

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ESTIMATES, 10 FEBRUARY 2016, 3 March 2016 and 17 March 2016

Department of Defence

Q No.	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Proof Hansard, page & hearing date or Written Q	Department	Date rec'd	Date tabled
1.	Gallacher	Contamination - AMINDEF Visits	<p>Senator GALLACHER: How many times have you visited RAAF Base Williamtown since news of the contamination broke?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I think the engagement and visits in regard to that have been undertaken by Assistant Minister Chester. You would be aware of that.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: As minister you do not?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Not me directly, no.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Have you ever met—obviously you have not—the concerned residents and businesses, or is that the assistant minister?</p> <p>Senator Payne: The assistant minister has as I understand it, yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Do we know when those meetings occurred?</p> <p>Senator Payne: No, but I will take that on notice and get that information for you.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The location and time of those meetings.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Certainly.</p>	Page 10	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
2.	Gallacher	Contamination – Compensation Claims	<p>Senator GALLACHER: I will just go through and try to get some facts on the record. At 22 December there was only one inquiry or claim for compensation. What is the situation now?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I am not aware of there being any more. The Defence legal team are talking to a number of people.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps you could take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I want to know if there are claims, what the level of claims for compensation are and whether they are being assessed.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I would just like to make the point that we</p>	Page 16	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			are talking to people who have indicated that they might want to make a claim against the department. We are bound by the legal services directives and we follow those. We seek to work with people to help them through that process. But, of course, there is a process that needs to be gone through.				
3.	Gallacher	Contamination – Hotline	<p>Senator GALLACHER: You said also on 22 December:</p> <p>I have heard that frustration today and I will take away a few things to follow up. It is not acceptable to me, for example, that people are ringing a telephone hotline that Defence has put in place and it is not being answered. That is unacceptable, so I will chase that down.</p> <p>So has Defence identified and resolved the problem with the phone hotline?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We have looked into that. I am not aware of how many cases there may have been when the hotline was not answered. But I think now the hotline is always monitored when it is declared to be monitored. I am hopeful that that problem has been sorted.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps on notice you could give the improvements and changes that you made and how many calls the hotline has taken since it was set up.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We can take that on notice.</p>	Page 16	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
4.	Gallacher	Contamination - Claydon	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Is it correct that the member for Newcastle has made more than 25 representations to either the Minister for Defence or the assistant minister, and has to date not received a response?</p> <p>Senator Payne: No, I do not think that is correct, Senator. In fact, I know that the member for Newcastle—if I remember correctly—was briefed by officials. I am not sure what month it was last year, but I will check that. It is Ms Claydon, isn't it? If it was not Ms Claydon it may have been one of her staff. I will get that detail for you on notice and come back to you. Mr Grzeskowiak has indicated that in fact there have been a number of responses made on representations from the member for Newcastle.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I have certainly signed many responses for the member for Newcastle and, indeed, some other members.</p>	Page 17	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>Senator GALLACHER: Was there a delay in responding while you got information together?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I think some of the responses took longer than we would have wished, but you would appreciate that we are in the process of ramping up our team to deal with this. There has been a range of issues we have had to deal with—staffing the Senate inquiry and the like. We have briefed the member for Newcastle in detail on the issue as well.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Did you go, Steve?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I was involved in a briefing, I think, in her office.</p> <p>Senator Payne: So there has been quite some contact there, Senator. But if I am wrong about that I will clarify on notice.</p>				
5.	Rhiannon	Contamination - sites	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Could you provide the committee with a map showing the area of contamination, current structures and the planned infrastructure and structures. Could you provide that please?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Just to clarify, that is on the base around the—</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Yes, just the base.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We will provide that.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: You said there are 16 sites where you have identified similar problems. Could you give the location of those on notice please?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We will take that on notice.</p>	Page 19	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
