

Department of Defence – Hearing date: 24 October 2018; Due date for answers: 7 December 2018

Portfolio QNo	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
1	Kim Carr	Naval Shipbuilding College	<p>1. During a hearing of the Senate Economics References Committee’s Inquiry into the Future of Naval Shipbuilding on 7 June 2018, I asked Ms Lisa Paul what specialist skills or specialist requirements of shipbuilding would be addressed by the new Naval Shipbuilding IRC or the Naval Shipbuilding College that are not covered by any one of four existing industry reference bodies. Ms Paul’s answer was that it was “a question worth asking the College”. She went on to say, in relation to specific skills gaps, that “the evidence from our shipbuilding colleagues on the board would be that there may be gaps in some areas, both in vocational education and in higher education.” In response to a question about skills not covered by the work of the existing IRCs, Ms Paul responded: “One of the things that actually impressed me a lot about the set-up of the college is the way that they are going about doing their gap analysis. I have not so much been concerned that the existing governance in vocational education and training can cope with it; I’ve been concerned that someone do a gap analysis to make sure that all the trades and all the higher education areas will be covered. I’m not so interested, as long as someone’s doing it. The thing that I’ve been concerned about with the college is whether there is going to be a good gap analysis done of what exists. And yes, there is.”</p> <p>Have the gaps in skills to which Ms Paul referred -- those not addressed by the existing Industry Reference Committees specifically established by the Commonwealth for that purpose -- been identified? (See paragraph above “At Previous Estimates”)</p> <p>Has the gap analysis to which Ms Paul referred been published?</p> <p>Have the details of the gap analysis been referred to the four existing Industry Reference Committees charged with the development of Training Package content for inclusion in the relevant Training Packages?</p> <p>For example, has what Ms Paul referred to as “specialty fabrication” gap in her answers on 7 June been referred to the Manufacturing & Engineering IRC for action?</p>	Written	
2	Kim Carr	Naval Shipbuilding College –	<p>Along the same lines, what specific communication processes are in place to ensure there is no duplication, fragmentation of effort, or issues falling between the cracks</p>	Written	

		Development of Competency Units	<p>between the Naval Shipbuilding College, the Naval Shipbuilding IRC and the existing IRC's?</p> <p>Is it intended that the Naval Shipbuilding College will involve itself directly in the development of units of competency and qualifications?</p> <p>If the answer to Q6 is no, why does the college website refer to: Develop(ing) the criteria for the skills and qualifications relevant to Australia's shipbuilders and the supporting supply chain, against which potential workforce candidates are assessed. Develop(ing) standards for shipbuilding education and training courses provided by our education partners across the country."</p>		
6	Kim Carr	Broadspectrum contract	<p>At previous Estimates</p> <p>In Senate Estimates on 29 May, Defence advised (p169 of transcript) that "Broadspectrum are expected, consistent with the standard Commonwealth requirements, to comply with the Fair Work Act and the government's Fair Work principles". On 4 July, Commissioner McKinnon of the Fair Work Commission recommended that Broadspectrum and the AMWU "recommence bargaining for an enterprise agreement to replace the [current Land Material Maintenance] Agreement. Assuming the AMWU maintains its claim for a broader scope in that agreement, I recommend that it particularise that claim as a matter of priority and that a notice of employee representational rights be issued to employees within the broader scope sought by the AMWU".</p> <p>Is the department aware of Commissioner McKinnon's recommendation on 4 July, cited above?</p> <p>Is the department aware that the AMWU has twice written to Broadspectrum particularising its claim on scope?</p> <p>Did Broadspectrum, through its actions, accept the recommendation of Commissioner McKinnon, such that negotiations resumed (noting that those negotiations had originally commenced on 1 June 2016)?</p> <p>If not, how does this sit with the government's Fair Work Principles?</p>	Written	
7	Eric Abetz	Judge Advocate General Report - 2017	The annual report of the JAG (Rear Admiral the Hon Justice Michael Slattery) for 2017 raises a number of concerns with the operation of the Defence Force Discipline Act 1982 (DFDA). The JAG advises that the DFDA increasingly faces a risk of procedural	Written	

			<p>obsolescence and suggests priority areas for reform to address what are described as procedural defects. The Director of Military Prosecutions has also raised concerns about some areas of the DFDA in her last two annual reports.</p> <p>At these Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings a year ago, the then Acting CDF, Vice Admiral Griggs, advised the committee that there was a significant review of the military justice system underway with the Military Justice Coordination Committee looking at a range of issues, including potential amendments to the DFDA.</p> <p>What is Defence's response to the comments by the JAG about the operation of the DFDA in his most recent annual report?</p>		
8	Eric Abetz	Military Justice Review	<p>The annual report of the JAG (Rear Admiral the Hon Justice Michael Slattery) for 2017 raises a number of concerns with the operation of the Defence Force Discipline Act 1982 (DFDA). The JAG advises that the DFDA increasingly faces a risk of procedural obsolescence and suggests priority areas for reform to address what are described as procedural defects. The Director of Military Prosecutions has also raised concerns about some areas of the DFDA in her last two annual reports.</p> <p>At these Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings a year ago, the then Acting CDF, Vice Admiral Griggs, advised the committee that there was a significant review of the military justice system underway with the Military Justice Coordination Committee looking at a range of issues, including potential amendments to the DFDA.</p> <p>Can you provide an update on the progress of military justice review underway, and will it address the issues raised by the JAG in the annual report?</p>	Written	
9	David Smith	AGSVA Clearances Issued	<p>1. In the past 24 months, how many Security Clearances have been renewed or issued to individuals who were neither engaged nor intended to be engaged as employees under Section 22 of the Public Service Act, excluding serving ADF members?</p> <p>2. Please provide the sponsoring agency and the number issued per agency.</p>	Written	
10	David Smith	Breakdown of Contracted workforce	<p>1. Over the past 24 months, how many individuals have been carrying out duties within your agency who were not engaged as employees under Section 22 of the Public Service Act?</p> <p>2. Please provide a breakdown showing categories of duties e.g policy, ICT, program delivery.</p> <p>3. How many of these individuals have been providing services to the Department for</p>	Written	

			greater than 12 months? 4. What was the reason for not employing these individuals under Section 22 of the Public Service Act?		
11	Penny Wong	Fiji: Blackrock Facility	<p>Senator WONG: I will start with the public reports about the agreement or the arrangement between Australia and Fiji regarding the Blackrock Camp in Nadi. I want to get some sense of the process leading up to and resulting in that decision and then I'd like to understand the arrangement for the execution of that understanding....</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: The issue of Blackrock Camp has been a longstanding ambition of the Fiji government.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sorry; a longstanding?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: Ambition to develop the Blackrock facility. We had been in discussions with Fiji in a bilateral context in terms of developing that facility. We had engaged in some initial planning over the period of the last two years or so. I'll need to get the precise dates for you. As a result of those discussions and the invitation from the Fiji government for Australia to help construct the facility and work with them on building the facility, the decision was taken, as Mr Hamilton outlined.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did the invitation occur, as opposed to—</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: I'll have to take that on notice—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Approximately?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: in terms of when there was a specific invitation.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm sorry, I was referencing what you said, Mr Jeffrey.</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: In the sense that this had been an issue of how we would work together on Blackrock, it's been an issue where we've discussed it on a number of occasions. As you could appreciate, we speak to our Fijian counterparts all the time. So the discussions on how we develop the facility have been going on for quite a while.</p> <p>Senator WONG: All of which I accept. You just said that there was an invitation to engage in the way we have determined to do so. That is a good thing. I'm not criticising it; I'm just trying to get a sense of when that occurred. Do you need to take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: Sure. I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	5
13	Penny Wong	Lombrum Naval Base redevelopment	<p>Senator WONG: In the context of the scoping study. I always have an issue with the phrase 'we are in constant contact' because it's actually not possible to be in constant contact. Leaving that aside, I understand what people are saying—ongoing and regular</p>	Hansard	12

			<p>et cetera. I'm not asking about that. I'm actually asking about the work phase associated with scoping the potential redevelopment. I'm asking how many meetings have occurred in respect of that. I think your answer is at least one meeting, which is the scoping visit of 28 to 30 August. I'm asking what other meetings have occurred between Australian officials and PNG officials.</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: With respect to any development on Manus Island?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Correct.</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: I would posit that there would be a number of daily bilateral contacts, but I can take on notice—</p> <p>Senator WONG: That was well diverted, Mr Jeffrey. How about we focus then on the Lombrum Naval Base redevelopment? Is that how we described it? Yes, that's how the PNG government described it.</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: I can take on notice whether there have been any additional meetings.</p>		
15	Penny Wong	Freedom of Navigation Exercises in the South China Sea	<p>Senator WONG: Can anyone explain to me what the minister was referencing when he talked about increasing the pace of navigations through the South China Sea in terms of multi-flag operations?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	17
16	Kim Carr	Defence Trade Controls Act Review ¶Deadline	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Have you been able to find out what the day was for the legislative requirement for the report to come back to the parliament?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: We've confirmed 15 days, but we are checking—we want to make sure we get it right—what that means in terms of dates for tabling.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: My understanding is that it is this year?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: We will check and confirm. We want to get that right.</p>	Hansard	21
17	Kim Carr	Defence Export Controls Working Group	<p>Mr Hamilton: I'm saying there will be widespread consultation in relation to the response to the submission.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, not in response; I'm saying in terms of the submission itself. For instance, can you tell me this: when did the defence export controls working group last meet?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I will have to check when the last meeting was.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm told it was 22 February 2018; is that correct?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: That was at the time of the last estimates.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Has it met?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	23

			... Senator KIM CARR: What does the defence export controls working group actually do? Dr Kearnan: I will get some detail on that. I will take that on notice. They look at export control issues.		
18	Kim Carr	Defence Trade Control Act Breaches	Senator KIM CARR: There was, in fact, a breach that I'm aware of that you haven't seemed to have picked up and that's the one with CSIRO and Pakistan. Dr Kearnan: The one that was discussed at the last estimates? Senator KIM CARR: With Pakistan. Dr Kearnan: That didn't actually relate to the legislation that we're talking about today. Senator KIM CARR: It did. Dr Kearnan: That related to Customs. Senator KIM CARR: No. Actually I think you'll find that it was related to this legislation but in the very early days. How many of these events have actually related to China, which seems to be the centre of this interest here? Mr Hamilton: We'll take that question on notice and get a response to you as soon as we can.	Hansard	25-26
21	Rex Patrick	AIR 7000	Senator PATRICK: Perhaps on notice then, because CASG has project plans in relation to this, you can lay out some of the milestones and some dates, just broadly, so that I can keep a watch on that as we proceed. Air Vice-Marshal Roberts: Just in terms of the project plan at the moment, the approval at the moment is only for the first aircraft and the construction of facilities, so the project is only planned to that level. It will be planned in more detail as we get the approvals for the additional aircraft. At the moment it's only the early stage of the project that is planned. I think those milestones are fairly clear and we have the dates on which we intend to achieve our capability. So there isn't a lot more detail that you would get in terms of a CASG project plan at the moment. Senator PATRICK: I've worked inside CASG and I know that, in the lead-up to these projects being approved, there is a mound of documentation and there is a mound of consideration in respect of how you bring something into service. Air Marshal Davies: We'll take that on notice and get back to you.	Hansard	28
22	Alex Gallacher	Australia-Saudi Arabia MOU	Senator GALLACHER: I'm happy with the answer you're not going to tell me. That's fine. Mr Pyne told the Land Forces conference in September that Australia was looking to sign a formal defence industry agreement with Saudi Arabia. Has work started on such	Hansard	35

