



Submission No 32 - Supplementary

Inquiry into Australia's Maritime Strategy

Organisation: The Australian Centre for Maritime Studies
Incorporated

Contact Person: Harold Adams, AM
Chairman of the Board

Address: PO BOX 55
RED HILL ACT 2603



THE AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR MARITIME STUDIES Incorporated

PO Box 55, Red Hill ACT 2603

Phone: (02) 6295 0056 Fax: (02) 6295 3367 Email: acmarst@bigpond.com

The Secretary
Joint Standing Committee on
Foreign Affairs, Defence & Trade
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

18 March 2003

Dear Sir,



Submission: 32

Inquiry into Australia's Maritime Strategy

I return herewith the proof Hansard copy of the evidence I gave to the Committee. The proof has been marked up as requested and has been limited to points of grammar and possible transcription errors.

Also enclosed is a table of naval unit cost effectiveness. This is submitted in response to questioning after the hearing was completed when one of the Committee members asked how I could back up my statement as to the cost effectiveness of a carrier.

The table which I have developed shows the range of operations and warfighting capabilities that a carrier can undertake in peace and war. In situations short of war the carrier is particularly valuable in operations involving such things as evacuation of Australian nationals, intervention, peacekeeping/defence of trade. These are situations which can arise at short notice in the new security environment which we now face.

Clearly the weighting given to the values in the table are entirely judgmental and can be adjusted depending on the importance one wishes to put on a specific role. Also some platforms are role specific – submarines and replenishment ships – which tends to weight their scores.

In the case of the carrier one needs to understand that it will be an effective unit for a minimum of 30 years. Moreover, unlike the steam powered carriers of the past, which were personnel-intensive ships, modern ships, with marine gas turbines, are markedly manpower effective, which makes their through-life costs much most cost effective.

The point which the table draws out, and which is relevant to the Committee's considerations, is the number of roles which the carrier can undertake and how effective it is in those roles. Moreover I would not be alone in saying that in the emerging uncertain strategic environment a carrier-type vessel could prove a particularly valuable asset now and well into the future.

As indicated above in situations short of war the value of a carrier has no peer.

Clearly any decision to acquire a carrier would require detailed study, in which case I would, with due respect, suggest that the Committee recommend to Government that it set up an open inquiry into the benefits of acquiring a carrier in the context of underpinning our broad maritime defence strategy.

Yours faithfully,

Harold Adams AM
Chairman of the Board

OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR - NAVAL FORCE - COST EFFECTIVENESS

(Max Score = 20)

OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR									
Primary Roles	Carrier	Sea Control Destroyer	Patrol Frigate	Off-shore Patrol Craft	Submarine	Landing Platform Amphibious	Underway Replenishment	MCM Vessels	Patrol Boat
Deterrence	20	14	8	2	12	2	2	2	0
Peacekeeping	18	14	12	8	0	12	4	0	0
Embargo, Sanctions	8	12	16	10	4	8	4	0	0
Oceans Governance (sea constabulary)	10	10	10	20	2	4	6	4	18
National Interests	18	12	10	12	8	8	6	4	10
SAR	18	14	12	10	0	8	6	4	4
Peacetime National Tasking	16	12	10	6	0	14	6	2	2
Disaster Relief	16	12	10	6	0	16	6	1	1
Diplomatic	18	12	10	8	12	8	6	2	2
Afloat Support	10	4	4	2	0	6	20	0	0
TOTAL	152	118	102	72	38	86	66	19	37
Cost per unit A\$billion	1.5	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.05
Effectiveness Score – Cost / capability	101	118	170	360	63	286	330	95	740

NAVAL FORCE – COST EFFECTIVENESS

(Max Score = 20)

HOSTILITIES DECLARED									
Primary Roles	Carrier	Sea Control Destroyer	Patrol Frigate	Off-shore Patrol Craft	Submarine	Landing Platform Amphibious	Underway Replenishment	MCM Vessels	Patrol Boat
Air Warfare	20	16	6	0	0	0	2	0	0
Surface Warfare	20	14	10	0	16	0	4	0	0
Undersea Warfare	18	10	8	0	16	0	4	0	0
Land Strike	20	14	8	0	10	0	0	0	0
Amphibious Warfare	18	14	8	4	4	14	6	8	0
Power Projection	20	16	8	4	12	8	6	4	2
Protection of Sea Lines of Communication (Trade)	18	20	16	4	10	0	6	14	0
Mine Warfare	8	2	2	2	12	0	0	20	0
Sea-Lift	18	6	4	4	0	20	6	8	2
Afloat Support	10	4	4	2	0	6	20	0	0
TOTAL	170	116	74	20	78	48	54	54	4
Cost per unit A\$billion	1.5	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.05
Effectiveness Score – Cost / capability	113	116	123	100	130	160	270	270	80