

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000002
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Bullying and Harassment complaints
Hansard Page: 14
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Were there other issues raised outside of bullying and harassment? Like nepotism or any other particular—

Mr Sullivan: No. I think they would have all been included inside bullying and harassment. I'd need to check that.

CHAIR: Sure.

Answer:

Other issues reported

110 reports relating to the Australian Antarctic Division were made to the Professional and Ethical Standards Branch between 1 July 2022 and 31 December 2023. Of these, 42 relate to bullying and harassment.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000003
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Timeline for resolution of investigations
Hansard Page: 14
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Bilyk asked:

Senator BILYK: In regard to those, is there a specified time line by which you try to resolve these issues?

Mr Sullivan: As quickly as possible. We do have indicative time frames for ourselves. It's not my area. I'm not going to make that up, so I'll take that on notice and get back to you.

Answer:

The Professional and Ethical Standards Branch aim to resolve issues as quickly as proper consideration of the matter allows; however, matters range in complexity which can affect how long it takes to complete.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000004
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Timelines for assessment, preliminary and formal inquiries
Hansard Page: 14
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Bilyk asked:

Senator BILYK: What's the difference between 'formal investigation' and 'under assessment'?
Mr Sullivan: 'Under assessment' refers to matters in the process of being assessed, including talking to the reporters and witnesses and collection of any other information that may be required to inform the most appropriate course of action.

Senator BILYK: You don't have any information on the time lines for any of these?

Mr Sullivan: No. I'm sorry; I don't. As I said, I'll take that on notice.

Senator BILYK: Could I get you to take that on notice? I'd be interested to know when those under assessment, preliminary and formal inquiries were first brought to the attention of the AAD. In fact, even with the 'for information' where more is needed I'd be interested to know how long they have been on the books, so to speak.

CHAIR: Obviously, we'd be interested in response times to the complainants as well. At what point are their complaints acknowledged, and are there any support services for them as well? That's something I'd be interested in.

Mr Sullivan: I went through some of that before, but we'll get that on notice for you.

Answer:

Timeframes for 'formal investigation' and 'under assessment'

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water supports individuals making a report to have more control over the process for handling their report, with options for their report to be held for information purposes only or for matters to be put on hold.

Professional and Ethical Standards case officers make prompt contact with reporters (within 24 hours where the query related to alleged inappropriate behaviour), to confirm next steps and seek preferences.

Case officers engage with the reporters regarding their preferred level of contact throughout the assessment process, and subject to the reporter's preference, updates are provided every two weeks during the assessment process.

The Professional and Ethical Standards Branch complete investigations as quickly as proper consideration of the matter allows; however, investigations range in complexity which can affect how long an investigation takes to complete.

Support services available

Reporters are reminded of support services available throughout the assessment process, including DCCEE's Employee Assistance Program and early intervention support. We take a people-centric approach and where additional support is required by the individual, this is facilitated through our People Support function.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000005
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Number of staff currently suspended
Hansard Page: 15
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senato Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: In relation to those numbers you provided—unfortunately, I probably didn't get all the terms written down quickly enough but I'll go back and have a look at them—are there any staff currently suspended under section 28 of the Public Service Act and section 14 of the Public Service Regulations in relation to inquiries?

Mr Sullivan: I'd have to take that on notice.

CHAIR: If you could, that would be good. As well, could you take on notice whether any suspensions have been undertaken in the 2023 calendar year; how many staff are currently reassigned to alternative duties, either for a temporary period or on an ongoing basis, under section 25; and how many staff have been reassigned under the Public Service Act in 2023.

Mr Sullivan: We'll take that on notice.

Answer:

Suspension from duties

- As at 31 January 2024, nil (0) Australian Antarctic Division (AAD) employees are currently under suspension from duties under s28 of the *Public Service Act 1999* and s14(2) of the *Public Service Regulations 2023*.
- In the 2023 calendar year, one (1) AAD employee was suspended from duties under s28 of the *Public Service Act 1999* and s14(2) of the *Public Service Regulations 2023*.