6.	Xenophon	Collins Class Project – Effective Rate of Assistance	<p>Senator XENOPHON: No, we are not talking about the future submarines. We are talking about the Collins-class submarines.</p> <p>Dr Bourke: To clarify that point: the purpose of creating a model and using Collins data in that context is to help frame the structure of the model which can then be used for C1000. That was the objective from day one of this project and it is the objective now. What I am saying here is that the Collins information was simply used to scope the structure and adjust the parameters of the model so that, when the cost data arrived for C1000, the model had been structured for a submarine environment and we could then proceed to generate results. The results of running some Collins data through the model simply</p>	Page 8, 3 March 2016 Hearing	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>served the purpose of allowing us to structure the model correctly.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am perhaps doing this at cross-purposes and I apologise if I did not ask the question with sufficient clarity. I am not asking about the Macroeconomics report or the inputs. I am asking about the Collins-class project and the inputs and outputs that you referred to generally but I am applying it quite distinctly from the Macroeconomics report about the C1000 project. I am asking if you as an economist within Defence have undertaken an analysis of issues such as, for instance, the effective rate of assistance, the national economic impact, the local economic impact, the number of jobs at the peak time of build, the indirect jobs created, the economic spillovers and the technical innovation spillovers in respect of the Collins project as quite distinct from the issue of the Macroeconomics report.</p> <p>Dr Bourke: No, certainly not.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But you would have details of the effective rate of assistance for the Collins project?</p> <p>Dr Bourke: Not unless we calculate it specifically for the project?</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: It has never been calculated?</p> <p>Dr Bourke: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you please take that on notice?</p> <p>Dr Bourke: I can certainly check that.</p>				
7.	Xenophon	Macroeconomics Framework – Other Projects	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I understand. The tender document that Macroeconomics eventually won made a sensible suggestion that the economic model could be used for other projects such as the offshore patrol vessels and future frigates. Can you indicate whether the model that has been developed can in fact be used for those other projects?</p> <p>Dr Bourke: Yes, and you are correct. The original intention of the study, which encompassed the Macroeconomics paper you referred to, was twofold. It was to develop an economic model which we thought might be applicable to Defence capital equipment projects generally—not just submarines but others</p>	Page 9 3 March 2016 Hearing	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>and perhaps the project that you have mentioned. Then, of course, it was to look at the submarine example of that. So, yes, I think the approach that has been developed since we started this project is applicable to other Defence projects and probably the one you mentioned.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: My question was whether the Macroeconomics framework developed for the tender could be used for other projects such as the OPV and future frigates. Dr Bourke helpfully answered that the economic model could be used. Is it the plan of Defence to adopt the model used for the Future Submarines Project in terms of economic modelling for the OPVs and future frigates given the considerable value of those projects?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You can understand. It is not a trick question; it was referred to in the document.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, I do. We will answer directly; I just need to check with the head of the surface project.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So it is a straightforward question.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: It is foreshadowed in the tender document. I am just trying to establish it. It seemed to be a fairly good thing to establish the economic impact—even though we have not seen it. It might be relevant in terms of the future frigates and the OPV. I do not know whether Mr Gillis is able to comment in respect of that economic modelling.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice. The general manager of surface ships is in Adelaide at the moment.</p>				
8.	Bernardi	Combat Ration Packs	<p>a) Regarding the decision to ensure the combat ration packs have halal, vegetarian and kosher meals included, what is the proportion for each of these requirements? (e.g. for a 12-pack of rations, how many have to be halal, kosher and vegetarian?)</p> <p>b) Which kosher certifying body is responsible for certifying the food in the kosher ration packs? If the ADF or Dept of Defence does not deal directly with the certifier, which supplier is used to supply the certified food and which</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>certifying body is used by that supplier to certify the food?</p> <p>c) How much does the ADF or Dept of Defence or the supplier pay to have the food certified that is used in the kosher ration packs?</p> <p>d) Which halal certifying body is responsible for certifying the food in the halal ration packs? If the ADF or Dept of Defence does not deal directly with the certifier, which supplier is used to supply the certified food and which certifying body is used by that supplier to certify the food?</p> <p>e) How much does the ADF or Dept of Defence or the supplier pay to have the food certified that is used in the halal ration packs?</p> <p>f) Had senior ADF personnel or senior management within the Department of Defence received complaints from ADF personnel that there was a lack of kosher, vegetarian and halal options in ration packs, and did this prompt the decision to include them? Or was this a decision made by senior personnel without any complaints having been received?</p>				
9.	Bilyk	Ministerial Functions – October 2015	<p>In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by the Ministers or Assistant Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries in the Defence portfolio since 20 October 2015, can the following please be provided:</p> <p>a) List of functions;</p> <p>b) List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister’s family or personal staff;</p> <p>c) Function venue;</p> <p>d) Itemised list of costs;</p> <p>e) Details of any food served;</p> <p>f) Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; and</p> <p>g) Details of any entertainment provided.</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
10	Bilyk	Secretary’s Speeches to Staff	Can a copy of any speeches delivered by the Secretary of the Department at any staff meetings since 20 October 2015 please be provided?	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
