are you undertaking in conjunction with the Digital Transformation Agency? 2. For each project: a. What criteria are you using for assessing success? b. What is the role of the DTA in the project? c. What is the timeframe for completion?	Written	CIOG	7 Nov 17
97	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 1	Who has executive control of the Osborne shipyards? Is it the Defence Department or Australian Naval Infrastructure (ANI)?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
98	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 2	Who makes the call on what ships are built at those yards?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
99	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 3	Who makes the decisions concerning projects undertaken by the shipyards? Will it be ANI CEO David Knox?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
100	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 4	What will be the capacity of the redeveloped shipyards? Will it be larger than what is required for the Frigates build?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
101	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 5	Does Defence intend to run other projects on the site concurrently?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
102	Carr	ASC/Australian Naval Infrastructure – 6	If so, how does Defence plan to manage multiple projects with multiple shipbuilders on the same site?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
103	Carr	Offshore Patrol Vessels -1	What is the status of the OPV tender? Is it correct that the successful designer will not be announced until mid-November 2017?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
104	Carr	Offshore Patrol Vessels - 2	What was the original guidance from Defence regarding the announcement timeline?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17

105	Carr	Offshore Patrol Vessels – 3	The announcement seems to have been delayed each month since the middle of the year. What caused these delays?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
106	Carr	Offshore Patrol Vessels - 4	The cutting of steel was intended to commence in April 2018. Does Defence still expect that deadline to be met?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
107	Carr	Offshore Patrol Vessels - 5	What impact will that have on the workforce at ASC? Is it correct that a delay in starting the OPV build until the end of next year could result in the workforce at ASC dropping to 150 people, from 1100 now?	Written	CASG	7 Nov 17
108	Carr	Security in the Supply Chain - 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does Defence have a process for assessing and managing IT risks in the supply chain?</li> <li>• If so, who approved the process?</li> <li>• Defence senior executives? (If so by whom, and at what level).</li> <li>• Was the process approved by the Minister? By Cabinet?</li> <li>• When was the process last reviewed?</li> <li>• Has the process been evaluated independently?</li> </ul>	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
109	Carr	DSD Reported Breach - 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did Defence perform due diligence on the sub-contractor responsible for the security breach identified by DSD (announced by Mitchell Clarke of DSD on 11 October)?</li> <li>• If a due diligence assessment was undertaken, what procedures were followed?</li> <li>• Were reasonable steps taken to ensure that confidential information was secured?</li> <li>• What gaps or lax procedures were noted by the due diligence report on the contractor?</li> <li>• Were those gaps reported to the risk committee?</li> <li>• Was senior management informed?</li> <li>• Was the Minister informed?</li> <li>• If the Minister was not informed, why not?</li> </ul>	Written	SP&I	7 Nov 17

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What level of breach would result in a report to the Minister?</li> </ul>			
110	Carr	High Risk Contractors - 1	Does Defence have a list of high-risk contractors?	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
111	Carr	High Risk Contractors – 2	Since the breach reported by DSD, has Defence reviewed its due diligence assessments of other high-risk contractors?	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
112	Carr	High risk Contractors – 3	How frequent are cyber-attacks on Defence and Defence contractors?	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
113	Carr	High Risk Contractors – 4	What is the rate of success for these hackers?	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
114	Carr	High Risk Contractors – 5	How easily can they be identified and prosecuted?	Written	SP&I redirected to CIOG	7 Nov 17
115	Carr	Shipbuilding Advisory Board - 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the meetings of the Shipbuilding Advisory Board can the department please provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting dates</li> <li>Duration of meetings</li> <li>Locations of meetings</li> <li>Attendance of board members</li> <li>Attendance of other parties</li> <li>The travel costs each party claimed for the meeting</li> <li>Duration of their trip to attend the meeting</li> <li>The dates on which the board has provided advice to members of the National Security Committee of Cabinet.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SP&I	7 Nov 17
116	Carr	Shipbuilding Advisory Board - 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each member of the board can the department please provide a breakdown of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sitting fees paid to each member of the board</li> <li>Allowances</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	SP&I	7 Nov 17