Reassignment of duties

- Assignment of duties under s25 of the *Public Service Act 1999* is undertaken by line management frequently for a variety of reasons. Data of assignment of duties is not centrally captured.
- Reassignment of duties as a sanction for breaches of the APS Code of Conduct is done under s15 of the *Public Service Regulations 2023*.
 - As at 31 January 2024, nil (0) AAD employees were reassigned to alternative duties under s15 of the *Public Service Regulations 2023*.
 - In the 2023 calendar year, nil (0) AAD employees were reassigned to alternative duties under s15 of the *Public Service Regulations 2023*.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000006
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Further action undertaking following resignation of staff
Hansard Page: 15
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Just for some clarification, is it correct to say that, if a staff member is being investigated for integrity issues and they resign from the Australian Public Service, there's no further action that can be undertaken in terms of them being, for example, a potential perpetrator of sexual assault or other?

Mr Sullivan: That depends on the nature of what's being investigated. You're right, Senator—in some cases people make reports about an officer, and they will make a decision to resign. It's then a matter of judgement as to what we do about that with respect to follow-through. We're moving into an area where wording is important, so can I take that on notice?

CHAIR: Sure.

Mr Sullivan: I understand where you're coming from: is that just a get-out-of-jail free card in terms of just resigning?

CHAIR: Correct. This is all about a perception within the culture that no action has been taken, or someone hasn't been—

Mr Sullivan: There are privacy issues there where issues have been raised by a person, or they've been investigated and they resign. We cannot then publicly say, 'That person has resigned because of an issue.' We have to traverse those sensitivities with a sense of natural justice around that, and also the issues around how those are dealt with through the professional ethical standards under the Public Service Act. We'll take that on notice with respect to any more information I can give you.

Answer:

Former APS employees, or APS employees who resign during a Code of Conduct process, may still be investigated.

Should a finding of a breach of the APS Code of Conduct be found for a former APS employee, the former employee will be notified of the outcome, and they may be required to disclose details of the matter when applying for any future employment in the APS.

If a former employee is found to have breached the APS Code of Conduct and held a security clearance, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water will report this to the Australian Security Vetting Agency (AGSVA) as per reporting requirements.

Sanctions for breaches of the APS Code of Conduct cannot be imposed on former APS employees.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000007
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Number of requests for agency move in 2023
Hansard Page: 15
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Can you also take on notice how many employee requests for an agency move have been made in 2023, and how many are currently deferred under section 42A? I'll put that in writing to you.

Mr Sullivan: Thanks.

Answer:

Information on employee requests for an agency move is not recorded by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000008
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Formal proposal from TasPorts
Hansard Page: 18
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Duniam asked:

Senator DUNIAM: I will go to Mac 6 and the wharfing and docking facilities. To go back to Mr Donald's testimony, he I remain to this day a little perplexed as to why AAD would invest such significant money in a really important vessel for Australia and not confirm arrangements and put the appropriate things in place to secure a dedicated wharf that was fit for purpose.

TasPorts obviously is the infrastructure operator for maritime logistics in Tasmania. I don't believe any cruise ship company is being asked to build wharves appropriate for their vessels. Is it, to your mind, the job of the AAD to ensure there is appropriate infrastructure in place that would be owned and operated by the Tasmanian government? Is it something you'd have a joint arrangement on? Or is it something that TasPorts could have indeed looked at, given work commenced back in 2013 around what the needs would be. Did TasPorts suggest that this conversation should be had and work put in place?

TasPorts obviously is the infrastructure operator for maritime logistics in Tasmania. I don't believe any cruise ship company is being asked to build wharves appropriate for their vessels. Is it, to your mind, the job of the AAD to ensure there is appropriate infrastructure in place that would be owned and operated by the Tasmanian government? Is it something you'd have a joint arrangement on? Or is it something that TasPorts could have indeed looked at, given work commenced back in 2013 around what the needs would be. Did TasPorts suggest that this conversation should be had and work put in place?