			<p>an agreement?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: While the government has signalled its intent to conclude a memorandum of understanding with Saudi Arabia, discussions are only in the very early stages and are not a priority at this time.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Are you able to tell the committee whether it was an initiative of Saudi Arabia or Australia?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I will take that on notice.</p>		
23	Penny Wong	Australia-Saudi Arabia MOU development	<p>Senator WONG: The minister makes the announcement or the statement, for want of a less defined, definite term, and Senator Gallacher says, 'When did work on that agreement that the minister has referenced begin?' You then say, 'It's not a priority now.' The question still stands, though: when did work begin? Was it prior to that statement?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: Yes. We were aware of the possibility of an MOU prior to that statement, but I will take the specifics on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Are we talking months, weeks, years?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I'll take it on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did it become not a priority?</p> <p>....</p> <p>Senator WONG: Mr Hamilton, you gave evidence that this was not a priority. I accept that. I'm asking you: was it identified as not a priority before the minister made his statement in September or after?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: There is a standing team that looks at all MOUs that we work on. For example, the MOUs that we spoke about in the Pacific—</p> <p>Senator WONG: I understand that. In terms of that team, were they given responsibility for this MOU prior to the minister's announcement?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I will check and take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WONG: If not, when were they?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	36
24	Richard Di	Defence Export	<p>Senator DI NATALE: Let me ask you specifically about defence exports. At budget</p>	Hansard	43

	Natale	Licences	<p>estimates in May, you confirmed to my colleague Senator Whish-Wilson that the total number of licences granted for defence exports to Saudi Arabia since 2016 was 18. I understand that may have been more than just that year. I understand in responses you gave earlier today that you confirmed there were 10 licences approved in 2017 and four in 2018. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Is it correct that there was also a licence issued in the last month?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: Let me take that on notice and check the timing of those licences.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Could you, perhaps, do that by the end of the session? I imagine that would be very easy information to access, thank you. In May this year, the defence industry minister met with United Arab Emirates' foreign minister here in Parliament House. Have there been licences granted for defence exports to the UAE?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: Sorry, can you repeat that question for us?</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Have you granted any export licences to the United Arab Emirates?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: Have we granted any export licences since that meeting?</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Since that meeting.</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: We'll take that on notice to make sure we have the timing right.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I mean since that meeting and anything that predates that meeting as well.</p>		
25	Richard Di Natale	Saudi Arabia MOU	<p>Senator DI NATALE: My question is: is the government's current policy to continue establishing an MOU with the Saudi regime to sell weapons?</p> <p>Senator Payne: My understanding is that that discussion has been underway. Its current status is a matter for the Minister for Defence, and I will take those matters on notice for you</p>	Hansard	45
26	Penny Wong	Ministerial Responsibilities	<p>Senator WONG: Can you table something which tells me who is doing what? That's not a matter for the Prime Minister; that's a matter of good government. You've said yourself, Secretary, that you've got charter letters; you don't want to table them—I don't want to have a fight because I want to keep asking questions; they are then extrapolated into decision-making arrangements, authority arrangements et cetera within the department. Who has got what and where is that outlined? Is it on the website? Is there some internal document? Can you table something for the committee?</p>	Hansard	49 and later on page 97.

			<p>Mr Moriarty: There is an internal document, and I will take on notice whether it can be made available to the committee.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WONG: All right. You were getting a date on the charter?</p> <p>Mr Geering: We are just getting you a date on that. Sorry, I didn't bring it with me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: No, no, that's okay. You can come back on that. And, on the subsequent consultation within the portfolio as between the Minister for Defence and other ministers, do I take that to be more granular, more detailed arrangements?</p> <p>Mr Geering: We weren't a party to those discussions.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So how did you become aware of decisions as a consequence of those discussions?</p> <p>Mr Geering: Advice from ministers.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How?</p> <p>Mr Geering: Written advice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Written advice—from the chief of staff, from ministers, a letter to the secretary? How does that—</p> <p>Mr Geering: I'd have to take it on notice, Senator. I can't recall specifics.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Geering: Can I just provide a correction to the record?</p> <p>CHAIR: To correct the record, yes.</p> <p>Mr Geering: The department actually became aware of the charter letter to Minister Pyne on 24 September, not 18 October. The Prime Minister also wrote to our other two ministers.</p> <p>CHAIR: On that same date?</p> <p>Mr Geering: On or about that same date. I also think I said that the minister had discussed and settled portfolio responsibilities—that shorthand was not correct. I'm not actually aware of the precise manner in which they were settled, and I shouldn't have used the word 'discussed'. The minister did write to his ministerial colleagues, including the assistant minister, on or about 17 October, outlining the detailed portfolio arrangements...</p> <p>Senator MOORE: I just want to clarify, because my understanding was that Senator Wong asked to have that distribution of responsibilities provided to the committee, and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>that was going to happen. I really appreciate the correction, but she actually asked to have that provided to the committee. That will still be sent to the committee to clarify exactly who was responsible for what?</p> <p>Mr Geering: Yes, Senator. In my response to Senator Wong, I said I would take that on notice. We are in the process of making that information available in detail.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: I just wanted to clarify that the correction didn't fulfil that expectation. Thank you very much. Thank you, Chair.</p>		
27	Penny Wong	Naval Shipbuilding Plan	<p>Senator WONG: Mr Chesworth, I would ask a few questions. Can you explain to me if it was intended that in the 5,200, which is in the Navy shipbuilding plan, that you would include the submarine workers whose primary focus is sustainment? Because you have in how you've built the figure. If that's what was intended, let me know.</p> <p>Mr Johnson: Well, yes. The naval shipbuilding plan estimates by 2026 there will be 5,200 workers directly required for Australia's naval shipbuilding and sustainment workforce.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Okay. Are you telling me it was a figure you always anticipated would include those men and women currently working in ASC on sustainment?</p> <p>Mr Johnson: I'm only struggling with the word 'always'. Over the last three years this has moved a little bit, but, yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When you arrived at the 5,200 figure, I am asking whether that very large component of your 2,400, which is the 1,100 on sustainment at ASC—and it's quite a distinct workforce, as you would know—was intended to be included in the 5,200? If it wasn't, then you're actually a long way behind.</p> <p>Mr Johnson: I'll take that question on notice.</p>	Hansard	52
28	Alex Gallacher	Naval Shipbuilding Plan – Mature-age workers	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes. So there are three questions about mature-age workers, which are mentioned in the Naval Shipbuilding Plan. What work have you done on commitment? How many mature-age workers are to fulfil foremen and middle-management roles? How many mature-age workers have been employed to supervise the training of future generations of naval shipbuilding workers?</p> <p>Mr Johnson: That level of detail could only come from ASC. They testified yesterday. To answer your question, I'll have to take it on notice and get the answer for you.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Sometimes when we ask ASC they send us elsewhere. You're going to take it on notice. Thank you.</p> <p>Mr Johnson: Did you wish for the rest of the spectrum of how we're doing?</p>	Hansard	56

			<p>Senator GALLACHER: Those are the specific questions. How many mature-age workers have been employed? How many were employed to supervise? How many were employed as foremen and middle managers? If you don't have that, I think we'll wait for that on notice.</p>		
29	Alex Gallacher	Naval Shipbuilding College	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Can you tell the committee what communication activities have been undertaken, and how much you have spent and budgeted for in this financial year and next?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Communication activities have been focused on one-on-one interactions with a range of stakeholders including primes, SMEs and particularly focused on the TAFE sector. So this is about building relationships and goodwill for what is essentially a new entity. In relation to the amount of money that's being spent, did you mean the amount of money on communications activity or the college as a whole?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes. What communication activities have you undertaken and how much have you spent or budgeted for in this financial year and next?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: So far for the college as a whole this year, there has been A\$4.07 million, and US\$3.71 million. The contract is—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Not on comms though?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That's not on communities; that's in total. If you want on communities, we will have to take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	57
30	Alex Gallacher	Naval Shipbuilding Institute	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Where is the cost per student and where is the funding in the budget papers?</p> <p>Mr Johnson: There won't be a clear answer on that. We'll have to take it on notice, so we can at least—without using your time here—put it in perspective so you can get a full summation.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So the average cost of the student can come back on notice. The budget paper, where does the funding—</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We'll come back on the budget paper. The cost per student—students are usually funded by their employer and also through the TAFE system.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: And if you could take on notice what that expected cost will be.</p>	Hansard	58
31	Rex Patrick	Strategic Workforce Plan	<p>Senator PATRICK: I want to ask some questions on workforce, continuing from that, and then I'm going to go to submarines—just to facilitate logistics. Very simply, in 2016 Senator Conroy asked a question in relation to recruiting strategies and so forth and got</p>	Hansard	58