11	Conroy	Stuart Robert –	Senator CONROY: Did the letter seeking approval indicate	Page 24	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		Leave Letter	<p>that the minister proposed to travel to Singapore from Australia? Or China?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not know the answer to that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You do not have a copy? There is no copy on file in the department?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Well, I will inquire, but certainly I have not seen a copy.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: To be clear: when ministers travel, they have a section in their own department that handles their travel arrangements.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That is right.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And they would not have a copy of the letter?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I said I will inquire. I will take that on notice and I will come back to you.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: If the department does have a copy of that letter, could we have it tabled?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: A letter seeking leave? You require—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p>				
12	Xenophon	Macroeconomic Report - Studies	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I know. One of the inputs to the Macroeconomics study was as per the statement of work at 2.2C: 'copies of a range of economic impact studies for individual capital equipment projects which were commissioned by the department in recent years and cover a number of regional locations as industry areas'. Can you provide the committee with those studies given that they do not appear to be subject to any claims of cabinet in confidence?</p> <p>Dr Bourke: I believe so. I might take it on notice, but at this stage I would not see any problem with that.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: If you could. I do have some other questions, but I am not sure whether any of my colleagues have questions.</p>	Page 10 3 March 2016 Hearing	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
13	Fawcett	Liability	<p>Senator FAWCETT: I just want to continue our line of discussion around recording of absorbed measures in the defence budget. We have had a number of discussions in the past about</p>	Page 26	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		<p>how to highlight what the flow-on impacts have been, and we have had some discussions about various mechanisms to identify that to the parliament. One of the comments you have made to me in the past is that, within your formal reporting, it is difficult for you to put any measure of that.</p> <p>I notice in this year's annual report, on page 79 in table 4.3 on the net additional cost of operations over a period, that down towards the bottom of the table under 'Total net additional costs', 'Sources of funding for operations', one of the sources that has been identified is 'Department of Defence (absorbed)'. So you have clearly broken out there the fact that you have been instructed to absorb measures, and that is how much has come into your operational bucket. What would prevent you from taking that same accounting methodology in all the other areas, whether they be facilities or personnel, to identify that part of the funding you have used to run the organisation—whether it is removing asbestos or fixing fuel farms, or whatever—has come from absorbed measures? Clearly, you have identified an amount, or else you would not have that amount here in the table. What is then to stop you having a footnote somewhere to say that these are the areas that have been impacted, so that, for every decision taken to direct you to absorb, the parliament, as well as the minister and others, understand what the lingering cost to the organisation is?</p> <p>Mr Prior: If you were to look at the additional estimates document on page 19, we do identify and have, for as long as I can recall, always identified any government decisions that are absorbed, and they are articulated in the measures table. In terms of government decisions that are taken, and to the extent that they are funded by Defence, those measures are articulated in the documents that we table around the budget. So that is not something new; that has always been there. In terms of anything that is absorbed beyond that: we are now required under accounting standards to report a budget/actual variance in our annual reports, and you would see that in the annual report you are referring to. So, to the extent that there has been a change, or in how the plan has changed, that mechanism of variance</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>reporting in annual reports would be, in my view, the way that that could be identified—that is, to the extent that there is a plan and that is articulated in the budget document, if the plan were to change and there were to be reprioritisations, you would then see that come through in that variance report.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: But would the variance report give the opportunity to flag where the funding shortfall now lies? I still find it unacceptable that we were at a point a couple of years ago where we had fuel farms that were being risk-managed at a service chief level as opposed to being remedied, and that was a consequence of decisions taken by government and priorities made by Defence—all quite a valid process—but there was no visibility of the impact that was having and the extent of the measures that were having to be taken to manage the growing risk and backlog of work. We need to have a mechanism whereby those amounts can be correlated to what has not been done, whether it is training for capability or facilities maintenance, otherwise they get lost, and people do not realise the consequences of decisions they make.</p> <p>Mr Prior: As you said in your opening comment, the technical difficulty continues to be one of trying to produce financial information that is compliant with all the various accounting rules and so on, particularly in terms of measurement reliability. That is the most significant accounting concept that we have to deal with in this discussion. To that extent, as you would also see in that annual report, we have sections on contingent liabilities, remote contingent liabilities, unquantifiable contingent liabilities and so on, and those articulations are an attempt to identify those things that are difficult to measure.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: The chair is giving me the wind up, so can I ask you to take on notice and come back to the committee with a proposed solution. You talked about the difficulties, and I accept that. I am not an accountant, but I accept the fact that there are accounting standards; there are certain things you can and cannot do. But it is not beyond the wit of man, I am sure, to find a way to put into reports to the parliament the impact of decisions that have been taken around priorities and measures</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			that have been absorbed. Can you come back to the committee on notice with a proposed solution as to how you could do that. Mr Prior: I can certainly have a look at that.				