Ms Campbell: Again, we really see Hobart as the home port of Nuyina as a collaborative agreement between the Tasmanian government and the Australian government. We're working really collaboratively with the Tasmanian government on those home berthing arrangements, including on where an icebreaker fits in the relative priority of the harbourmaster and the Tasmanian port authority, as with cruise ships, as you referred to. Certainly, I wouldn't consider it the responsibility solely of the AAD, but, again, we do have a very strong interest in making sure that Nuyina can be supported in its endeavours.

Senator DUNIAM: That's excellent. Thank you for that very diplomatic answer. But I suppose I'm trying to understand—Mr Donald is bold enough to turn up here and basically say, 'AAD didn't do its job by building a new facility here in Tasmania and factoring in what it would do.' I can understand you having port or maritime infrastructure in Antarctica, on Macquarie Island or on any of the other areas you work in. But, in Tasmania, I'm trying to understand how it becomes your responsibility, as the CEO of TasPorts says, to build and maintain this infrastructure. When did TasPorts indicate to the AAD that this is your job, and you should do it?

Ms Campbell: I'd have to take the detail of that on notice. But, of course, we heard in TasPorts's testimony that they first provided a proposal to us. My recollection—and Mr Boxall might be able to check—was that, in October 2023, we had the first proposal for a dedicated wharf. That's my recollection, but we can check on notice when we first got that formal proposal from TasPorts.

Ms Campbell: Again, we really see Hobart as the home port of Nuyina as a collaborative agreement between the Tasmanian government and the Australian government. We're working really collaboratively with the Tasmanian government on those home berthing arrangements, including on where an icebreaker fits in the relative priority of the harbourmaster and the Tasmanian port authority, as with cruise ships, as you referred to. Certainly, I wouldn't consider it the responsibility solely of the AAD, but, again, we do have a very strong interest in making sure that Nuyina can be supported in its

Senator DUNIAM: That's excellent. Thank you for that very diplomatic answer. But I suppose I'm trying to understand—Mr Donald is bold enough to turn up here and basically say, 'AAD didn't do its job by building a new facility here in Tasmania and factoring in what it would do.' I can understand you having port or maritime infrastructure in Antarctica, on Macquarie Island or on any of the other areas you work in. But, in Tasmania, I'm trying to understand how it becomes your responsibility, as the CEO of TasPorts says, to build and maintain this infrastructure. When did TasPorts indicate to the AAD that this is your job, and you should do it?

Ms Campbell: I'd have to take the detail of that on notice. But, of course, we heard in TasPorts's testimony that they first provided a proposal to us. My recollection—and Mr Boxall might be able to check—was that, in October 2023, we had the first proposal for a dedicated wharf. That's my recollection, but we can check on notice when we first got that formal proposal from TasPorts.

Answer:

TasPorts provided the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water with an initial high level proposal on 8 December 2022.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000009
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: People Division
Topic: Referrals made to police
Hansard Page: 16
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Also, have there been any referrals or reports made to the police in respect of sexual assault, harm or harassment in the AAD?

Mr Sullivan: I'd have to take that on notice as well.

Answer:

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water has not made any formal reports to the police in respect of sexual assault, harm or harassment in the Australian Antarctic Division.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000010
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Funding expended - RSV Nuyina
Hansard Page: 26
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Duniam asked:

Senator DUNIAM: Okay. Just on a slightly different matter then, in answer to a question on notice— IQ23-000323—it was confirmed that, in the 2021-22 financial year, the government specifically provided \$32 million to support the commissioning of the RSV Nuyina and for additional shipping. When was the last of that funding expended?