			<p>an answer back saying defence is currently developing a strategic workforce plan. Is that plan still being developed?...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Fantastic. Noting it's a living document, I understand why you would do that. Can you provide the latest version to the committee please on notice?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I will have to take that up with ministers. It is a policy document and—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: There's nothing that fetters a policy document being provided to a committee and, indeed, advice. I'm well familiar with Odgers. Of course, you can make a public interest immunity claim.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I will take it on notice.</p>		
32	Rex Patrick	Future Submarines Budget Calculation	<p>Senator PATRICK: In the IIP, there's a line item—not the combat system; you've cleared that up as included in the \$50 billion—for weapons and it has a number of \$5 billion next to it. What are we doing on the weapon front that costs \$5 billion?...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: But we're not planning to go beyond Mark 48 torpedoes and harpoons? I remember in 2009 there was talk of cruise missiles. That, I think, disappeared in 2016.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes. We haven't completed all of the views about potential weapon suites for the submarines. It certainly includes the Mark 48 torpedo or the future variants of that weapon as we move forward. This funding would contemplate what we may need to do in terms of a missile inventory for the boat down the track, considering the life and age of the harpoon weapons system as it is today.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: But just in simple terms, a Mark 48 is probably \$2.5 million or something of that order, so \$5 billion just seems really excessive. On notice, could you perhaps offer an explanation of how you came to that number, please?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We'll take that on notice and get back to you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. You have also provided some sort of breakout of what is included in the \$50 billion. I'm not after commercial-level detail, but if you could give some indication like, 'Submarine, \$20 billion; shipyard, \$3 billion,' or just some rough order of magnitude that shows the make-up, because otherwise we end up with mischaracterisations and people saying the submarine is \$50 billion, where I don't think that's the case.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: It certainly isn't, and that is a claim that has been the in the media—that the \$50 billion is the contract with Naval Group of France. That is a figure</p>	Hansard	61

			that was more in the range of \$20-25 billion, as an example. There are other breakdowns there that we could provide.		
33	Mehreen Faruqi	PFAS remediation	<p>Mr Grzeskowiak: ... We've currently cleaned something like 1.3 billion litres of water of PFAS using water treatment plants.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Could you provide a list on notice of where that has happened and how many litres in each location?</p>	Hansard	65
34	Mehreen Faruqi	PFAS Contamination	<p>Mr Senator FARUQI: Is there anything happening in New South Wales, especially around Williamtown? Has soil been excavated there?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes, at Williamtown we've excavated around three kilometres of soil from the drains. That soil was taken off the base and disposed of through a process that was approved of by the New South Wales Environment Protection Authority. We're currently excavating the firefighting training area at Williamtown. Because that soil has higher concentrations of PFAS, because it's from one of the source areas, we're actually storing it on the base in a different location, in what I'd refer to as an engineered facility which seeks to ensure that there's no leachate coming out of that stockpile and back into the ground.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: What's going to happen to that stockpile?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We're investigating options at the moment for how we clean the soil. In the process of removing PFAS from the environment, the industry that deals with this is more advanced in the ways of cleaning water than it is in the ways of cleaning soil.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: How far away are you from a solution for that soil?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: On a Defence base in South Australia, we're actually trialling a soil cleansing plant. That's in the process of being constructed at the moment by one of our industry partners. I expect that trial to start early in the new year.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: When will it finish?</p> <p>Grzeskowiak: It will run for around three months. There will be an element of setting to work and an element of understanding how well that plant is working. The company installing it will need to tune and refine their plant. I would hope that, by around April or May next year, we'll have good results from that plant. If that proves to be an effective mechanism, then we would seek to look for opportunities to start using technology like that elsewhere on Defence estate and start to actually pull PFAS out of the ground through soil cleansing, as well as through the water cleansing we're already doing. We've currently cleaned something like 1.3 billion litres of water of PFAS using</p>	Hansard	66

			<p>water treatment plants.</p> <p>Se Senator FARUQI: Could you provide a list on notice of where that has happened and how many litres in each location?</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: No, that's all right; I'm running out of time, so on notice will be fine.</p> <p>How much compensation has Defence paid to communities who are suffering the contamination?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Defence is working with communities that are affected. Early on, particularly at Williamstown, when fisheries were closed by the New South Wales authorities, there was a financial assistance scheme put in place. That was really to ensure that those people whose livelihoods depended on fishing in Fullerton Cove, who could no longer fish, because of restrictions put in place by the New South Wales government, could continue to have some income.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Has there been any compensation paid apart from that?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: The total cost of that financial assistance scheme is around \$2.2 million.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Has there been any other compensation paid?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: As well, Defence has been assisting communities through the provision of a range of services—community liaison services, mental health services and the like.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Could you provide a list, by year, site and type of recipient—as an individual or company—of those that have been paid that money? I can put that question on notice as well.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Apart from the financial assistance scheme, which was to the fishing industry and some associated industries, we wouldn't provide details, because they're private and confidential.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: I'm not asking for the names of the individuals; I'm asking whether it was provided to an individual or a company.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We can provide some details of the financial assistance scheme.</p>		
35	Mehreen Faruqi	Quarantined firefighting foams	<p>Senator FARUQI: Were there any leftover firefighting foams containing PFAS in recent times which the department had to dispose of?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes. We've done some audits in recent times to see if there was any legacy of the product. It was a product called 3M Light Water. We made a decision in the department to move away from it in the early 2000s. We have found some drums</p>	Hansard	66

			<p>of those products. Where we found it, we've quarantined it and it's stored, waiting for appropriate disposal.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Is there a way to appropriately dispose it?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: There is, yes. As I said before, the technology exists for removing PFAS from water or in a liquid foam.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: These are liquid foams?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes. It's a liquid product.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Can I know how much there is of that?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: If you could, that'd be great. Also take on notice the location of where they are.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice.</p>		
36	Malarndirri McCarthy	Water Treatment Plant Funding	<p>Senator McCARTHY: Would you be able to table the agreement between Defence and the NT Power and Water Corporation about how the water treatment plant may be funded?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I couldn't table any agreement here...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: In terms of the costs, what parts of the project are attributed to and will be paid by Defence? And please, by all means, take this as a question on notice.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes, I will take that on notice. We are still in negotiations with Northern Territory Power and Water on the detail.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: And what are the ongoing costs of running both treatment plants each day?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes. It will be difficult for me to provide a Defence view of that. We are not close to the conversations that Northern Territory Power and Water are having with ECT 2, which is the American company that would provide the plant. Northern Territory Power and Water would be the authoritative source for a view on the ongoing costs of running the particular plant that they are looking at acquiring, which is significantly bigger than the plants we've acquired thus far</p>	Hansard	67
37	Janet Rice	Sea level Rise	<p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We do a bit of thinking about sea level rise. We actually had a report written, probably in 2012, looking at the issue. That told us that, at least for a fair while, there's no real issue that we need to worry about. But if we look in a 50- to 70-year horizon, there may well be issues that we'd need to look at.</p>	Hansard	69

			<p>Senator RICE: Have you tested the defence estate against a two-metre scenario?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't think we've tested it against a specific scenario. The report we had written was more of a look at what the current predictions were for sea level rise in the 50- and 50-plus-year horizon.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What levels were you looking at then?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I can't recall whatever the levels were that were predicted at that time.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you take that on notice—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I could take it on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: as to the planning that's being done. In particular, if you're not planning for a two-metre sea level rise, as the Pentagon are, why not?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I will take that on notice.</p>		
38	Janet Rice	Redress for LGBTQI	<p>Senator RICE: My third area was about redress for LGBT people being discharged from the services. It's my understanding that a policy brief detailing the historic discharge and discrimination of LGBT+ service members in the Defence Force that was written by Associate Professor Noah Riseman was sent to Defence Minister Payne and Veterans' Affairs Minister Chester on 25 September. Has Professor Riseman's policy been brought to the attention of the department?</p> <p>Ms Greig: We have been considering Professor Riseman's submission.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Who has seen the policy brief? Who is considering it?</p> <p>Ms Greig: Within the department?</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Greig: People Group, obviously. And we have been speaking with a number of people within the department—for instance, those in headquarters ADF. Clearly, the ADF need to form a view.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Specifically, is the department looking at delivering a national apology to LGBT-plus ex-service members or implementing an appropriate redress scheme?</p> <p>Ms Greig: We are considering the submission. Part of those considerations are certainly a context from 2012. The then General Hurley CDF did make a more general apology for Defence ADF and also APS employees who had suffered mental or physical abuse.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What are the time lines that you are looking at in terms of this consideration, and when do you think Defence will have done that consultation and</p>	Hansard	69

			<p>worked out what an appropriate way forward is to recompense and to redress and apologise for people who were so unfairly discriminated against?</p> <p>Ms Greig: I think we would need to come back to you on notice with that time line.</p>		
39	Penny Wong	Strategic Partnership Agreement – Negotiating Team	<p>Senator WONG: No—your negotiators. Presumably we've got a team of negotiators trying to negotiate the strategic partnership agreement—correct?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes...</p> <p>Senator WONG: I think you've provided all this, but on notice can I have a list of the negotiating team—if you don't wish to identify personnel I'm happy with them to be identified by their band, by their status—both ADF, DOD, other APS staff and contractors?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I can indeed. I think we've already had a question on notice where I have provided that information. I will provide you with the current composition.</p>	Hansard	72-73
40	Penny Wong	Future Submarines Design Contract	<p>Rear Adm. Sammut: At this stage, we are having to accommodate the delay in the strategic partner agreement, but, as I mentioned to you before, we have set up the contract to be easily extended so that work on the Future Submarine program can continue as we continue to conclude the strategic partnering agreement with Naval Group.</p> <p>Senator WONG: And the cost of each of these extensions?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: It depends on the statement of work that we put in place.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Do you want to go through them then?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: No, I don't really want to go through them. In fact, I'll have to take it on notice as to the cost.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'll possibly need to rephrase the question.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: What I can say is that the current contract value, based on the extensions of the design mobilisation contract, is \$340 million.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I am going to ask you about this. Do you have the cost of each extension here?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I don't have it with me. I can take that on notice and provide it.</p>	Hansard	74
41	Alex Gallacher	Osborne South Shipyard	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Sorry, I'll rephrase that: the government announced Lendlease as the managing contractor on 12 October. They then went ahead and tendered out some work packages. When did work actually start on the site?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I suspect I do have that date, Senator, if you give me a second to have a look, otherwise I can take it on notice. We're looking it up if you want to keep</p>	Hansard	78

			<p>going, Senator, in the interests of time.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: How much has the government spent on that contract to date?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: To date? Again, that's a matter for ANI. We know that they're—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I'm asking how much the government spent. Who does that go to? Does that go to Senator Fawcett?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: It's a matter for Finance, Senator.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: It's a very circular thing, estimates, isn't it! 'Go to the next department.'</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: It's being constructed using equity—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Usually you go to the day before's estimates to get the answer! Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>So, you can't answer that?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I could take it on notice. I can tell you how much the planned spend for the Osborne South shipyard is, but I couldn't tell you exactly how much they've spent on that to date.</p>		
42	Alex Gallacher	Future Frigate Construction	<p>Senator GALLACHER: If we were to refer that evidence and compare that to a media release from April 2016 where the government announced that the future frigates will start being built by 2020—it's joint release by the then defence minister and the Prime Minister, and presumably a cabinet decision—is your evidence consistent with that media release, or is that—</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I think that media release dates back to 2016. I think we're consistent with that, that we will still commence construction in 2020, but we will commence construction by prototyping. As I testified just before, one of the reasons why we're moving into a prototype phase is to control those risks. At that stage, as we started to look at the reference ship design and the amount of change that we wanted to make to it, that had created an extreme schedule risk if we were to commit to building the first ship in 2020.</p> <p>We are demonstrating a lesson learnt from the Air Warfare Destroyer Program where we commenced construction when the design wasn't as mature as we would have liked, and that did create issues for us in the management of that program. I think this is a rational, sensible step to take to manage the risks in the program, and the government has agreed with us, and we have got that period now of prototyping. That</p>	Hansard	79-80