14	Xenophon	CEP Submarines – Requests for Clarification	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Maybe I will request clarification on 'request for clarification'. Can you explain the nature of that request? Is it designed to clarify responses or is it designed to elicit new information?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: No. As I stated, and I need it to be very clear, it is to clarify responses; it is not to elicit new information.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And the probity audit is presumably a sign-off to ensure that it is simply a case of clarification, not the eliciting of new information?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Indeed.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So the probity auditor—</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: There is a review process whereby any clarification question sent to a participant is reviewed independently by our probity adviser before it is sent out to any participant to ensure it conforms with the regime by which we are seeking a clarification of information already provided. It is not often an opportunity for participants to improve their offer.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But in so far as a request for clarification might give a participant—and I am not thinking of any participant in particular—an opportunity to provide new information, how do you and how does the probity auditor deal with that? So it might be that, on the face of it, you are simply requesting clarification but that clarification provides the information.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: So two steps: in the first instance, the question is considered to ensure that it does not provide any participant with the opportunity; however, if more information is provided to us, what I did not mention is that the response is vetted by the probity adviser before it is released to the evaluation working groups to ensure that it has not offered new information over and above what was originally put in the proposals.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you on notice provide us with the number of requests for clarification and the number of responses.</p>	Page 27-28	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>I am not actually asking you for the details of that but I just want to get a flavour of how many requests there have been for clarifications and what—</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We have that data; I can provide that on notice. (.....)</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I understand that but, to date, how many requests for clarifications have there been to the French, the German and the Japanese bids; and how many responses have there been from each of those bids? I am not asking you for details of the nature of the clarifications sought but details of: have you sought more clarifications from one bidder than from others?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I can take that on notice, because we have listed that. They are of the order of 20 to 30 questions at this stage.</p>				
15	Lambie	RTI Training - Observers	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Can I please have, on notice, the number of resistance to interrogation exercises or courses conducted every year for the last 16 years, the number of personnel on each exercise, a list of all the equipment used and the total cost of each exercise?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes. (.....)</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Were females present or allowed to participate on these resistance to interrogation exercises that involved the SAS?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: To date, persons serving in special forces have only been men who are barrier qualified.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: You have brought in no ADFA or military police females to be involved in those exercises?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Senator, if you are speaking to a broader group of persons who might experience some sort of resistance to interrogation training experience, there may well have been at some point women. I would have to take that on notice (.....)</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Had any of the interrogation subjects been subjected to physical assault either prior to or as part of the</p>	Page 31-34	Defence	15/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>resistance to interrogation exercises?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: There is no justification or acceptability of physical assault at any time in either the Army or the Defence Force more broadly and that includes resistance to interrogation.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I did not ask you for justification; I am asking you whether or not there have been allegations of assault as part of these RTI exercises.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I am now aware from your statement in the House of one such allegation. I will take on notice as to whether we have record of any other such allegations being made. (.....)</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: How many hours of these recordings are stored by the Australian Defence Force and are these recordings then used for further training purposes?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice, Senator. (.....)</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Were only members of the Australian Defence Force either observing or participating in this resistance to interrogation training, or are there personnel from other government agencies present as well during this resistance to interrogation training?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice. I am just not aware of the answer to that question.</p>				
16	Lambie	RTI Training – Independent Assessment	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Does the resistance to interrogation training comply with international conventions against torture, and is the Australian Defence Force in breach of the Geneva Convention Against Torture?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes, it does. No, it is not.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: How do you know that, and have you had it independently assessed?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: It has been very carefully designed in keeping with the requirements of Australia's domestic and international legal responsibilities.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Has that been independently assessed?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice. (.....)</p>	Page 33, 74	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Senator LAMBIE: That is fine. Earlier today I asked Lieutenant General Campbell a couple of questions regarding resistance to interrogation training. You may recall that I asked: does the RTI training comply with international conventions against torture and is the Australian Defence Force in breach of the Geneva Convention against torture? And how do you know and have you had it independently assessed? I believe your reply was that the Army had received legal advice which essentially gave the all-clear for this type of exercise to be carried out. I just want to clarify: did the Army receive legal advice which essentially gave the all-clear for this type of exercise to be carried out?</p> <p>Major Gen. Burr: As General Campbell said in the earlier session, we will respond to all of those points that you made earlier today.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I am asking that question because I would also like to see the legal advice that you obtained and have it tabled.</p> <p>Major Gen. Burr: We will take that on notice.</p>				
17	Conroy	Trade Missions – Robert’s Involvement	<p>Senator CONROY: I want to move onto a different trip. Does the Department of Defence organise trade missions?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I am not aware of us organising trade missions.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: They could be delegations of businessmen that we can call anything we want. Do you provide support? Do you provide—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: For instance, we certainly do get involved in air shows. Every two years, you have the big event down in Avalon, outside of Melbourne.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: This would be a delegation leaving Australia to visit other countries.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: No, I am just saying, we get involved in matters of that kind. I think, from time to time in the past, there would have been occasions when ministers have been accompanied by business leaders in their portfolio area of responsibility. And that is not unusual.</p>	Page 35-36	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