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Travel costs</li> <li>d. Class of travel</li> <li>e. The company that these fees/costs were paid to and the AusTender reference.</li> <li>f. The amount of taxation that has been paid by the board members for their services rendered in Australia.</li> </ul>			
117	Carr	Shipbuilding Advisory Board - 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was establishment of the Shipbuilding Advisory Board a decision of Cabinet? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. On what date was the decision made?</li> <li>b. Which Minister made recommended members appointed to the board?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>What were their appointment dates?</p>	Written	SP&I	7 Nov 17
118	Farrell	Defence Spending	Is the Government on track to achieve its own commitment of defence spending equivalent 2% of GDP by 2020?	Written	SP&I redirected to CFO	6 Nov 17
119	Farrell	Defence Spending	Are the projects and timelines outlined in the 2016 Defence White Paper on track?	Written	SP&I redirected to VCDF	6 Nov 17
120	Farrell	Defence Spending	Can you detail precisely year-on-year how the 2% target will be met?	Written	SP&I redirected to CFO	6 Nov 17
121	Farrell	Defence Spending	Can you describe the specific projects and their timelines that will achieve the 2% target?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
122	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What processes have been put in place to ensure that ASD staff have appropriate credentials when they attend sites to investigate cyber breaches?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
123	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What are the current staffing numbers in ASD?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
124	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What information has been compromised? Some projects quoted are worth billions. What is the total cost of the information that has been compromised?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17

125	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	How are the responsibilities for advice to government agencies on cyber security divided between ASD, the Digital Transition Agency and the Cyber Security Advisory Office?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
126	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What is the key performance indicator applied by ASD to the assessment of accreditation for access to the protected and unclassified cloud for government agencies?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
127	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What is the key performance indicator applied by ASD to the assessment of accreditation for access to the protected and unclassified cloud for the private sector, such as telecommunications companies?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
128	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What process does ASD follow when the KPI is unable to be met?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
129	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	How does ASD advise or engage with companies or government agencies about their accreditation status? Is the communication ongoing throughout the assessment process?	Written	CIOG redirected to SP&I	6 Nov 17
130	Farrell	Centralised Processing Services	<p>I have some questions about the Centralised Processing Services ICT project. In response to QoN 84 you advised that an additional \$37million had been allocated to the project. Has any further funding been authorised or sought, since then?</p> <p>In your response you state that the costs relate to “unforeseen costs related to changes in the Defence landscape, delivery and commercial challenges, and the impact of delays to Final Operating Capability”. What exactly was the additional \$37million spent on?</p> <p>You also advised, in response to QoN 85, that 18 changes to the project had been authorised since September last year (including eight in the weeks after estimates). Have any other changes been made to the project?</p>	Written	CIOG	6 Nov 17

			<p>Why was there a surge of changes after estimates?</p> <p>I note that six of these changes involved price variations. What was the total value of the 18 changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you please break these down to each change?</li> </ul> <p>How many of the changes (and which ones) related to reductions in quality for the project?</p> <p>How many of the changes (and which ones) are due to delays in project deliverables?</p> <p>There were reports in July that the project had been delayed. What is the nature of these delays and how have they affected the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delays relate to the deployment of a private cloud and migrating applications. Have these products been delivered yet?</li> <li>• What is the expected date of delivery for these?</li> <li>• Are they on track to be delivered by this date?</li> </ul> <p>How does Defence measure and track this project: do you have KPIs, or similar, with the supplier?</p>			
131	Farrell	Centralised Processing Services - Leidos	<p>How is the supplier, Leidos Australia, tracking against the KPIs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the supplier meeting the KPIs?</li> <li>• Are there any penalties if the supplier misses KPIs?</li> </ul> <p>Have any penalties been applied to Leidos for missing KPIs, milestones or similar?</p> <p>What is the nature of these penalties?</p>	Written	CIOG	6 Nov 17
132	Farrell	Media and	On 17 July the Prime Minister travelled to Holsworthy Barracks to	Written	Army	6 Nov 17

		Communications – Army	<p>announce new arrangements for the ADF to intervene in domestic terror incidents. There were a number of ADF personnel and assets on hand at the announcement. Did the Minister or her office ask for them to attend? Who did?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When was the request made for them to attend? And the decision?</li> <li>• What was their role at the announcement? What extra information did they provide?</li> <li>• What would they have been doing if they weren't being used as a backdrop for the Prime Minister</li> <li>• I note that the personnel had their faces covered. Why was that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was any consideration given about the absurdity of using personnel who need to keep their identities secret as props for a media event?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>I note there was a watercraft in attendance as well. What extra information did it provide?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where does it normally live? Holsworthy?</li> <li>• How much did it cost to move there for this announcement?</li> <li>• What would it have been doing if it wasn't being used as a prop?</li> </ul>			
133	Farrell	310 St Kilda Road, Victoria Barracks, Melbourne – 1	What progress has been made to obtain an independent property valuation for this site?	Written	E&IG	7 Nov 17
134	Farrell	310 St Kilda Road, Victoria Barracks, Melbourne – 2	Has the Victorian Government made an off market offer for the site?	Written	E&IG	7 Nov 17
135	Farrell	310 St Kilda Road, Victoria Barracks, Melbourne – 3	Has any offer been put to the Minister for Finance?	Written	E&IG	7 Nov 17