			<p>gives us two more years, effectively, to mature the design before we actually commit to start work on the first ship.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Presumably advice was given to the government about that announcement in 2016. Was it you that provided that advice, Rear Admiral?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: No.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Would anybody know the timing of that advice? When was that advice provided? Presumably it was before this prototyping decision.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: Yes, I expect. We could go back and have a look at that and take it on notice, if you like.</p>		
43	Alex Gallacher	Future Frigates Program Review	<p>Senator GALLACHER: We understand that in the second half of 2016 an internal review was conducted into the Future Frigates program, which identified all sorts of risks associated with the time line. What were the original factors that prompted that review?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: We conduct ongoing reviews into our programs all the time. There is an independent assurance review. In 2016, those independent assurance reviews were called 'gate reviews'. They are a normal part of the way defence manages complex projects.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: When did you first become aware, or when did the department first become aware, that there would be extreme risk in the program due to the time line? Was that 2016 or earlier?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: That predates me. I would have it take that on notice, but I think it certainly was in that period of time.</p>	Hansard	80
44	Penny Wong	Defence Budget	<p>Senator WONG: Thank you. Can I ask you or whomever about the progress against the white paper two per cent commitment? I just want to give you the opportunity to explain to us the difference between the forward estimates appropriations now as compared with the white paper. For example, for current financial year, there was a white paper figure of \$36.769 billion, but now it's \$36.532 billion. That difference continues over the forward estimates and there is a cumulative reduction, I suppose, between the white paper publish figures and the current forward estimate figures of about \$5 billion to \$6 billion. Can you just explain to me why that is the case?</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes. I will start off on that. We are still on track to meet the two per cent commitment by 2020-21, when you include the Australian Signals Directorate appropriation as part of those calculations, because that was part of Defence at the</p>	Hansard	80

			<p>time of the white paper. Now it's a separate appropriation. On your question around the movements, I don't have a table with me that compares the white paper and what the current forward estimates is showing, but, as you would be aware, there's a variety of changes that get applied to our budget in each budget round, including foreign exchange updates and operations funding, which is on a no-win, no-loss arrangement. All those sorts of things get applied. I know there has been some movement.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes. Could we do this on notice?</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WONG: Could you look at the white paper forward estimates provisions or numbers and the current forward estimates? And perhaps you could outline the drivers of the variations?</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WONG: Are they parameter variations? Are they changes in policy decisions? Are they increases in estimated costs—those sorts of things?</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes, and it could just be things like, as there has been—as we've discussed already today—some slippage in some of the programs and money moved out of the forward estimates.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It would be useful to me if you could make sure that we are clear what is a parameter variation and what is an estimates variation, and the drivers of each of those.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes, we can do that.</p>		
45	Penny Wong	HAWKEI Procurement	<p>Senator WONG: I want to speak about the Hawkei procurement. I have some questions about that. First I would like to go through the process and chronology of the DOD's engagement with the Auditor-General in relation to this report. This is about the protected mobility vehicle light—the Auditor-General's report No. 6 of 2018...</p> <p>Senator WONG: Were you aware that he had done so, or were you aware that—how did you become aware of the decision that your minister made to request the Attorney-General to do so?</p> <p>Dr Clarke: We were advised by the minister's office that they had signed a letter.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Did you prepare the letter?</p> <p>Dr Clarke: We drafted a letter, yes, Senator.</p>	Hansard	84-88

			<p>Senator WONG: Was it changed in the office?</p> <p>Dr Clarke: I would have to take that on notice, Senator.</p>		
46	Rex Patrick	Future Submarines	<p>Senator PATRICK: I understand, but I'm just joining a few dots. I have now seen a study that's been done by Defence to shift it, and now I'm hearing that ASC North may well be the site for construction of the Future Submarine, which would be inevitable ending to full cycle dockings in South Australia.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Depending on which options are taken. It wouldn't say that it's just the ASC North site that ASC currently occupies. It will be a larger area of the Osborne precinct that will be required for the construction of the Future Submarines.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Perhaps on notice, could you provide what the list of options are, just at the very high level?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We'll take that on notice. To the extent that we can provide the information, we certainly shall.</p>	Hansard	89
47	Alex Gallacher	Collins class Sustainment	<p>Senator GALLACHER: So you're saying that the retirement or the new boats and the lowest sustainment cost have been factored into that 9.3 out-turn dollars?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: The 9.3 would look at what plans were in 2016 for extension of the Collins class.</p> <p>Mr Johnson: To which year?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: To whichever year that was going to be. What you have said is that if you kept six in service until a particular date you end up with a larger figure. The assumption wasn't necessarily that we would keep six in service to a particular date when those figures were reached.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The retirement of the number from six down to five down to four, is that available to be tabled, how you calculated that figure?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Am I reading your answer to a question on notice that the out-turn 2.6 billion in the integrated investment plan is all that is required to keep six Collins class submarines upgraded to a regionally superior standard over the next period—two or three decades?</p> <p>Mr Johnson: I think we've already taken that question on notice. Because of the level of detail, to give you a precise answer we'll have to see exactly how it was worded.</p>	Hansard	91
48	Penny	Minister for Defence	<p>Senator WONG: Senator Payne, I suspect you'll say, 'I'll take this on notice,' but I am</p>	Hansard	93

	Wong	and Thales contact	going to ask you if you can provide details of any contact as between Minister Pyne and Thales representatives, or his office and Thales representatives, in relation to their application to the Attorney-General under 37(1)(b) between January 2018 and the decision. Senator Payne: I'll certainly take that on notice.		
49	Claire Moore	ADFMIDI	Air Vice-Marshal Smart: The funding for the ADF malaria institute, now called the Australian Defence Force Malaria and Infectious Disease Institute, is part of the budget of Joint Health Command. Senator MOORE: Over what cycle is that? I want to get an idea, because we've been very impressed by its work and because of the collaborative way that it operates with a number of universities, balancing how that operates. Air Vice-Marshal Smart: The core funding comes from within our budget, but there are a number of activities it does with other universities. The funding arrangement depends on the projects it is doing. Sometimes that is in-kind type arrangements, in that the university will fund some research and we'll do it within our centre using their people. It depends on the actual nature of the project funded. Senator MOORE: Does have it a core annual budget? Air Vice-Marshal Smart: It does, but I'd have to take on notice exactly what that is. Senator MOORE: That's fine on notice. And that's in the forward years as well? Air Vice-Marshal Smart: Yes.	Hansard	93
50	James McGrath	Mental Health and Suicide Programs and Support	Senator McGRATH: I suppose it's quite a difficult area, particularly when it comes to mental health and suicide. I understand there are probably a range of programs that you may have, and you might wish to touch upon those, but what records do you keep in relation to suicide and suicide attempts by those who are serving? Air Vice-Marshal Smart: We have kept a database on suicides in service since the beginning of 2000. Up until 9 October we had 134 confirmed or suspected deaths by suicide of serving members in that time. We've also, in the last two or three years, been collaborating with the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare to look at comparisons of the rates of suicide in serving, ex-serving and reserve members compared with the general population. Obviously any suicide is a tragedy, but the good news from Defence's point of view is that our suicide rate for serving men is actually 51 per cent lower than the general population. That's full-time serving men. For reservists, it's 47 per cent lower than the general population. Now,	Hansard	94-95

			<p>that changes when people transition, and obviously that is a concern we're looking at with the Department of Veterans' Affairs.</p> <p>Senator McGRATH: It goes up quite a lot, doesn't it?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Smart: It goes up to about 18 per cent overall, but in that younger age group—under the age of 28—it is much increased, yes. We're looking very closely with DVA. The fact that our rate is low is testament to the investment that we put in over the last nine or so years. Since 2009, we've invested over \$304 million in defence mental health awareness programs, suicide prevention programs and a lot of increase in our workforce and expertise in mental health, which is why we're seeing those good results. The area now for us is to look at the protective factors that are in defence. They are obviously working. How we can better prepare people for transition and then ensure that we hand over to the Department of Veterans' Affairs to try and assist with that problem in the veteran space.</p> <p>Senator McGRATH: I will get you to put on notice the programs that you have. I'm sure they're probably easily available on the website. In terms of what you're doing, I was speaking to someone the other day and they talked about red flags. I'm asking, I suppose, a confirmation question, that you have systems in place that identify those who are serving that may be at risk? I imagine they probably don't particularly self-identify?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Smart: Absolutely. It's a very complex area. There are a number of programs that we can provide on notice...</p>		
51	Janet Rice	Government reponse to climate change risks	<p>Senator RICE: I'm presuming that Defence has looked at the report of the recent Senate inquiry into the implications of climate change for Australia's national security?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: Yes, I would assume that the department has done that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you have any response to the committee recommendation that the Commonwealth government develop a climate security white paper or a similar planning document, to have a coordinated, whole- of-government response to climate change risks?</p> <p>Mr Hamilton: I understand that the government has responded to that Senate committee report. Let me just check for you. In any event, a decision to do something like that would be a matter for government.</p>	Hansard	70
52	Penny Wong	Future Submarines Design Contract	<p>Senator WONG: The \$340 million is the current cost?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: The current value of the contract.</p>	Hansard	74

			<p>Senator WONG: To date?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: To date.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Taking into account the three extensions but not the fourth one, which is imminent?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That's right</p> <p>Senator WONG: That's fair?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What was the original cost?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I can't recall what it was for that first period of work.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Surely someone knows</p> <p>RRRear Adm. Sammut: I will get a figure for you. What I can say is that it was intended to be able to cover up to \$600 million worth of work. That was the announcement at the time when we negotiated the design and mobilisation contract.</p>		
53	Rex Patrick	Air 7000 and crash of a Triton	<p>Senator PATRICK: There was the crash of a Triton at Point Mugu in California last month. What was the cause of that accident?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Roberts: They're still investigating the cause of that accident and we're yet to have the final accident report released to us.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Perhaps similar to the Growler, is it possible to have that released? Will it be released publicly once the report is concluded?85</p> <p>Air Marshal Davies: We will be able to release a form of report and whatever we're able to release, so we will do that. But at the moment it's still with the United States navy. We don't have that report yet.</p>	Hansard	29
54	Penny Wong	Navigation through South China Sea	<p>Senator WONG: Just on this then Mr Pyne—it was Mr Pyne—says that we have in recent times increased our pace of navigations through the South China Sea in terms of multi-flag operations. I wonder if you could just correlate for me some of the data you've just given me about operational days—sorry, I can't remember the metric you used—and multi-flag operations?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: The data that I provided was in actual terms of deployment days, acting in that region. And when we talk about the South China Sea and the presence of our naval ships in that area, we are talking about transits, regional exercises and named operations, and these exercises extend from north of Singapore, east to the Gulf of Thailand, west of the Philippines and south to Taiwan. So it's a very broad area. The majority of the exercises are conducted in the vicinity of Singapore and the Malaysian</p>	Hansard	17