		<p>Senator CONROY: This is the Assistant Minister for Defence. Has Mr Robert led any such delegations?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could I get information on any that Mr Robert conducted that you can find in this period?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, we can provide that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could I get indication on the dates of them?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, we can provide you with those details.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: On the names of the people accompanying him?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will take advice on that, but I see no reason why that could not be provided.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I will await your response. Where they travelled too?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am particularly interested in one that possibly went last year in around April, possibly to the UAE or possibly to Washington, if that helps narrow the—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Okay.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Are you familiar with the Washington trip?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: If we are thinking about the same trip, the answer is yes, but I do not know what trip you are thinking about.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am thinking about the trip that I think a ministerial press release was put out on a few days after the minister's return. I would be surprised if you did not know, but you did indicate that you do know. Given that I have been more specific, do you have a list of the delegation that went with Mr Robert? I am not sure if it went to the UAE and Washington or just to Washington.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will take that on notice, but I think we would probably have a copy of that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: In particular, I want to know whether Mr Paul Marks was on that delegation. Does that ring a bell?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I have read the name in the newspapers over the last few days.</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>Senator CONROY: How do people qualify to go on these trips? Are they funded by the government? Do they pay for themselves? What was the process for this trip?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I cannot answer in respect of this particular trip; I need to take that on notice. In the past, it has varied, but I think, more often than not, the businesspeople pay for their own travel.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I will come back to that and, hopefully, a little later, before or after lunch, we can get a list of those. In terms of the processes of how these are put together—who puts them together? Does the department say, 'Look, we think you should lead the delegation'? Does the minister? What is the process for creating a delegation like this?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I have seen a variety of processes. I have seen officials suggest such a delegation to a minister and to a Prime Minister—that is, in the context of a prime ministerial or ministerial visit abroad. I have seen departments suggest, 'What about a trade angle to it?' I have seen ministers and Prime Ministers initiate their own suggestions. In terms of the attendees or the people accompanying a Prime Minister and a minister, I have seen departments have inputs and I have seen departments not have inputs.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Are you aware of how this trade delegation—if we could just use that phrase; it could be officially called something else—was created? Do you know whose idea it was or who put the program together? I am assuming the department put the program together. Were invitations issued by the department? Did the minister or assistant minister provide the names and say, 'These people should come on a delegation'? How did that work for this Washington delegation?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will take that on notice, Senator.</p>				
18	Conroy	OKRA – Air Operations	<p>Senator CONROY: On average, how many missions are we flying daily or weekly? I appreciate the point you just made, that we have just been through a very intense period, so it may be that the averages are a little distorted at the moment.</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will take that on notice to give you the breakdown and the rate of effort, noting that it is not</p>	Page 38	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>quite the rate of effort we worry about; it is more the effect that they have when they are on task.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Are you aware of any reports that our assets have been fired upon while undertaking operations since last estimates?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I am not aware of anyone being fired upon, but, as I explained last time, anyone can pick up a rifle and shoot. Is it possible? Yes, but I am not aware of that. I will take that on notice just to confirm that for you.</p>				
19	Reynolds	NZ residents and ADF Recruitment	<p>Senator REYNOLDS: I have a question which is possibly a little out of left field. I am very happy for you to take it on notice. It relates to an issue that has been brought to my and to some colleagues' attention. It relates to the eligibility of some categories of New Zealanders who live here permanently who are currently ineligible to enlist, either when they have gone through cadets or directly into the ADF. I understand the substantive issue is one for the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection because it relates to visa 444. The issues that have come to my attention and to some of my colleagues' attention are in relation to the aspect of Defence enlistment. What I hope you will take on notice are some of the circumstances surrounding that. As we have a look at this issue further, we can then see if we cannot find some solutions so that those New Zealanders, particularly those who may have been one year old when they came here, can have a pathway to serve in the ADF. Could you specifically take on notice issues such as whether you are aware of the issue, how recruiting deals with the process and at what point of the enlistment process what advice is given to those seeking to enlist but who are rejected. I have had varying numbers of how many people might be impacted. Do you keep records of how many people have been rejected on those grounds? Do you have any advice about what would be required, from Defence's perspective, to consider enlistment or make enlistment and service possible? That is the issue.</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: In fact, what you have just said shows the complexity of the issue that we have, especially for someone who was born—or who was one year old when they</p>	Page 41	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			came to Australia. We will take it all on notice because we can explain out the complexities and where it sits. But in simple terms, at the moment unless you are an Australian citizen or going through the process to be an Australian citizen you cannot join the Australian Defence Force. Likewise, I cannot join the New Zealand Defence Force because they have the same issue, although it is probably not as much of a problem going that way as going this way. But it is something that does affect a number of people. I know—I see the letters come through. If we take it all on notice for you then we can provide a fairly detailed answer				