136	Farrell	310 St Kilda Road, Victoria Barracks, Melbourne - 4	What was the outcome of the Minister's consideration of the offer?	Written	E&IG	7 Nov 17
137	Farrell	Greenbank Training Area -1	The Greenbank Training Area in Queensland is broken up by a highway. The overall training area is used for exercises, except for a small pocket of land that is derelict on the opposite side of the highway. How does Defence intend to use this land into the future?  What plans does Defence have for this land?  Has Defence considered disposal of this small pocket of land?  If so, what progress has been made towards its disposal?	Written	E&IG	7 Nov 17
138	Reynolds	Navy Pier	What has been the total internal cost allocated to managing the Navy Pier including internal Defence FTE allocation, contractors for stevedoring etc and security?	Written	CASG	8 Nov 17
139	Farrell	Land release at Maribyrnong	1. Given the previous use of the land at Maribyrnong as a Defence range, it will need to be remediated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the land contaminated?</li> <li>• What types of contaminant are there?</li> <li>• What progress has been made to remediate the site?</li> <li>• What remediation strategies have been employed?</li> </ul> 2. Has the timetable for an open market testing process been established? If so, can Defence please table it? 3. Have weed control measures commenced at the site? 4. What progress has been made on the riverside walking and cycle path between the site and the river?	Written	Assoc Sec	6 Nov 17
140	Farrell	ASD Cyber Security	What is the projected staffing numbers needed?	Written	SP&I	6 Nov 17
141	Moore	Pathway to Change	<b>Senator MOORE:</b> Without creating any more work, because it sounds like it's a difficult enough task, can we get some information	Spoken Pg. 104	DPG	21 Nov 17

			<p>about just that process, in terms of the methodologies of getting feedback, the proposed methodologies for the reviews you talked about? It's how you maintain the engagement.</p> <p><b>Ms Kelley:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> And also anything in terms of identifying areas which are not engaged—I mean, with 100,000 people, there'll be places that, for whatever reason, are not—and how you're going to respond to that.</p> <p><b>Ms Kelley:</b> Yes.</p>			
142	Carr	Naval Shipbuilding Taskforce – Non APS	<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> The question on notice is 119. There is a reference here that, as of 22 May, Naval Shipbuilding Taskforce expended a total of approximately \$3.6 million on non-Australian Public Service activities. Could I get an update on that figure? If it's \$3.6 million at that date, what's the figure now?</p> <p><b>Mr Ablong:</b> I will get you an update on the exact figure now, but, in essence, this is for the Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board and its activities in support of the government's consideration of the naval shipbuilding activities currently underway.</p>	Spoken Pg. 13-14	SP&I	21 Nov 17
143	Gallacher	Heart Morass – Contracts with Commercial Fishers	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice you could give us the schedule of meetings, the contact with the commercial fishers [in the Heart Morass] and the follow-up of the meetings</p>	Spoken Pg. 46	PFAS	22 Nov 17
144	Moore	Ombudsman	<p><b>Senator Payne:</b> In fact, there is a very deliberate separation.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> For the process, I agree, but there was nothing at the end of the process. Where did all that go—into filing for archive purposes? Who owns all the information that was generated in that extensive process?</p> <p><b>Vice Adm. Griggs:</b> I'm not 100 per cent sure. I suspect some would have transferred to the Ombudsman.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> It may indeed be held by Attorney-General's, but we can make some inquiries.-</p>	Spoken Pg. 102	VCDF	22 Nov 17
145	Kitching	OPVS Sovereign Capability	<p><b>Senator KITCHING:</b> I want to come back to the sovereign capability question. How much did the RFT and the evaluation process cost? How much did we spend on it?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> I have to take that on notice. It's not something that we have done on an ongoing basis. Usually, we would do that at the end</p>	Spoken Pg. 10-11		15 Dec 17