			Peninsula and in the area of the Philippines where we've had patrol boats operating in specific operations that have been assisting the Filipino navy and country with respect to countering terrorism activities in the south of the Philippines. I'd have to take on notice any breakdown of those specific figures to specific operations or exercises.		
55	Catryna Bilyk	Ministerial functions	In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017, can the following please be provided: 1. List of functions 2. List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff 3. Function venue 4. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive) 5. Details of any food served 6. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage 7. Any available photographs of the function 8. Details of any entertainment provided	Written	
56	Catryna Bilyk	Departmental functions	In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017, can the following please be provided: 1. List of functions 2. List of attendees 3. Function venue 4. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive) 5. Details of any food served 6. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage 7. Any available photographs of the function 8. Details of any entertainment provided	Written	
57	Catryna Bilyk	Executive Office upgrades	1. Were the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries, upgraded in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017? 2. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive)?	Written	
58	Catryna Bilyk	Facilities upgrades	1. Were the facilities of any of the Department's premises upgraded in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen	Written	

			<p>refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?</p> <p>2.If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrade please be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)? Can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?</p>		
59	Catryna Bilyk	Staff travel	What was the total cost of staff travel for departmental employees in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017?	Written	
60	Catryna Bilyk	Media monitoring	<p>1. What was the Department's total expenditure on media monitoring in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017?</p> <p>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all media monitoring contracts in that period please be provided?</p>	Written	
61	Catryna Bilyk	Advertising and Information campaigns	<p>1. What was the Department's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017?</p> <p>2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department run in the relevant period?</p> <p>3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in that period please be provided?</p>	Written	
62	Catryna Bilyk	Promotional merchandise	<p>1. What was the Department's total expenditure on promotional merchandise in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017?</p> <p>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided?</p> <p>3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided?</p>	Written	
63	Catryna Bilyk	Ministerial overseas travel	<p>Can an itemised list of the costs of all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in the financial year commencing 1 July 2017 please be provided?</p> <p>This list should include the costs of:</p> <p>1. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel</p> <p>2. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials</p>	Written	

			<p>3. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed</p> <p>4. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided</p> <p>5. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</p>		
64	Catryna Bilyk	Social media influencers	<p>1. What was the Department's total expenditure on social media influencers during the financial year commencing 1 July 2017?</p> <p>2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department use social media influencers to promote?</p> <p>3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided?</p> <p>4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided?</p>	Written	
65	Alex Gallacher	Waste at Woomera	<p>1. In regards to the radioactive waste at Woomera, what is cubic meterage of the waste and level of waste is it?</p> <p>2. Who owns the waste?</p> <p>3. Who has responsibility of the waste in terms of its current and future storage?</p> <p>4. Are there any prohibitions on the land at Woomera being used as a National Radioactive Waste Management facility?</p>	Written	
66	Doug Cameron	Naval Shipbuilding College	<p>1. What is the budget for the Naval Shipbuilding College (NSC)?</p> <p>2. Please provide the aims, objectives, and performance indicators for the Naval Shipbuilding College contract.</p> <p>3. What is the schedule of payments to the operators of the Naval Shipbuilding College (ie those that are covered by the current contract).</p> <p>4. Please provide details of all parties to the Naval Shipbuilding College contract.</p> <p>5. What is the duration of the Naval Shipbuilding College contract?</p> <p>6. Please identify all 'partners' involved with the NSC and specify their roles, and legal status of the partnership.</p>	Written	
67	Doug	Naval Shipbuilding	<p>1. How many students has the NSC 'connected' to endorsed shipbuilding courses?</p>	Written	

	Cameron	Courses	<p>a. Where and what are those students studying? (RTOs and their locations, and qualifications)</p> <p>2. What does the NSC consider an 'endorsed' course? And how is that list determined?</p> <p>3. How many apprenticeships have been brokered or arranged by the NSC?</p> <p>a. Where are those apprentices working and where are they studying? (please provide the employers and the RTOs, and their locations)</p> <p>4. Please identify the stakeholders that the NSC is consulting with in industry.</p>		
68	Doug Cameron	Naval Shipbuilding College Course Standards	<p>1. What standards for shipbuilding education and training courses have been developed by the NSC?</p>	Written	
69	Doug Cameron	Naval Shipbuilding College Workforce Register	<p>1. How many organisations and how many individuals are on the NSC workforce register? How many hits has the register had for people looking to employ workers? How many hits from people looking for employment? How many workers on the register have undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of their qualifications and skills Counselled on career or training opportunities Pre-screened for employment via background checks <p>How many staff work for the NSC? How many provide the services outlined above in qu13?</p> <p>Who operates the workforce register? Who owns the rights to the workforce register? Is there any oversight of the workforce register by the Department? Who is given access to details of individuals on the employment register? Has the privacy policy of the workforce register been cleared by the Department? Which companies have access to the data that is collected on the workforce register? Which companies have rights to use the information collected on the workforce register?</p>	Written	
70	Alex Gallacher	Social Media Influencers (linked to Q64 SBE 2018)	<p>What is the ADF's marketing policy?</p> <p>When was the last time this was updated?</p> <p>How often is this updated?</p> <p>Was the hiring of videogamers Alen Catak and Elliott Watkins in line with this policy?</p> <p>What steps were taken in the hiring of Alen Catak and Elliott Watkins to ensure that their material would be in line with the culture of the ADF?</p> <p>Was the ADF satisfied with the material which Alen Catak and Elliott Watkins provided?</p>	Written	

			<p>What guidelines were they provided? Was their hiring contingent on meeting these guidelines? How many social media influencers has the ADF hired to date? What guidelines are influencers provided? Is their hiring contingent on meeting these guidelines? How much funding has gone towards the social media influencers? 8. Does Defence continue to hire social media influencers and videogamers as part of their marketing for recruitment?</p>		
71	Alex Gallacher	Social Media Monitoring	<p>1. The Daily Telegraph recently reported the Defence Department was data mining social media sites to complement other forms of information gathering for their use during natural disasters. What services are being used to gather this information? Are they third party companies, contractors etc. a. If third party contractors – i. How is this information being stored? ii. How is the information being secured? 2. Can the Department advise when they began collecting this information? 3. To the current financial year, how much has the Defence Department spent on collecting this data? 4. It is understood this service is to complement other forms of information gathering, can the department advise what other forms of information gathering do they do? 5. The explanation the department provided the telegraph said this could be used in situations such as natural disasters. Can the department detail how this would work? 6. Is it possible for this data to be used for something other than a natural disaster? If so, what would this be? 7. Is it possible for this data to be used for something other than its intended purpose? a. If so, can the department provide examples?</p>	Written	
72	Alex Gallacher	Transition Seminars	<p>1. It is our understanding Transition Seminars for those leaving the ADF have recently been reduced from two days, to only one day. Why has this change been made? 2. Whose decision was it to reduce the seminar? a. Who signed off on the change? 3. Did the Department engage with DVA or the ex-serving community about this change? a. Yes;</p>	Written	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What was the feedback? b. No; i. Why not? ii. Who made the decision to not engage? 4. Many members in the ex-serving community has raised concerns about how two days isn't long enough to prepare someone to move into civilian life, particularly in the area of employment. Is the department aware of these complaints? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes; i. Given this, why was the change made? 5. How many individuals have participated in these seminars over the past 12 months? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 24 months? 6. What follow up is conducted by defence to ensure ADF members have transitioned? 7. How are ex-service organisations involved in the seminars? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the department aware of any issues for ESO's in participating in these seminars? 		
73	Alex Gallacher	Invictus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much funding has the Department of Defence contributed towards the Invictus Games? 2. What 'in kind' support was provided by the Department? 3. Is the Department aware of what will happen to the sporting equipment post the games? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will it be distributed via an open process which enables organisations to bid for items? 	Written	
74	Alex Gallacher	Internal Complaint Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What process is followed within Defence when an ADF member, working within Defence, raises complaints about unacceptable behaviour about a colleague or immediate supervisor? 2. What is the Redress of Grievance process within the IGADF? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many complaints have they received over the past 12 months? b. How many complaints have they received over the past 24 months? 3. What was the average time taken to process complaints in the IGADF over the past 12 months? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. And over the last 24 months? 4. When the responsibility for this process came across to the IGADF in 2014, was more funding made available to the IGADF? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes; 	Written	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How much? ii. Is this sufficient to handle the complaint process? iii. Have any complaints been delayed due to financial constraints? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. how many b. What is the IGADF doing to assist these individuals and to process these complaints asap? b. No; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Why not? ii. How much additional work has this been? iii. How is the IGADF handling the additional financial implications of running this process? iv. Have any complaints been delayed due to financial constraints? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. how many b. What is the IGADF doing to assist these individuals and to process these complaints asap? 		
75	Alex Gallacher	CTAS Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Department provide an update on the review of the Career Training Assistance Scheme? If completed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What were the outcomes of the review? b. What recommendations were made as a part of this review? c. Have the recommendations been accepted? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Yes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will they be implemented? ii. No; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why not? d. Will the review be made public? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Yes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When? ii. No; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why not? If changes are flagged; 	Written	

			<p>a. Can the Department detail the changes to CTAS?</p> <p>b. When are they expected to be finalised?</p> <p>If incomplete;</p> <p>i. When will the review be completed?</p> <p>ii. Has an interim report been prepared?</p> <p>1. Yes;</p> <p>a. What are the outcomes?</p> <p>b. When will the final report be prepared?</p> <p>c. Will the draft report be made public?</p> <p>i. Yes;</p> <p>1. When?</p> <p>ii. No;</p> <p>1. Why not?</p>		
76	Alex Gallacher	Defence Trade Controls Act	<p>1. Australia ratified the Arms Trade treaty in 2014, and we saw significant amendments to the DTC Act in 2015. How much of the current review will focus on how the Act currently reflects our obligations under the Arms Trade Treaty?</p> <p>2. How many exports were approved over the last 12 months?</p> <p>a. And the last 24 months?</p> <p>3. Does Defence have any concerns that any of those may have created issues for us under the Arms Trade Treaty?</p> <p>4. Has the Government received any representations from stakeholders concerned that exports approved in the last 24 months may have created issues under the Arms Trade Treaty?</p> <p>a. Who expressed those concerns?</p> <p>b. What is the nature of the concerns expressed?</p> <p>5. When will the government complete and publish its framework for transparency in defence exports?</p>	Written	
77	Alex Gallacher	Naval Shipbuilding Plan	<p>1. Can you please provide the raw data that was used to produce Figure 4.1 on page 66 of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan?</p> <p>2. The Naval Shipbuilding Plan states that “Demand for construction workers will reach a peak of around 5,200 in 2026” (para 4.17, page 65) – can you please provide the modelling and/or the assumptions that support that conclusion?</p> <p>3. What is the number of construction workers currently directly employed in</p>	Written	