20	McEwan	DECA Bargaining Sessions	<p>Senator McEWEN: There was a bargaining session in the week of 18 January and there was one more recently—is that right?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not know whether it was the 18th. Ms Skinner might have the precise answer.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I will need to confirm the exact dates of the bargaining that was held in January. We did hold our final rounds of bargaining last week, on 2 and 3 February.</p>	Page 44	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
21	Xenophon	Data Item Descriptors	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Tell me the significance of the data item description. The definition of 'data item description' I have from this thing called Wikipedia says it is 'a completed document defining the data deliverables required of a defence contractor'.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That is a fairly accurate description. It defines the information that is required to be submitted in response to a request.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So it would define the data content, the format and the intended use of the data in the context of a contract or a project?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: In order to have a proper procurement process, you need to have those defined parameters of the DIDs?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So a DID is significant?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Part of the CEP approaches that we made to the participants included data item definitions.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And data item descriptions or definitions—</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Descriptions.</p>	Page 49-50	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Senator XENOPHON: My understanding of the definition is that data item descriptions are used in government contracts because they form the basis of any contract. Correct?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You said that you sought clarification in respect of a number of things, but could you confirm the number of DIDs? How many DIDs are there? How many data item descriptions are there currently in respect of the CEP?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: There are in the order of 20 data item descriptions that define the information—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Is it 20, 21 or 19?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I believe there are 22 data item descriptions that define the information that we are seeking. I will confirm that, just to make sure that we did not define one particular deliverable from the participants as a DID. But it is of that order.</p>				
22	Conroy	OKRA – Lessons Learnt	<p>Senator CONROY: I also understand we are now on our second rotation of ADF personnel as part of the task group. What lessons have been learned from the first rotation?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: At the tactical level, I would have to take that on notice. At the operational level, we have taken lessons from the first rotation into the second rotation. What we will be learning now will be rolled into the mission readiness exercises for the next rotation as well. I do not want to go into the details. I do not have the exact details. The other issue is working with the Iraqis on the training audience that they are looking to bring in and to facilitate that. We will also get a good understanding of the next training rotations from them. The relationship on the ground has been built quite well.</p>	Page 53	Defence	22/09/16	13/10/16
23	Conroy	OKRA - Training	<p>Senator CONROY: I assume the Special Operations Task Group has completed its draw-down to about 80 personnel?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I think we discussed this last time as well. We initially had up to 200. They were doing a lot of the CTS training in Baghdad as well as mentoring and advising and assisting the operational forces. In putting the BPC mission into Taji we assessed the draw-down, remembering the initial period that the SOTG was announced to have been in there for; we</p>	Page 54-55	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>looked to draw them down but we wanted to make sure that we were continuing to stand behind the success of 1st ISOF Brigade. The difference between when we first went in and when we considered what they needed to do was that other nations had started to put special forces into Baghdad as well. NATO SOF had put in forces. There are other countries now coming in to do that basic training, and so we focused on more the up-end side and also putting more into the support of the operations so they could have the agility on the battlefield to fight and win.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So we are down to our 80?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: About 80.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: How many personnel do they train at a time? Is it one for one at this high level or is it one for 10, one for 20?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to take that on notice, and I will not have that specific stat but I will be able to give you the numbers of people that they have trained, just in raw figures. They have qualified over 836 Iraqi CTS soldiers in range and combat skills, and in my opening address I talked about a lot of the operational support that they have given them. They are also taking some of these forces as they come off the front line back in for additional training before they then go back out again.</p>				
24	Bilyk	Executive Office Upgrades	<p>Have the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or any Deputy Secretaries, been upgraded since 20 October 2015? If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
25	Bilyk	Special Purpose Aircraft – KC-30A and VIP Flights	<p>I refer to the answers to Chamber QoNs 2769 and 2770 asked by Senator Jacinta Collins, in relation to whether the Turnbull Liberal Government was considering acquiring KC30A aircraft to serve as new VIP aircraft for the Prime Minister. Senator Collins was advised:</p> <p><i>“Project Air 5402 is valued at \$1.820 billion (MYEFO 15/16) to acquire the KC-30A Multi-Role Tanker Transport Fleet of five aircraft with training devices, support systems and qualification.</i></p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			<p><i>In June 2015 an additional two aircraft were approved and a contract change implemented at a cost of approximately \$408 million”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) What role is the Defence Department playing in the acquisition of new VIP aircraft for the Prime Minister? b) Is it correct that the KC30A is a version of the Airbus A330 aircraft? c) Are you able to advise whether the two additional aircraft approved last year were specifically for service as the PM’s VIP aircraft? Does the \$408 million represent the anticipated costs of acquiring those 2 private jets for Mr Turnbull? Are you able to confirm the anticipated costs? d) Was the current or former Prime Minister or their offices consulted about the acquisition of these aircraft? e) What role is the current Prime Minister’s office playing in the project? f) What role did the former Prime Minister’s office play in the project? g) Who is responsible for deciding upon the configuration of the aircraft and the fitout of the interiors? Is it the Prime Minister, his office, the Defence Department or the Defence Minister? h) An article published in <i>Fairfax</i> newspapers on 29 November 2015 available online at http://www.smh.com.au/interactive/2015/Shirtfronted reported that the Prime Minister’s office (or former PM Abbott’s office) was responsible for the configuration of the aircraft: “<i>When Assistant Defence Minister Stuart Robert asked then Air Force Chief Air Marshal Geoff Brown for an update on the refit of a KC-30 jet so it could serve as a VIP plane for the Prime Minister, he was told it had been taken out of the hands of the Air Force. Credlin was personally designing the reconfiguration, he discovered</i>” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is that report accurate? ii. Has responsibility for the design of the Prime Minister’s new private jet returned to the Defence 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>Department or does it remain with the Prime Minister's office?</p> <p>iii. Are you able to advise when the Prime Minister's new private jets are expected to enter service?</p> <p>iv. What stage is the project at currently?</p> <p>v. Can any schematics or design specifics of the refit, and any illustrations or photographs be provided?</p>				
