

Committee Secretary
Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit
Parliament House
Canberra
ACT

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE - 23 NOVEMBER 2005

Dear Sir,

I wish to forward the following response to the questions taken on notice during my appearance before the Committee 23 November 2006.

With reference to a question from Senator Nash regarding the pros and cons of recent Security Regulation:

Airport Fencing – Airport fencing to the same standard of fencing as a CTFR airport is concentrated on preventing people in the vicinity of an apron from accessing the apron. This fencing does not provide CT perimeter security as, in many cases, the fencing will not enclose the entire airport.

Closed Circuit Cameras – The instillation of closed circuit camera systems has been and will continue to be beneficial in investigating apron incidents, after the event. These will enhance security by deterring the non-determined person from entering the apron and by allowing a better chance of apprehending persons who may damage an aircraft or equipment.

Screening of Aircrew Arriving from Unscreened Ports – This is a very good public relations exercise which provides no security enhancement, as discussed during the appearance

Aviation Security Identification Card – The introduction of ASIC to regional airports is considered by Rex to be a security requirement which has not necessarily enhanced the security of small regional airports. At these airports, the airport staff and airline staff maintain a close relationship and know each other well. Any other person who approaches an aircraft is easily identifiable and such people approaching an RPT aircraft would be approached and challenged. The introduction of the ASIC system has occurred at great expense to regional airports and regional airline agents and does not enhance this system which has worked for many years.

Flight Deck Doors – The introduction of flight deck doors is seen by Rex as a major enhancement of aviation security and the prevention of hijack. As outlined during the appearance, there has been a weight penalty. There is a safety issue with the closed and locked doors and more careful thought could have been taken in the design of the door to allow access from the cabin in the event of a safety emergency, such as incapacitated crew.

With reference to the question from Senator Hogg relating to recent costs to the airline of screening crew:

An adhoc survey conducted during December 2005 and January 2006 indicates that the majority of crew attend work early to allow for screening before signing-on for duty. Sign on cannot take place at this time as this will place some crew of being in breach of CAO 48, relating to crew duty times. No delays occur for first flight of the day due to crew screening.

With regard to delays caused by screening crew arriving from an unscreened port during a turnaround, during the period 01 July to 31 October 2005 the delays caused by screening amounted to 4 hours 21 minutes. At the quoted cost of \$45 per minute this equates to an \$11,745 cost to the Company, averaging approximately \$2,936 per month.

During the period 01 November 2005 to 30 November delays totalling 43 minutes are attributable to screening. At the quoted figure of \$45 per minute this equates to \$1,935 in costs. This reduction in the monthly figure is partially attributable to priority afforded crews during screening.

Please contact me if you require further information relating to these issues.

Yours Sincerely,

Compliance and Quality Assurance Manager

31 Jan 2006