			<p>of the process and then we would do an uptake on how many staff, the time et cetera.</p> <p><b>Rear Adm. Dalton:</b> We're still in contract negotiations, which is all part of that process. When we get to contract signature, we will be able to look back at the total cost. There will be some cost. Some of the risk reduction studies that we did with all three ship designer-builders was funded. That will be included in the cost as well.</p>			
146	Patrick	ICCPM Contractor Costs	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> You might recall the conversation that Senator Xenophon had in relation to ICCPM and the rate of a particular contractor being somewhere up around the \$4,500-per-day mark. Do you recall that conversation? Mr Gillis may be able to help.</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> There have been a number of issues in relation to this, yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Moriarty:</b> I don't, but I think Mr Johnson may.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> For brevity's sake, would you take on notice how many subcontractors Defence have used that have been above that rate. I just want to ask a question of the minister. I don't seek to ambush you here, so I'll just read from the Legal Services Directions that are signed off by the Attorney. I'm asking whether or not you would consider something similar, noting the Auditor-General's response to the original amounts that were being paid to that particular contractor. Basically, the Legal Services Directions say: Senior counsel are not to be paid a daily rate above \$3,500 (inclusive of GST) without the approval of the Attorney General. Junior counsel are not to be paid a daily rate above \$2,300 (inclusive of GST) without such approval.</p> <p>It then goes on to talk about how that might be obtained. I'm wondering whether you might be open to something similar, noting that the \$4,500 a day was quite a—</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> On behalf of all the groups in Defence, I've been working on a re-tendering process for major service providers, which will result in a significant reduction in the daily rates that we're paying. That should be announced in the next couple of months. I agree with you: high rates are not sustainable, and we are trying to make sure</p>	Spoken Pg. 28		15 Dec 17

			<p>that we buy the most effectively priced consultants and contractors that we can. And we've gone through a very detailed and extensive process to ensure that we get best value for money.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Thank you. I think that probably answers my question on that particular matter. Major General Coghlan, I'm wondering whether you can give a quick update on where we are with the ration pack contract or tender. You might recall the discussions between Senator Carr and Senator Xenophon and yourself.</p>			
147	Patrick	Schedule of Future Submarine	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Moving to the schedule of the future submarine, I refer back to some evidence provided by Rear Admiral Sammut at the last estimates. It related to two documents: one being the steel plan and one being the industry capability plan. It related to a question that was put to Defence during the 29 to 30 May estimates. The question was asked: 'In respect of the design and mobilisation contract, please provide a list of milestones that have not been met and the magnitude of delay.' The response we got back was: 'All milestones, as of 1 August, have been met.' A discussion took place. It would appear that the steel plan and the industry capability plan had not been finalised. I have a copy of the contract here that states that those documents were to be delivered at ED plus five, which would have taken it to some time before August. Can I get some clarification? Was the response that was provided to us incorrect or had there been a payment made against that milestone? There's an inconsistency in the answer that's been provided to the committee.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Without Rear Admiral Sammut here, it may be easier to take that on notice and provide you with a response on notice, unless another official wishes to take it up now?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> No, Minister. I think it's an appropriate matter for Rear Admiral Sammut, but he is in negotiations in France at the moment and was unable to attend.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> We'll come back to the committee on that.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Have those two documents been finalised: the</p>	Spoken Pg. 33-34		15 Dec 17

			<p>steel plan and the industry capability plan?</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> I'll take that on notice and have Admiral Sammut answer that question. He's the program manager dealing with the issues.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Can you also take on notice when the milestone payments were made for those particular milestones?</p> <p>Minister, I just remind you that there's still an order for production outstanding, waiting for the completion, which is why, I guess, at this point in time those documents haven't been provided.</p> <p><b>Senator Payne:</b> Noted, Senator.</p> <p><b>Mr Gillis:</b> Mr Johnson, at this stage, where are we up to in terms of schedule? Are there any other milestones in relation that design mobilisation contract that have not met schedule?</p> <p><b>Mr Johnson:</b> I'm happy to take that question on notice</p>			
148	Patrick	Submarines – Study of Propulsors and Propellers	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Thank you very much, and I will come back to you briefly on that. Back in 2014, Senator Johnston was making inquiries as to the way in which the Commonwealth was spending \$214 million of de-risking money for their submarines. In amongst that money was a study on pump jets. I will refer you to the Hansard of 28 May 2012, where it makes it clear that DSTO were doing some studies on pump jets. Are you aware of those studies and the outcomes of those studies?</p> <p><b>Dr Zelinsky:</b> I'm aware that we have been studying propulsors, propellers, various forms of propulsion for submarines, but I cannot, at this stage, give you the outcomes of that study from five years ago. I'd have to take that on notice. Subsequently, as we have gone through the competitive evaluation process, we have provided work and studies to that. I am sure our work has matured and our work does underpin the work of CASG.</p>	Spoken Pg. 31		15 Dec 17
149	Burston	2011 DHAAT Inquiry – Aug 2017 RCB Submission	<p>1. Given the overwhelming primary and secondary evidence provided to all key stakeholders in the August 2017 submission to the Minister, much of which has been located or created through empirical research SINCE the 2011 DHAAT enquiry, will the Minister explain the consultative process between his office, Defence and the ADF recipients that led to his</p>	Written		15 Dec 17