26	Reynolds	Shipbuilding – Supporting Infrastructure	<p>Senator REYNOLDS: On notice, can you give me a further breakdown of what work is currently underway and where that mapping is in terms of short-, medium- and long-term requirements with the shipbuilders themselves and all of the support around them—the trades required for the build. As the secretary said, you have different levels of skill required for the different ships, but, also, for sustainment and maintenance. There is some crossover, but again there are some differences in those. Could you provide more information about the process, the trades that you are identifying and also what work has been done to identify the workforce around the nation—and, perhaps, where some of the gaps are, as I am sure there will be gaps in visibility. I think it would be useful for us to start to have a look at where the gaps are and how we fill them. Also, from a Western Australian perspective, if there are going to be prospective jobs in Western Australia, what can we do, in a civilian sense, to try and encourage other industries to keep the trades there for any future sustainment and maintenance work, or make other jobs in other states more visible to them, so that, as a nation, we keep the skill sets. So, if you do not mind taking those on notice, I would be grateful.</p> <p>Mr Baxter: I am very happy to do that.</p> <p>CHAIR: Your question, Senator Reynolds?</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: Yes. If there are going to be projects, if a certain tender is successful, this is what the support and the infrastructure would need to be in location which could help inform earlier some of the infrastructure projects for roads, housing and the ports in location down there as well. Now, how we do that is another thing. But if you could take on notice if there is a way that we can—Vice Admiral Barrett, did you have a</p>	Page 62-63	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>comment on that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: I am agreeing with you, Senator, in that this is a national endeavour and it is not constrained purely to the delivery of the platform. It is really about the infrastructure that is put in place so that we can sustain that capability for its entire life whilst we also consider the build after next, because continuous build is just that—not a series of individual projects that follow each other but a capability that you have built beyond just the ships themselves that allows you to give certainty to industry but also then give certainty to the capability manager that those ships will be delivered and can be operated in the right place.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: One of the things we are already finding is that there are limitations on existing facilities on wharves and hardstandings. The air warfare destroyers are being limited—the flow-through of those vessels. If and when we do go to a continuous shipbuilding process, the facilities are going to be absolutely critical, and working with the states is also going to be critical, to ensure the facilities are up to scratch when we actually start.</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: So my question on notice, Chair, is: is there a way, looking forward, that these discussions can start to foreshadow things with state governments now so that they can influence and perhaps impact on their longer term infrastructure projects so that we do not get to the point where you want to implement some of these—</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes, of course—absolutely.</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: Thank you. That is the question.</p>				
27	McEwan	Macroeconomics Report Contract Cost	<p>Senator McEWEN: Then, in another answer to a question that I asked at the last estimates, it says that Defence commissioned Macroeconomics to prepare a model for assessing the economic impact of major Defence capital et cetera and submarines, and that contract was for \$395,000. Is it the same contract we are talking about or is this an additional contract to the original Macroeconomics report?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Could you refer me to the question on notice that we responded to?</p>	Page 66-67	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		<p>Senator McEWEN: It was in answer to Senator Conroy's question reference No. 76. And to a question on notice, after supplementary budget estimates on 21 October 2015, where the preamble to the question said that the original contract with Macroeconomics was for a report into the effect on the economy of building submarines in Australia, the cost was \$459,000 for a report to be delivered by 30 June 2014. When I asked some follow-up questions to that question on notice, also during the October estimates, the answer was, 'In mid-2013, Defence commissioned consulting company Macroeconomics', et cetera 'to help the department prepare a model'—which you have been talking about—'suitable for assessing the economic impact of major Defence capital equipment.' The consultancy contract for that was \$394,676 including GST. That was extended in 2015 by a further \$96,780. I am just curious. Are we talking about two separate contracts or—</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: No, I believe we are talking about one contract and there was an extension for the work to be done.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: But there is quite a difference between the original 2012 contract of \$459,000. Then, in answer to my question on notice in mid-2013, the department commissioned Macroeconomics to prepare the model that you have been talking about, but the cost of that contract was \$394,000 and that was extended in 2015 by a further \$96,780. I am trying to clarify whether we are talking about \$459,000, plus \$394,000, plus \$96,780 or is \$394,000 part of \$459,000?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I believe it is the latter.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Can you check that and get back to us?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes, I will check it.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Also, has there been any further extension beyond 2015 to the consultancy contract for the model? Have there been any payments subsequent to the 2015 payment of \$96,780?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: There have been some further payments to refine the model, but not through Macroeconomics, who are no longer involved. Their work has been completed in developing the model to a certain point. We have done further</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>development of the model and that has involved some supplementary funding.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: How much was that?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: And who was it paid to?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: And when was it paid?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: How long will we have to wait for the information about whether or not we are talking about three separate sums of money paid to macroeconomics?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We will take that on notice and provide our responses as soon as possible.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Thank you.</p>				