Ms Campbell: Sorry, I'm just looking at the question on notice. My recollection is that funding was fully expended in the last financial year—2022-23—and I can confirm that on notice.

Senator DUNIAM: If you could confirm that on notice, that would be great. Following the provision of that money—that \$32 million—there weren't any overspends on the Nuyina or any additional backup and supporting arrangements for it during the 2021-22 financial year—is that right? You said the funding didn't fully exhaust until 2022-23.

Mr Sullivan: We'll need to check that, because it was additional estimates funding from—

Senator DUNIAM: Yes.

Mr Sullivan: So we'll need to check the allocation between financial years for you.

Answer:

1. The \$32 million was totally expended in 2021-22.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000011
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: RSV Nuyina - monthly meetings
Hansard Page: 17
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Bilyk asked:

Senator BILYK: Sorry, just while we're still asking questions on that: you said there were monthly meetings. Are you able to give us the dates of those monthly meetings?

Mr Sullivan: I can't, but I can have a go at—

Senator BILYK: Were there any minutes or records taken that we could get access to?

Mr Sullivan: I think, again, some of those staff members—as I said, the leader of that project team no longer works in the Antarctic Division—

Senator BILYK: But surely there would be official—

Mr Sullivan: We'll have a go at finding something for you.

Senator BILYK: It would be good if you can take that on notice.

Answer:

Please refer to the response provided for IQ24-000017.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000012
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Consultant spending - AECOM
Hansard Page: 26
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Bilyk asked:

Senator DUNIAM: ... I will just go back to the matter of—and this will probably be one of my last questions, Chair—the consultant spending that we talked about last time we caught up—perhaps in Canberra, I think, or was it here? I can't \$20 million that was spent in relation to consultancy in 2020-21. At the last hearing, former chief scientist Professor Webster did indicate that the money would have been spent on elements specifically related to niche or specialised skills required for the Davis aerodrome project. So I just want to get a sense, because there was a list of the contractors provided in answer to some of the questions placed on notice by my colleagues. Is that how you'd best characterise how that money was spent?

\$20 million that was spent in relation to consultancy in 2020-21. At the last hearing, former chief scientist Professor Webster did indicate that the money would have been spent on elements specifically related to niche or specialised skills required for the Davis aerodrome project. So I just want to get a sense, because there was a list of the contractors provided in answer to some of the questions placed on notice by my colleagues. Is that how you'd best characterise how that money was spent?

Ms Campbell: Yes. In terms of the expenditure that financial year, a large amount of money was spent on the work the government asked us to do about scoping the permanent runway at Davis aerodrome. In between 2016-17 and 2022-23, the government had provided \$91.6 million to develop that scoping of options. Work in Antarctica is expensive, and this was a very significant project with significant environment and geotechnical feasibility. So that work was done to really understand what those impacts would be and to plan for a runway, as the government had asked us to do. That work eventually informed the decision of the former government to not proceed with that project.

Senator BILYK: What was the result of the extraordinarily large spend? Was it that a runway should go ahead or that it shouldn't?

Ms Campbell: Again, from my understanding—and people at this table may correct me if I'm wrong—the government asked us to explore feasibility of the runway and we did that work. The government made a decision, which was announced in November 2021, not to proceed with the runway due to the complexity of the construction at the remote site, the estimated 20-year time frame, the potential environmental impacts and the cost. I will say that a lot of the work that was done was detailed ecological or environmental work that has increased our understanding of east Antarctica.

Senator BILYK: Is there a written report in regard to that? I'm especially interested in the money that went to AECOM.

Ms Campbell: We can take that on notice. I'm sure we would have had reports from consultants, so we can take that on notice. Ms Campbell: Yes. In terms of the expenditure that financial year, a large amount of money was spent on the work the government asked us to do

about scoping the permanent runway at Davis aerodrome. In between 2016- 17 and 2022-23, the government had provided \$91.6 million to develop that scoping of options. Work in Antarctica is expensive, and this was a very significant project with significant environment and geotechnical feasibility. So that work was done to really understand what those impacts would be and to plan for a runway, as the government had asked us to do. That work eventually informed the decision of the former government to not proceed with that

Senator BILYK: What was the result of the extraordinarily large spend? Was it that a runway should go ahead or that it shouldn't?