			<p>satisfaction that there is no new evidence?</p> <p>2. Given the Minister expresses complete faith in the 2011 DHAAT findings and given that it has been pointed out that the same findings totally ignored all evidence after 1975, how can the Minister continue to believe the flawed findings or worse still, multiple errors, failures and mis-information from the NOSB which is the prime source of so-called expert advice on such matters as the RCB claim?</p> <p>3. Is the Minister prepared to take disciplinary action against public service/ministerial staffers found to be generating deliberate mis-information thereby putting elected Ministers into a situation of contempt of parliament during Petition hearings now on record on the matter of the RCB petition?</p> <p>4. Has the Prime Minister really been allowed to read the August 2017 RCB submission to apply his own intellect and sense of fair play, or is the Minister's Statement that the PM is comfortable with advice on the matter another fabrication by brief writers?</p> <p>5. Why does the latest Ministerial rejection leave out, for the first time ever, reference to 'training', a deception to which successive brief writers have clung as the main point upon which to reject the RCB claim of being on warlike service as is proven by the evidence now available?</p> <p>6. How does the Minister and his advisors propose to defend the official position they adopt on the RCB claim when the public and mass media are alerted to the scale and duration of the deliberate deception regarding the true nature of the RCB deployment during the Communist Insurgency?</p> <p>7. Why does the Minister now seek to bring the RAAF into the discussion when the RCB submission is specifically based on the deception method of deploying the ARMY unit (RCB) under warlike-specific tasks to protect the airbase, tasks and supporting</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Rules of Engagement repeatedly documented in both Army and RAAF operational and other directives, unless to accidentally reveal the government's REAL motive - the perceived cost of recognition?</p> <p>8. As the Minister is responsible for both Service Personnel AND Veterans Affairs, to what extent is he (as opposed to script writing staff) aware of the adverse effect the continued denial of justice is having on RCB veterans when they learn they are represented in Parliament by an entity that cannot seem to accept overwhelming evidence?</p> <p>9. Why was Minister Bilson's determination to grade RCB as "hazardous service" in 2006 not implemented prior to, or after, the change of government in 2007?</p> <p>10. Given the stated attitude of the government as contained in a conversation between a Defence official and staff of the American War Library in 2006, If the veterans were prepared to pay for their own medals, would the Minister consider recognising their contribution to Australia and the region's security and stability over a period of nearly 20 years by finally recognising RCB service as warlike?</p>			
150	Patrick	Submarine Pump Jet Selection	<p>1. Circa 2012 the DSTG conducted research into pump jets as part of a \$214 million SEA 1000 de-risking program:</p> <p>a. How much did the pump jet research cost?</p> <p>b. What approach was used to conduct the research – e.g. paper study, modelling study, co-operation with submarine designers etc?</p> <p>c. What was the deliverable that flowed from that research (e.g. a report, a chapter in a report etc) and what was the quantum of the deliverable (e.g. 2 pages, 30 pages, 100 pages)?</p> <p>D. What further research has been conducted in relation pump jets – in terms of cost, approach, deliverable type and quantum?</p>	Written		20 Dec 17
151	Patrick	Submarine Pump Jet Re-Risking	<p>1. What is the programmed date for the submarine design's preliminary design review (PDR)?</p>	Written		20 Dec 17