			shipbuilding?		
78	Alex Gallacher	Future Submarines	<p>1. The Naval Shipbuilding Plan has construction of the first submarine to start in 2022. Is that still the planned start date for construction?</p> <p>2. Who is responsible for building the yard to construct the Future Submarines?</p> <p>3. When does Defence expect the design for that yard to begin, and be complete?</p> <p>4. When does Defence expect construction on that yard to begin, and be complete?</p>	Written	
79	Alex Gallacher	Capacity at Osborne North	<p>1. The Collins Class Submarines undergo full-cycle docking at Osborne North, where the Government has committed that Future Submarine construction will be by 2022.</p> <p>a. When in the next three years does Defence expect that decision would need to be made for there to be time for that decision to be implemented by 2022?</p> <p>b. When would consideration need to begin for that decision to be made on that timeframe?</p> <p>c. The Naval Shipbuilding Plan states: The Osborne North facilities will continue to support Collins Class sustainment for some time to come. Planning will be required to ensure this activity can continue without detriment while the submarine infrastructure construction activity is underway. Naval Shipbuilding plan, p53</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The yard will need to be complete by 2022 to meet that timetable. When will planning will need to begin for construction to be complete by that time? 	Written	
80	Alex Gallacher	Australian Industry Content	<p>1. Defence provided an answer on notice to Senator Gallacher from the May Estimates round that “The initial phase of procurement of major systems/equipment is scheduled for completion by December 2018.” What is the Australian industry content likely to be once that is complete?</p> <p>2. In that same response, Defence told Senator Gallacher that “The level of [Australian] industrial capability is as anticipated at this stage.” What is that anticipated level?</p>	Written	
81	Alex Gallacher	Offshore Patrol Vessels	<p>The Government announced the OPV prime contractor in November 2017, and in May Defence advised Estimates that the contract between Lürssen and ASC would be finalised within four weeks.</p> <p>In answers to questions at the Finance and Public Administration Estimates Hearing on 23 October 2018, ASC indicated that it had not signed a contract with Lürssen to date because the structural separation of ASC into three entities has not yet been completed.</p> <p>1. Given the Government announced the separation of ASC into three entities in</p>	Written	

			<p>October 2016, two whole years ago, and 18 months into the separation this contract would be signed in four weeks, what is the causing the delay in the structural separation of ASC?</p> <p>2. When does Defence expect it to be complete?</p> <p>3. When does Defence expect the contract to be finalised?</p> <p>4. Given Defence is yet to sign a contract, construction possibly begin on the first OPV this year as promised?</p> <p>At the May 2018 Estimates hearing, Senator Carr and Mr Cuthill had this exchange: Senator KIM CARR: How many people are actually required for the OPV project? Mr Cuthill: At the moment we're still working through with Lurssen some of the options. At the moment we've got plans; it depends which options get allocated into that contract.</p> <p>(Extract from page 32 of Estimates Transcript)</p> <p>5. Given no contract has been signed, does that mean ASC has no agreed understanding of how many people they will need to work on the OPV program?</p> <p>6. Is the fact that the contract has not been signed the reason ASC was forced to announce the loss of a further 63 permanent positions, including 56 production employees on 16 October 2018?</p>		
82	Alex Gallacher	AGSVA	<p>Defence noted in its response to the ANAO's audit report into security vetting from earlier this year that the Australian Government Security Vetting Agency (AGSVA) is "still undertaking a significant reform program with many of the issues flagged in the Report planned for implementation in the next year."</p> <p>1. Which issues have been completely addressed by this reform program?</p> <p>2. Which issues are still to be completely addressed by this reforms program?</p> <p>3. Which issues are Defence addressing in other ways?</p> <p>4. The ANAO found that many agencies were using workarounds in the Protective Security Policy Framework to deal with the delays in getting clearances, and that many did not comply with the proper controls to do so. Defence pushed back implementation of some reforms to the PSPF from July till October. Are they now fully in place?</p> <p>5. News reports say other reforms have been pushed back even further, to October 2020. What they are?</p>	Written	
83	Alex Gallacher	AGSVA Clearance Processing	<p>6. Defence published a discussion paper earlier this year about how Defence can improve processing times. News reports are that industry came back with 29</p>	Written	

			<p>suggestions.</p> <p>a. What was the tenor of those responses?</p> <p>b. When does Defence expect to complete a full analysis of those responses?</p> <p>c. When will Defence be able to provide that to the committee?</p> <p>7. The discussion paper discussed a future approach to market, including the services required. When does Defence expect to make that approach to market?</p> <p>a. How many of the responses Defence received related to that approach to market?</p>		
84	Alex Gallacher	Defence Innovation Hub	<p>1. Where does the Innovation Hub appear in the Budget Papers?</p> <p>2. The announcement for the Innovation Hub in the Defence Industry Policy Statement was for \$640 million over the decade to 2025-26. The then-ministers issued a press release with the budget saying the Hub has awarded 37 contracts worth \$62 million to date.</p> <p>a. In each of the financial years to-date, how much was been spent on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o capital and establishing the Hub; o recurrent costs; o contracts awarded. <p>b. In each of the years in the Budget Papers, how much will be spent on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o capital and establishing the Hub; o recurrent costs; and o contracts awarded. 	Written	
85	Alex Gallacher	Larrakeyah Defence Precinct	<p>1. Defence told the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works that a previous review of the Larrakeyah Defence Precinct in 2012 found that working accommodation for several military units was in poor condition, did not meet contemporary work or training standards and/or was not fit for purpose. Given the findings of the 2012 review, why has it taken six years for the redevelopment project come forward?</p> <p>2. The commitment for these upgrades was first made in the Integrated Investment Program (IIP) that accompanied the Defence White Paper in 2016, four years after that review. Several Ministers put out releases that included this commitment at the time the IIP was published. Can Defence indicate where that commitment is reflect in the 2016-17 Budget, and subsequent budgets?</p> <p>3. Defence announced a contractor to oversee the project in July. Where did that funding come from?</p> <p>4. How much money had Defence spent on this project by the time of the 2017-18</p>	Written	WREN

			<p>Budget?</p> <p>a. What had that been spent on?</p> <p>5. When will a line in a budget showing this project has been funded appear?</p>		
86	Alex Gallacher	Larrakeyah Tender	<p>6. The prime contractor for this project has put out the first package of tenders.</p> <p>a. Can Defence provide a rough order of magnitude for this work?</p> <p>b. When does Defence expect that work to begin?</p> <p>c. Where in the Budget is the appropriation for this work?</p> <p>7. What does Defence expect the spending on this project to be in each of the years in the forward estimates?</p>	Written	
87	Alex Gallacher	Larrakeyah Local Industry Opportunities	<p>8. The Minister for Defence announced in a press release dated 30 June 2018 that there would be a Local Industry Capability Plan to maximise the opportunity for small and medium businesses on this project.</p> <p>a. Who is responsible for developing this plan?</p> <p>b. Who is responsible for making sure it's followed?</p> <p>c. Is it complete?</p> <p>d. How will the plan work? How does the plan maximise opportunities for local SME's? What issues does it address?</p> <p>e. Please provide a copy of this plan for the Committee.</p> <p>9. What will the local industry content be on this project? What steps Defence has taken to check that that is the maximum possible?</p> <p>10. Has Defence received any feedback from local industry about whether this project could have been put to market in a way which delivered more local content?</p> <p>a. Does Defence have mechanisms in place to capture this feedback if it were offered?</p>	Written	
88	Alex Gallacher	Larrakeyah Public Works Submission	<p>11. The submission from Defence to the Public Works Committee stated that one of the inadequacies to be addressed is that "the firefighting infrastructure is non-compliant".</p> <p>a. What infrastructure does this statement refers to?</p> <p>b. Given the sensitivities of the community, can Defence confirm this statement does not refer to the use of fire fighting foams containing PFAS?</p>	Written	
89	Alex Gallacher	Henderson	<p>1. On 29 June 2018 the Government announced \$670 million in works at Henderson related to the Future Frigate program. The release says construction is expected to commence by the end of next year.</p> <p>a. When does Defence expect to have a head contractor for this infrastructure project?</p> <p>b. When does Defence expect to have a Local Industry Capability Plan?</p>	Written	

			<p>c. How much of that \$670 million will be spent this financial year, and in each financial year over the forwards estimates?</p> <p>d. Will this project to appear in MYEFO?</p>		
90	Alex Gallacher	Henderson Works ¶	<p>On 20 February 2017 Prime Minister Turnbull and Minister Pyne announced \$100 million for Henderson. Senator Kitching asked a question on notice about what that \$100 million commitment was for at the May 2018 estimates hearing. Defence said: Infrastructure investment identified at the time, either through direct Defence investment in infrastructure or as a consequence of Defence investment in military capability, included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the redevelopment of HMAS Stirling, including investment in wharves and jetties; • new MH-60R helicopter sustainment facilities; • improved Collins class submarine sustainment facilities; • new shipbuilding facilities for the Pacific Patrol Boat Replacement; • anticipated infrastructure investment associated with the Offshore Patrol Vessel project. <p>2. Does that remain the purpose of the \$100 million commitment?</p> <p>3. Where does this commitment appear in the Budget Papers?</p> <p>4. Were these projects Defence had already committed to before the Prime Minister and Minister issued this press release?</p>	Written	
91	Alex Gallacher	Henderson Stirling Tenders	<p>5. Are the works at Henderson and HMAS Stirling being tendered separately, or as a single work package?</p> <p>a. How many tenders are out?</p> <p>b. How many tenders have been awarded?</p> <p>6. What, if any, construction on those projects is underway?</p> <p>7. When does Defence expect work to begin on the first Offshore Patrol Vessel to be built at Henderson?</p> <p>8. When will work on the yard to facilitate that begin?</p>	Written	
92	Alex Gallacher	Henderson Footprint ¶	<p>9. In a response to a question on notice from Senator Kitching, Defence said: "The Department of Defence is also providing input to the Western Australian State Government as it develops a Henderson Master Plan. As part of this, Defence will provide clarity on its required footprint in Henderson which will inform further investment in the precinct."</p> <p>a. Has Defence provided that clarity?</p>	Written	

			<p>b. When will Defence be in a position to?</p> <p>c. What work or decisions need to occur for Defence to do so?</p> <p>10. Defence said in response to a Question on Notice from Senator Kitching from the May Estimates about the masterplan that: “Defence's planning and considerations for the Henderson Maritime Precinct are maturing and are expected to continue to mature through until at least 2020 as naval construction and related decisions are taken.”</p> <p>a. What considerations will be outstanding until 2020?</p> <p>b. What decisions are yet to be made that prevent Defence’s planning from being mature today?</p>		
93	Alex Gallacher	Henderson Capacity	<p>11. Given that Henderson is a mixed use facility for a wide range of businesses, not just Defence, what will be the split between defence facilities and commercial use facilities?</p> <p>12. What capacity will Henderson have to do non-Defence related work post-expansion?</p> <p>13. Who will have governance over the new facilities? Will an increase in capacity, both Defence and commercial, warrant a change in management?</p>	Written	
94	Alex Gallacher	USFPI	<p>1. Where does either of the two major projects under the US Force Posture Initiative (upgrades to RAAF Base Tindal and NT Training Areas & Ranges) appear in the Budget Papers?</p> <p>2. Where does the infrastructure spending for the USFPI overall appear in the Budget Papers?</p>	Written	
95	Alex Gallacher	Tindal Upgrades	<p>1. Lendlease has been announced as the head contractor of the jointly tendered upgrades at Tindal for the F-35s and the USFPI. What is the value of that tender?</p> <p>2. Did Lendlease provide a Local Industry Capability Plan?</p> <p>a. If NO, why not?</p> <p>b. If YES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Please provide a copy o Who is responsible for making sure it’s followed? o What is the local industry content? o How does the plan maximise opportunities for local SMEs? o What steps did Defence take to make sure this was the maximum possible? <p>3. Has Defence had any feedback from local industry about whether this project could have been put to market in a way which delivered more local content?</p>	Written	