Ms Campbell: Again, from my understanding—and people at this table may correct me if I'm wrong—the government asked us to explore feasibility of the runway and we did that work. The government made a decision, which was announced in November 2021, not to proceed with the runway due to the complexity of the construction at the remote site, the estimated 20-year time frame, the potential environmental impacts and the cost. I will say that a lot of the work that was done was detailed ecological or environmental work that has increased our understanding of east Antarctica.

Senator BILYK: Is there a written report in regard to that? I'm especially interested in the money that went to AECOM.

Ms Campbell: We can take that on notice. I'm sure we would have had reports from consultants, so we can take that on notice.

Answer:

As detailed in a previous Question on Notice (*IQ23-000310*), \$14,077.691 was awarded to AECOM in 2020-21 for the provision of the below services relating to the Davis Aerodrome Project:

- Environmental assessment and approvals services (in order to comply with EPBC Act & Antarctic Treaty Act obligations);
- Technical design services;
- Logistics and operations; and
- Geotechnical (site) investigation services.

In undertaking this complex body of work, AECOM produced an extensive range of documentation to support the development of:

- Project Scoping and Technical Requirements documentation;
- Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation; and
- Reference Logistics Strategy

The significant amount of knowledge obtained through this work has substantially increased the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water's understanding of the terrestrial and marine environment of East Antarctica.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000013
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: RSV Nuyina - modifications above the waterline
Hansard Page: 18
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Duniam asked:

Senator DUNIAM: That's good, because if someone were to say that the Australian government should have listened to warnings from as early as 2018 that the \$528 million icebreaking research ship was too big to safely pass underneath Hobart's bridge, a Senate inquiry's now been told they'd be incorrect. A point that's been made here is that in 2018 you knew your boat was too big, despite having monthly consultations with TasPorts. The design parameters had been worked on in consultation with them, and it wasn't the size of the vessel but its performance on water—which wasn't known in 2018—that ultimately knocked this thing on the head. Am I correct?

Mr Sullivan: They are tied to each other, to be fair. The waterline issue didn't change.

Obviously, the top of the ship did change, but the harbourmaster was aware of those changes.

Senator DUNIAM: Yes. But it's not the top of the ship that's stopped it passing.

Mr Sullivan: That does couple with the sea trials in terms of directional stability. Again, this is not my area of expertise, but I think they are tied with respect to the waterline width of the ship, which obviously didn't change, because that was cast in 2018. I think, where I understand it from both the sea trials and the simulation trials undertaken by the maritime college, it was a combination of both the ship's stability and taking into account the width of the ship above the waterline.

Senator BILYK: Could directional stability not have been raised earlier than the trials in May, though?

Mr Sullivan: It was, but, again, that's still a residual risk of what the design of the ship looks like versus its performance on water.

Senator DUNIAM: That, of course, wasn't apparent until 2023, not 2018. I was quoting there from the minister herself, who completely misinterpreted what was going on there. Sadly, saying that makes it appear that it is AAD's problem instead of what you've been able to outline to us, which is a collaborative and consultative process. You've had residual risk.

Mr Sullivan: As I said, those changes made with respect to the design above the waterline, coupled with directional stability, did have an impact. That's why I don't disagree with the statement, but I wanted to put some context around it. We did consult post the modifications above the waterline. I'd have to take on notice the issues with respect to how they impacted both the sea trials and the simulations through the maritime college.

Answer:

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water understands it was Nuyina's performance on water that ultimately influenced the TasPorts decision to deny the ship permission to transit the Tasman Bridge. Directional stability was raised as the primary concern during April 2023 trials where the ship proved to have handling characteristics not forecast during modelling and simulations prior.