		<p>2. What is the programmed date for the submarine design's critical design review (CDR)?</p> <p>3. Are there any intermediate points in the design cycle other than PDR and CDR. If so, what are they and what is the programmed date for those intermediate points?</p> <p>3. Mr Johnston indicated that the design for a pump jet would normally be optimised for a particular speed or operational profile. He also indicated that the Submarine Project would be relying on data from the French Barracuda trials as part of the project's de-risking. Noting the Barracuda is a nuclear powered submarine with an essentially unlimited power source (i.e. efficiency is unlikely to be as big a design requirement on a nuclear submarine as it would be for a conventional submarine which rely on battery power) and nuclear submarines have different operating profiles (i.e. their transits are conducted at higher speed):</p> <p>a. Has Defence examined the pump jet input requirements of the French Barracuda submarine?</p> <p>b. If so, are the requirements different and what is the magnitude of the difference (e.g. minor, major)?</p> <p>c. When does the project anticipate having access to the Barracuda's at-sea data?</p> <p>d. Will Australian officials be on-board the French submarine when this at-sea data is be collected?</p> <p>e. What process will Defence use to reconcile differences between the Barracuda pump jet input requirements and the Australian pump jet input requirements when examining the Barracuda at-sea data?</p> <p>4. Mr Johnston indicated that Defence will conduct pump jet scale modelling:</p> <p>a. On what date will this scale model test program commence.</p> <p>b. Who will conduct the work? (E.g. Defence, Naval Group, DSTG,</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--



			contractor)? c. Where will the test program take place (where will the scale models reside)? d. On what date will this scale model test program be completed?			
152	Gallacher	Report on Sexual Misconduct in the ADF	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A recent report by Brigadier Woodward (which was reported on by Michael Innman) noted a spike in sexual misconduct - is the department able to advise if this report was made public?  Yes; When was this report made public?  No; why not?</li> <li>2. Is there a conflict given detailed information has been released to media outlets?</li> <li>3. What was the catalyst for this report to take place?</li> <li>4. Is this an annual or biannual report?</li> <li>5. What information forms the basis for this report?</li> <li>6. Is it only on information which comes from the Director of Military Prosecutions?</li> <li>7. If cases are not recorded through the Director of Military Prosecutions, are incidents still recorded in this report?</li> </ol>	Written		20 Dec 17
153	Gallacher	Pathways to Change	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the department confirm what work took place for the government's update to Pathways to Change, 'Evolving Defence Culture'? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When did this process begin?</li> <li>b. When was this finalised?</li> <li>c. Was this equal to the development of the Pathways to</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written		20 Dec 17

			<p>Change program which ran from 2012-2017?</p> <p>d. What were the significant differences between the ‘Evolving Defence Culture’ statement and the Pathways the Change program?</p> <p>2. Is there any further information which supports the Evolving Defence Culture statement for implementation?</p> <p>3. Can the department advise given the significance of the Pathways to Change program 2012-2017, why the Evolving Defence Culture statement was not supported with a campaign or media statement from Defence or the Minister’s office?</p> <p>a. Considering the significance of cultural reform within the ADF, would this not be reasonable?</p>			
154	Gallacher	Mefloquine – 2000-2002 Drug Trials	<p>1. With regards to the issue of Mefloquine, has any consideration been given to proactively contacting, where possible, those who participated in the 2000 – 2002 drug trials to see how they are progressing?</p> <p>a. No; why not?</p> <p>i. <i>If the answer is no records held on these individuals post defence – why not? Is this standard protocol? Was any consideration given to maintaining records given that they had participated in a drug trial?</i></p> <p>b. Yes; has any attempts been made to contact these individuals?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p>	Written		20 Dec 17
155	Gallacher	AGSVA – Security Clearances	<p>1. What is the average wait time for security clearances for each of the clearance levels conducted by the Australian Government Security Vetting Agency?</p> <p>2. Does the agency have a target for how long each clearance should take to be completed, if so, what is it?</p>	Written		20 Dec 17

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. How many applications have been received this year for each of the clearance levels?</li> <li>4. How many applications did the Australian Government Security Vetting Agency receive in 2016 in total and for each security clearance level?</li> <li>5. What is some of the common reasons for delays?</li> <li>6. What is the longest outstanding application currently awaiting completion in the Agency? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What are the reasons for the delay?</li> <li>b. What communication has been had with the individual/s involved?</li> <li>c. What action is being taken to resolve this issue?</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. How many full time employees does the Agency have? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What was the full time employees in 2016?</li> <li>b. Was the agency required to reduce staff in line with the public service freeze?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--