			<p>a. Does Defence have mechanisms in place to capture this feedback if it were offered?</p> <p>4. When will this project go to the Public Works Committee?</p> <p>5. When does Defence expect works to begin?</p> <p>a. Please provide the funding allocation for this project over the forward estimates. (Please provide the annual funding allocation.)</p>		
96	Alex Gallacher	NT Training Areas and Ranges	<p>1. Upgrades to NT Training Areas and Range received first pass approval last year. What is the current status of this project?</p> <p>2. Given these upgrades cover the Robertson Close Training Area, Kangaroo Flats Training Area, Mount Bundey Training Area, and Bradshaw Field Training Area, will they be put to market as a single tender, or will they be put to market as individual work packages?</p> <p>a. Has Defence done an assessment of what that will mean for the ability of local contractors to bid as the prime?</p> <p>b. Has Defence had any feedback from local industry about whether this project could have been put to market in a way which delivered more local content?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does Defence have mechanisms in place to capture this feedback if it were offered? <p>3. When will this project go to the Public Works Committee?</p> <p>4. When is the work scheduled to begin?</p> <p>5. Please provide the funding allocation for this project across the forward estimates. (Please provide the annual funding allocation.)</p>	Written	
97	Alex Gallacher	Osborne South	<p>1. What is the total value of the project to provide new infrastructure at Osborne South to support the Future Frigates program?</p> <p>a. Where does that appear in the Budget Papers?</p> <p>2. Lendlease was announced as the managing contractor for this project in October 2017.</p> <p>a. How much was spent on this project in that financial year?</p> <p>b. How much does Defence plan to spend on this project over the forward estimates? (Please provide the annual funding allocation.)</p>	Written	
98	Alex Gallacher	Osborne Infrastructure Project	<p>3. Has Defence had any feedback from local industry about whether this project could have been put to market in a way which delivered more local content?</p> <p>a. Does Defence have mechanisms in place to capture this feedback if it were offered?</p>	Written	
99	Alex Gallacher	Shoalwater Bay Purchases	<p>1. On 7 February 2017 the former Minister for Defence stated that Defence would be purchasing land from willing sellers.</p>	Written	

			<p>a. How many purchases have been made?</p> <p>b. What is the total value of those purchases?</p> <p>c. What is the total area of the purchases?</p> <p>d. What percentage of the total required purchases does this represent?</p>		
100	Alex Gallacher	Shoalwater Bay Purchases – Additional Locations	<p>2. The Department of Defence said on 29 November 2017 that it was seeking additional land purchases from Greenvale, Ravenswood or Pentland.</p> <p>a. How many purchases have been made in these or any other additional locations?</p> <p>b. What is the total value of those purchases?</p> <p>c. What is the total area of the purchases?</p> <p>d. What percentage of the total required purchases does this represent?</p>	Written	
101	Alex Gallacher	Shoalwater Bay Local Impact	<p>3. What has the impact on the local economy has been to date?</p> <p>4. Defence indicated in November 2017 it would be holding forums with members of the community and local industry.</p> <p>a. How many forums have been held so far?</p> <p>b. How many people have attended these forums?</p> <p>c. What have been the top issues raised by the local community during these forums?</p> <p>5. What is the total spending by Defence on this project to date?</p> <p>a. Where does this appear in the Budget Papers?</p> <p>b. What has this spending has been on?</p> <p>6. What does Defence expect to spend on this project in each of the years in the forward estimates? (Please provide the annual funding allocation.)</p>	Written	
102	Alex Gallacher	Shoalwater Bay Remediation Project	<p>7. On 30 April 2018, F.K Gardner and Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd Joint Venture were announced as the managing contractor engaged to deliver the Shoalwater Bay Training Area Remediation Project and had developed a Local Industry Capability Plan as part of Defence's local industry capability framework.</p> <p>a. What is the local industry content under this contract?</p> <p>b. What work has Defence done to assure itself this is the maximum possible?</p> <p>c. Has the feedback from local industry universally supported Defence's approach?</p> <p>d. Is Defence aware the Local Industry Capability Plan developed by the Joint Venture companies that states a commitment to sourcing 80 percent of its construction subcontractors from the Livingstone and Rockhampton regions?</p> <p>e. Has any work commenced on expanding the Training Area?</p> <p>o If so what work is being undertaken?</p>	Written	

			<p>o Have any local industry/businesses commenced working on the Project? ? If so: How many? ? What types of work are they employed to do?</p>		
103	Alex Gallacher	JSF Infrastructure Projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many individual estate infrastructure projects have been planned to support the arrival of the JSF aircraft capability in Australia and what are they? 2. How many individual estate infrastructure projects supporting the JSF aircraft capability have commenced? 3. What are the costs of the individual projects? 4. Are these costs reflected in the overall acquisition of the JSF? 5. If these are separate costs, what are the total costs of JSF acquisition, weapon testing and infrastructure or estate upgrade costs? 	Written	
104	Alex Gallacher	Amberley Upgrade Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress has been made on the engine test cell 1 upgrade project? 2. When is the project expected to be complete? 3. What percentage of local industry and businesses are engaged on the project? 4. How does this compare with other projects at other Defence locations? 5. Is there a Local Industry Capability Plan for this project? If so, please provide a copy for the Committee. 	Written	
105	Alex Gallacher	Woomera Remediation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress has been made on the Woomera Range Remediation Facilities project? 2. What percentage of local industry and businesses are/were engaged on the project? 3. How does this compare with other projects at other Defence locations? 4. Is there a Local Industry Capability Plan for this project? If so, please provide a copy for the Committee. 	Written	
107	Alex Gallacher	Divestment of Estate ¶	<p>Defence provided the following answer to QON 34 (Defence BE Q74 2018) during the May Estimates: Of the 32 properties referred to in ANAO Audit report No. 34, nine properties had previously been approved by Government for divestment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frenchville Rifle Range, QLD • Mount Vince Rifle Range, QLD • Kalgoorlie Rifle Range, WA • Pontville Small Arms Range, TAS (SOLD) • Paterson Barracks, TAS • Leeuwin Barracks, WA 	Written	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulimba Barracks, QLD • Stokes Hill Fuel Installation, NT • 310 St Kilda Road, VIC. <p>The remaining 23 properties have not been approved for divestment. Therefore, details of those properties cannot be provided.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress is being made to obtain Government approval to divest the remaining 23 sites? 2. What timeframe is Defence working towards to finalise the divestment of these properties? 3. Of the nine properties provided in the list by Defence, when is the divestment or sale of these properties expected to be finalised? 4. The list of nine properties with Government approval for divestment did not include Defence Site Maribyrnong. Was this site approved for divestment by Government? 5. Why was it excluded from the list provided by Defence in its answer to Question on Notice number 64? 6. If it is not included in this list, are there multiple lists of Defence properties for divestment? 		
108	Alex Gallacher	Maribyrnong	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On 18 October 2018, Defence announced a marketing campaign to support the sale of the Defence site in Maribyrnong, Victoria. Please outline what is included in Defence’s marketing campaign for the sale of Defence Site Maribyrnong. 2. The Fact Sheet supporting the sale of Defence Site Maribyrnong shows there are five stages to the sale process, with a targeted contract completion date expected towards the end of 2020. The timeline assumes there are no delays. What are the identified risks in the sales process? 3. One of the prerequisites for registering interest in the development of the property is the need to have demonstrated experience undertaking large scale urban development and site remediation projects. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The fact sheet refers to developers needing to remove “common” types of contaminants. What contaminants remain on the property? b. What “Defence specific” contaminants were remediated by Defence? c. Is there a requirement for the remediation of the property to be managed in accordance with the National Environmental Management Program (NEMP) developed by the Department of the Environment in 2018? If not, why? 	Written	

			d. Was Defence remediation completed in accordance with the NEMP? If not, why?		
109	Alex Gallacher	Maribyrnong Registration of Interest	<p>4. According to the Fact Sheet, Stage 2B of the process will see registered parties from the Registration of Interest process submitting an initial Expression of Interest. The EOI will outline the parties' preliminary design concept and how they will meet the opportunities and constraints of the site. These concepts will then be evaluated by Defence's evaluation panel against set evaluation criteria.</p> <p>a. What are the constraints of the site?</p> <p>b. Who sits on the Defence evaluation panel?</p> <p>c. What are the set evaluation criteria to be considered by the evaluation panel?</p> <p>d. Are these criteria provided to EOI applicants?</p>	Written	
110	Alex Gallacher	Maribyrnong Heritage List	<p>The Defence Site Maribyrnong is listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List (ID 105325). Defence's Fact Sheet states:</p> <p>"Defence will nominate the site to the Victorian Heritage Register to provide for ongoing heritage protection following the sale. Defence is updating a heritage management plan to include strategies to protect the heritage values of the site in the context of any future development proposals".</p> <p>1. Why is Defence nominating the site after the sale?</p> <p>2. What areas are protected by the inclusion on the Commonwealth Heritage List?</p> <p>3. Are any of these areas under threat by potential development on the site? If so, what are they?</p> <p>4. Will Defence's update to its heritage management plan ensure these areas would be protected during redevelopment?</p> <p>5. Would heritage protection mean placing some constraints or restrictions on how the land would be developed? If so, what impact would this have on the market value of the property?</p> <p>6. Are there any current requirements or constraints on the development of the site? For example, is public access to the riverfront a requirement of any future development on the site?</p>	Written	
111	Alex Gallacher	310 St Kilda Street	<p>1. Has due diligence on the site been completed? Did Defence or the Victorian Government under take this work?</p> <p>2. When was the Fact Sheet for this divestment project last updated? Is the information current?</p> <p>3. Is Defence aware of how much it will cost to remediate the site? If yes, how much?</p>	Written	