Environment and Communications References
 Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000014
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Frequency of inspections
Hansard Page: 25
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Duniam asked:

Senator DUNIAM: What's the standard for frequency of these inspections? I think you said before that we have the second-highest number of inspections under the convention—

Ms Buchanan: Yes.

Senator DUNIAM: and it happens frequently. What is the standard for frequency?

Ms Buchanan: There's no standard set. From a policy point of view we've taken the view that we should be active in that space, including in terms of support of the Antarctic Treaty system. We've been active since the 1960s, in terms of conducting inspections. It is something that we think is a good way for us to demonstrate that commitment to the ATS.

Senator DUNIAM: Okay. If there's no standard, how often do they occur? With the last one being in 2020, when was the one before that?

Ms Buchanan: I can take that on notice. Unfortunately I don't have that available at the moment.

Senator DUNIAM: Sure. Do we have any insight into how often other treaty signatories would be inspecting stations under the convention?

Ms Buchanan: Again, I can take that on notice.

Senator DUNIAM: Sure.

Answer:

- The website of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat provides full details of all inspections conducted - (<https://www.ats.ag/devAS/Ats/InspectionsDatabase?lang=e>).
- Australia has carried out the following inspections:

Year (Antarctic summer)	Station, vessel, Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA), Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA), or Historic Site and Monument (HSM) inspected	Location
2023-24	(details will be available when the requisite diplomatic processes are complete and the report has been released)	
2019-20		
	Jang Bogo (Republic of Korea)	
	Inexpressible Island (China)	
	Gondwana (Germany)	
	Taishan (China)	in the AAT
	Molodezhnaya (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
	Mountain Evening (Belarus)	in the AAT
2016-17		
	Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station (United States of America)	partially in the AAT

	Antarctic Specially Managed Area 5 – Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station	partially in the AAT
2010-11		
	Gondwana Station (Germany)	
	Leningradskaya (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
	Vostok (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
2009-10		
	Druzhnaya-4 (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
	Molodezhnaya (aerial observation) (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
	Soyuz (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
	Syowa Station (Japan)	
	Antarctic Specially Protected Area 168 – Mount Harding, Grove Mountains, East Antarctica	in the AAT
2004-05		
	McMurdo Station (United States of America)	
	Scott Base (New Zealand)	
	RV Nathaniel B. Palmer (United States of America)	
	ASPA 122 - Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island (United States of America)	
	ASPA 158 - Hut Point, Ross Island (New Zealand)	
	HSM 18 - Scott's Discovery Hut (New Zealand)	
	HSM 19 - George Vince's Cross (New Zealand)	
	HSM 20 - Observation Hill Cross (New Zealand)	
	HSM 54 - Richard Byrd's Bust (United States of America)	
	HSM 75 - Hut A, Scott Base (New Zealand)	
2004-05 (jointly with United Kingdom and Peru)		
	Arturo Prat Antarctic Naval Base (Chile)	
	Bellingshausen (Russian Federation)	
	Brown (Argentina)	
	Carvajal (Chile)	
	Comandante Ferraz (Brazil)	
	ECO Nelson (Czech Republic)	
	Decepción (Argentina)	
	Esperanza (Argentina)	
	Gabriel de Castilla Station (Spain)	
	Gabriel González Videla (Chile)	
	Great Wall (China)	
	Johann Gregor Mendel (Czech Republic)	
	Juan Carlos I (Spain)	
	King Sejong (Republic of Korea)	
	Marambio (Argentina)	
	Pedro Vicente Maldonado (Ecuador)	
	Petrel (Argentina)	
	Risopatrón (Chile)	
	Rothera (United Kingdom)	
	Ruperto Elchiribehety (Uruguay)	
	San Martín (Argentina)	
	St. Kliment Ohridski (Bulgaria)	
	Vernadsky (Ukraine)	
	Yelcho (Chile)	
	MV Professor Molchanov (Russian Federation)	
	HSM 55 - East Base (United States of America)	
	HSM 61 - Port Lockroy (United Kingdom)	
	HSM 62 - Base F Wordie House (United Kingdom)	
	HSM 63 - Base Y (United Kingdom)	
	HSM 64 - Base E (United Kingdom)	

1990-91		
	Zhongshan (China)	in the AAT
1986-87		
	Mirny (Russian Federation)	in the AAT
1985-86		
	Dumont D'Urville (France)	
1963-64		
	Amundsen-Scott South Pole (United States of America)	partially in the AAT
	McMurdo (United States of America)	
	Scott Base (New Zealand)	
	Byrd (United States of America)	

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000015
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Science projects 4520, 4546 and 4574
Hansard Page: 29
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Let's fly through the questions on notice that we didn't get a chance to ask you about at the last hearing. Regarding question on notice 307, in relation to the 10 unsupported projects for this summer, you did provide some detail on how you were trying to support them this summer or going forward. Can I get an indication in relation to projects 4520, 4546 and 4574—4574 was 'State Estimate of East Antarctic Ice Shelves'— whether these projects will remain unsupported? Will they go into the pooling process that the chief scientist works on for next year? You've provided some details about how the other ones may progress, but those ones had no details attached to them. Are you able to answer that?

Dr Terauds: I'll have to take that on notice. I don't have the detail at hand.

Answer:

Of the three projects 4520, 4546 and 4574 that were not supported with field work in the 2022-23 season, the following updates apply:

- 4520 Assessment of waste and contamination in marine and terrestrial ecosystems with recommendations for environmental management at Mawson station
 - This project has been subsumed by the broader AAS4622 A Cleaner Antarctica project, and the relevant work packages remain in scope for future season delivery.
- 4546 Integrated observations of Antarctic land-fast sea ice physical and biological processes during the spring transition
 - The 2022-23 season activities for this project were deferred and remain in consideration for future season support.
- 4574 State Estimate of East Antarctic Ice Shelves
 - The 2022-23 season activities for this project were deferred and remain in consideration for future season support.

Environment and Communications References
Answers to questions on notice
Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Portfolio

Inquiry: Inquiry into Australian Antarctic Division funding
Question No: IQ24-000016
Hearing Date: 29 January 2024
Division/Agency: Australian Antarctic Division
Topic: Science projects 4633 and 4644
Hansard Page: 29
Question Date: 29 January 2024
Question Type: Spoken

Senator Whish-Wilson asked:

CHAIR: Ms Campbell, projects 4633 and 4644 were 'Biodiversity and East Antarctica: Underwater and Terrestrial' and Antarctic Nearshore and Terrestrial Observing System: East Antarctica'. You said they 'were to be realigned with the decadal plan for science and East Antarctic Monitoring Program once these have been finalised'. You've noted that when the decadal plan will be released they will be looked again. That's why I think it's significant and I'd like to know when that's going to happen.

Ms Campbell: We can take the next steps for those projects on notice.

Answer:

Projects 4633 "Biodiversity of East Antarctica: Underwater and Terrestrial" and 4644 "Antarctic Nearshore and Terrestrial Observing System - East Antarctica" contain numerous elements and activities that deliver to the objectives of the East Antarctic Monitoring Program.

These activities include biodiversity surveys in both terrestrial and nearshore environments and the installation of long-term monitoring stations for the collection of multidisciplinary data. In this context, both projects involve multi-year activity schedules that we anticipate will align with the Decadal Plan once it is finalised.

In the interim, activities in support of both 4633 and 4644 have continued as the East Antarctic Monitoring Program has progressed. These include the deployment of equipment to Casey station in the 2023-24 season for future season field personnel use under 4633, and the acquisition of key instrumentation in support of 4644.