			4. Has an off-market offer from the Victorian Government been received by Defence? If so, what a decision been made on this offer?		
112	Alex Gallacher	Bulimba Barracks	<p>In March 2015, a media release from the Parliamentary Secretary of Defence stated the environmental site assessments had recently commenced. The real estate manager for the sale of the site, Knight Frank, was appointed in February 2018.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why has it taken so long for the disposal of this site to progress? 2. Why is the sales process for Bulimba Barracks different to Defence Site Maribyrnong? 3. What will the sales process for Bulimba Barracks look like? 4. When is the sale expected to be finalised? 5. Is it likely to be a market or off-market sale? 6. The report for Stage One is not available on the project site. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What were the summary findings of the report? b. What contaminants were identified? c. What remediation activities did Defence complete on the site? d. Why has remediation taken so long to complete? 7. When was the report for Stage Two of the Environmental Investigations completed? 	Written	
113	Alex Gallacher	Maryborough Rifle Range	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the current status of the negotiation on the sale of this site? 2. Has the Minister made a decision on the offer of sale on the site? If not, has the Minister for Finance given Defence any indication of when a decision will be made? 	Written	
114	Alex Gallacher	Mount Vince Rifle Range	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the current status of the negotiation on the sale of this site? 2. Has the Minister made a decision on the offer of sale on the site? If not, has the Minister for Finance given Defence any indication of when a decision will be made? 	Written	
115	Alex Gallacher	Frenchville Rifle Range	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why didn't Defence sell the buffer zone at the same time as the sale of the Rifle Range in 1998? 2. Has the rifle range been rezoned by the new owners? 3. What types of contaminants are expected to be identified in the environmental investigation process? 4. Has the Rockhampton Council shown any interest in acquiring the site? 5. Has there been any interest shown by other parties? 	Written	
116	Alex Gallacher	Kalgoorlie Rifle Range	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the current status of the negotiation on the sale of this site? 2. Has the Minister made a decision on the offer of sale on the site? If not has the Minister for Finance given Defence any indication of when a decision will be made? 	Written	
117	Alex	Haberfield Army	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did Defence agree to upgrade the storm water drain as part of its contract 	Written	

	Gallacher	Reserve Depot	<p>requirements with the Council?</p> <p>2. What is the current status of negotiations?</p> <p>3. Have any of the contracts for sale been resolved?</p>		
118	Alex Gallacher	Defence Establishment Orchard Hills	<p>1. Noting there are several smaller ranges Defence intends to divest itself of in Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, and given the size of the base's footprint, are there any plans to release or dispose of some land at Orchard Hills?</p> <p>2. Are there any parts of the base that are used in a civilian capacity? If so, what are they?</p> <p>3. Would Defence consider allocating a portion of land for use as a civilian range?</p> <p>a. If yes, what information would Defence need to undertake its consideration?</p> <p>b. If not, why not?</p>	Written	
119	Alex Gallacher	Williamstown Expansion	<p>1. Defence is planning to resurface the runway at RAAF Base Williamstown. How far has planning progressed?</p> <p>2. What timeline is Defence working to for the project?</p> <p>3. Has funding been provided for this work?</p> <p>4. When was funding provided?</p> <p>5. Is it possible to revise the plan to include strengthening the runway?</p> <p>6. Would an upgrade of the runway to accommodate heavier aircraft add to capability in Williamstown?</p> <p>7. Does Defence have any plans to upgrade the runway to accommodate heavier aircraft in the future?</p> <p>8. Would Defence oppose upgrading the runway to facilitate longer range civilian aircraft? If so, why?</p> <p>9. Does Defence have any other plans to extend or upgrade airfield infrastructure at Williamstown? If so, what is planned?</p>	Written	
120	Alex Gallacher	PFAS	<p>Reviewing transcripts of the hearings in Katherine, Oakey, Williamstown and Canberra make sobering reading. The concerns from residents have been similar across all the hearing locations – inadequate communication between Defence and affected communities.</p> <p>1. Why does Defence think this issue was raised in all three hearing locations?</p> <p>2. How has Defence responded to these concerns?</p>	Written	
121	Alex Gallacher	PFAS Communication	<p>Defence has undertaken a significant program of community walk in sessions, one-on-one sessions, and other consultation processes in affected communities. Yet the</p>	Written	

		Strategy	<p>evidence provided at the hearings appears to indicate its messaging isn't working, it isn't getting through.</p> <p>3. Has Defence reviewed its communications strategy in light of the concerns raised in the inquiry process?</p> <p>4. Has Defence been able to identify what is working, and what isn't?</p> <p>5. Is Defence's communications strategy part of a broader whole-of-government communications strategy?</p> <p>a. If so, who is the lead agency or person on the communications strategy?</p> <p>6. Has Defence discussed the communities concerns about its communications strategy broadly with the PFAS Task Force?</p> <p>a. If so, what direction was provided to Defence by the Task Force?</p> <p>b. If not, please explain why.</p> <p>7. How does Defence respond to the concerns raised in the hearings about people having a "lack of trust" in Defence because it is the "polluter"?</p>		
122	Alex Gallacher	PFAS Inquiry	<p>1. At the Canberra hearing of the PFAS Inquiry, the CSIRO made the comment "there isn't enough urgency from Government in this space" and there needs to be a prioritisation scheme.</p> <p>a. What is Defence's view on these comments? Does Defence agree? If not, please explain why.</p> <p>2. Is Defence collaborating with the CSIRO on any remediation research for PFAS contamination?</p> <p>a. If yes, what is the focus of these projects? For example, is it focused on ground water remediation techniques? Is it soil remediation techniques?</p> <p>3. Is there a contract between Defence and the CSIRO in relation to this research?</p> <p>a. If so, what are the terms of the contract?</p> <p>b. What is the length of the contract?</p> <p>c. What specific works are listed in the contract?</p> <p>d. Does the contract involve on site trials of remediation techniques?</p> <p>e. What is the cost of the contract?</p> <p>f. Was the contract awarded through a competitive tender process? If so, what other parties tendered for the work?</p> <p>g. What milestones are listed in the contract/s?</p>	Written	
123	Alex	RAAF Base Pearce	<p>1. What is the current status of investigations at RAAF Base Pearce?</p>	Written	

	Gallacher		<p>2. What assistance is being provided to the Bullsbrook community whose groundwater is contaminated with PFAS?</p> <p>3. Have any remediation techniques been deployed?</p> <p>4. Are there any plans to install a water treatment plant to clean the groundwater, similar to Williamstown?</p> <p>5. In an article on the weekend, the ABC reported the community has been using alternative water supplied by Defence for two and a half years. This is unsustainable. How does Defence intend to provide access to water in the longer term for this community?</p> <p>6. Are mental health services being provided to the Bullsbrook community?</p> <p>7. If so, when were these services rolled out? If not, why has there been a delay?</p> <p>8. Has a voluntary blood test program commenced?</p> <p>9. Has RAAF Base Pearce and the Bullsbrook community been referred to the ANU for inclusion in its epidemiological study? If so, when did this happen? If not, please explain why.</p>		
124	Don Farrell	Administration Costs	<p>1. What was the total cost incurred by the Department on new business cards for all Ministers, Assistant Ministers and Ministerial staff following the change of Prime Minister on 24th August 2018, and the subsequent reshuffle of the Government ministry on 28th August 2018 (please include production, design, and printing costs)?</p> <p>What was the total cost incurred by the Department on new letterhead and personalised stationery for all Ministers, Assistant Ministers and Ministerial staff following the change of Prime Minister on 24th August 2018, and the subsequent reshuffle of the Government ministry on 28th August 2018? (please include production, design, and printing costs)</p> <p>What was the total cost incurred by the Department on new electronic equipment (including telephones, ipads, computers, laptops) for all Ministers, Assistant Ministers and Ministerial staff following the change of Prime Minister on 24th August 2018, and the subsequent reshuffle of the Government ministry on 28th August 2018?</p>	Written	
125	Peter Whish-Wilson	Future Frigates Tenderers	<p>1. Did any of the tenderers guarantee no job losses in the Adelaide shipyards?</p> <p>2. Did the selected tenderer guarantee no job losses in the Adelaide shipyards?</p> <p>3. Did government offer inducements to select the selected tenderer? For example, did the government offer to purchase other military equipment from a tenderer?</p> <p>4. Was the selected tenderer the cheapest?</p>	Written	

			5. Was the selected tenderer the lowest risk?		
126	Peter Whish-Wilson	Future Frigates Sovereign Capability	6. What guarantees have been provided regarding sovereign shipbuilding capability to design as well as build the country's future naval ships?	Written	
127	Peter Whish-Wilson	Future Frigates	7. How could this procurement deal be considered good 'value for money' when other countries—including the United States—already reached the conclusion that BAE's offering was too risky?	Written	
128	Ian Macdonald	Pacific Patrol Boats	Mr Hamilton: Can I correct the record? I think I gave you the wrong number for Pacific countries that will receive patrol boats: 10 Pacific countries will receive vessels. We can give you the breakdown of how many vessels per country. As well as Timor-Leste, additional countries will also receive aerial surveillance services. Senator IAN MACDONALD: Thank you... Mr Hamilton: Earlier we provided some advice to Senator Macdonald's questions on Pacific Patrol Boats. I advised that in total 21 boats will be provided but I wanted to clarify the countries that will receive those vessels. Twelve Pacific island countries will receive them and, in addition, Timor-Leste.	Hansard	14 & 41
129	Kim Carr	Defence Trade Controls Act Review Consultation	Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. You indicated that there'd been consultations about that submission. Who with? Dr Kearnan: There were consultations, both internally and externally, in the department. Internally it was with the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group and with Defence Science and Technology Group. Externally it was, from memory—and I will probably have to confirm this for you—the Department of Home Affairs, Prime Minister and Cabinet, Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Australian Research Council and the department of industry. I think that's all, but I'll just confirm.	Hansard	20
130	Penny Wong	Defence Attache to Israel	Mr Jeffrey: As the secretary and the Foreign Minister said, the request that Australia appoint a defence attaché to Israel has been longstanding— Senator WONG: That wasn't my question. Mr Jeffrey: This is an issue that's known to us. This department provided advice to our minister on that issue. Senator WONG: When? Mr Jeffrey: It was in September—I'll get the exact date for you. We consulted on that advice with the Department of Foreign Affairs and of course with our post in Tel Aviv and our wider diplomatic network.	Hansard	38

131	Alex Gallacher	Naval Shipbuilding Project Separation of Infrastructure	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Sorry for butting in, but we're going to run out of time in the section. I want to be very specific and get answers to the particular questions I have. When was the decision made to separate infrastructure from shipbuilding?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I think that was done in 2016, Senator, but I'll get that confirmed.</p>	Hansard	78
132	Alex Gallacher	Shipbuilding Prototyping Programs	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Can you point us to another program where prototyping is being undertaking? Are you saying it's world's best practice? Where are they doing that?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I've already pointed to one for you. In the United Kingdom they used prototyping in the Queen Elizabeth class aircraft carrier. There are several other examples that I can take on notice to provide for you.</p>	Hansard	81
133	Alex Gallacher	Australian Industry Content Plans	<p>Rear Adm. Dalton: They all provided Australian industry content strategy.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is it possible to see those? Can you table those industry content plans?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: They are commercial in confidence. I would have to go and have a look at what we can table. Once we have the head contract in place, there will be an Australian industry content plan, which will be a public plan</p>	Hansard	81