28	Fawcett	Macroeconomic Peer Review	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Coming back to the modelling, you are probably aware that there have been many discussions around economic impact of large defence projects. I understand that the perspective of the Department of Finance, and today the Defence department, is that they do not take into account second-order or spillover effects and quite often the projects that are quoted are relatively low-tech projects. But this committee and others in the parliament have received a fair bit of evidence that, for highly complex projects where there is a lot of problem-solving to be done, spillover effects can be measured and are significant. In fact, RAND confirmed that. Can you just inform us: does the modelling that you are using include any aspects of spillover or second-order effects?</p> <p>(.....)</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: But there are three broad types of models, I understand, that are used to look at economic impact: an input-output model, which I tend to understand Professor Roos has used; a macro time series model; and another model that we call a computable general equilibrium model. The work that we have done in developing the model that we would use to inform government has considered all of those approaches and what is the most balanced way of representing the economic impact by looking at spillovers and looking at a number of other things that</p>	Page 66	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>go into assessing impact at the end of the day.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Does the order of the impact under your modelling compare with what RAND has indicated they believe surface ship-building—is it of the same order of magnitude?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We have not completed the modelling yet, so I cannot answer your question directly. It will depend on what results come out based on what the inputs are into the model at the end of the day.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Have you sought to verify the model by going back and looking, for example, at the Air Warfare Destroyer project or even maybe Collins?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We used Collins to help us verify the form of the data, so there has been a validation and verification process. The model has also been peer reviewed and consulted appropriately within areas to ensure that it represents a balanced view of the economic impact and does not overemphasise unduly any one particular factor.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Are you able to let the committee know who did the peer review?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Sure.</p>				
29	Rhiannon	Animal Testing	<p>Senator RHIANNON: I understand that the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, when they run early management of severe trauma courses, use live animals to teach emergency medical procedures to ADF personnel. Is that correct?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: That is my understanding in certain very limited and specified conditions. I will get Commander Joint Health to give you the details.</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: Sorry, Senator: could you repeat the question again?</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: I understand that the Royal Australian College of Surgeons, when they run early management of severe trauma courses, use live animals to teach emergency medical procedures to ADF personnel. I was asking whether that was correct, and I was just informed that it was, so I will go on to the next question. Are you aware that the US Department of Defense issued a new policy, effective from 1 January last year, stating</p>	Page 68	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>that 'suitable simulation alternatives can replace the use of live animals' in the training, and ordered the entire US military to end animal use in favour of simulation? Are you aware that that is the situation with the US military? And has that had any impact on the situation with the ADF?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: I am afraid I will have to take that question on notice.</p>				
30	Rhiannon	Animal Testing – US DOD Policy	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Am I correct in understanding from that evidence that you are saying that as well as courses in severe trauma run by the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons courses run by other institutions, say, universities—and I would be interested in what the institutions are—also would be maybe using live animals to teach ADF personnel? So, it is not just the RACS?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: There are several courses—the emergency management of severe trauma course, the definitive surgical trauma course, and some other training as well. The College of Surgeons is one of the providers, but there is also the International Association for Trauma Surgery Intensive Care. Some of those courses are delivered through Australian universities, yes.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We can get you, on notice, the full details of that, if that would help.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Yes, and if those details could include whether live animals are used in those courses. Is the ADF—considering the US context with the US Department of Defense issuing that new policy, and also considering how you determine your own policies on these issues—taking steps to immediately require, or to require in the future, all early management of severe trauma courses that your personnel undertake to be taught with non-animal simulation models?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: If there are non-animal simulation options available to deliver the type of training that we need our people to have, then they will always be taken. The types of courses we are talking about are ones for which there is not a simulation option available at the moment.</p>	Page 68-69	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			(.....) Senator RHIANNON: Could you provide the committee with the details of what animals are used in this teaching and how many of each species? Vice Adm. Griggs: We will do that as part of that response that we undertook earlier to give you about the different courses; we will put that into the detail of that response. Senator RHIANNON: For each of the different institutions you engage with—thank you.				
31	Conroy	Operation Gateway	Senator CONROY: I would like to discuss Operation Gateway. Could you provide an overview of the history of this operation and its current purpose, mission and areas of operation? (.....) Senator CONROY: Other than what you have described, is there a succinct way to say that this is their mission or this is their role—a precis, a couple of sentences? Air Chief Marshal Binskin: There will be an exact mission statement, and I will have to get that for you.	Page 69	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
32	Conroy	Operation Gateway - Flight Challenges	Senator CONROY: Which countries are challenging our flights? Is it just China or do the Philippines and Vietnam, to pick two others, or any other countries— Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will take that one on notice. I know it is China, but let me just check because, as you know, there are five different claimants from for many of those islands, and while China is changing the status quo and building quite large features there are other features out there that actually do have people on them. If I can take that on notice I will big able to give you a more detailed answer on that. Senator CONROY: Just from your general knowledge, is it China— Air Chief Marshal Binskin: It is predominantly China. Senator CONROY: If you find it is anyone else let us know, otherwise we will work on the assumption that it is China. Air Chief Marshal Binskin: Yes. Senator CONROY: If possible, I am interested in seeing the trend data. On notice, could Defence please write a summary of	Page 71	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>how many sorties have been conducted each year for the past five years in the South China Sea under Operation Gateway, and how many of those sorties have been challenged by another country, and by which country.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am not sure that is something we are in a position to put on the public record in that way.</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to have a look at that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am happy for you to take it on notice.</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will take it on notice.</p>				
33	Gallacher	Seaward Village Security Risk Assessment	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Thank you. Now, if we go to the security assessment, at supplementary estimates on 21 October 2015 we were told by the Chief of Army:</p> <p>I am advised that the security risk assessment of Seaward Village resulted in Defence Security and Vetting Service recommending security design principles for incorporation into the redevelopment and concluding that, subject to the adoption of these principles, it had no basis on which to recommend Defence rejects the Seaward Village redevelopment.</p> <p>(.....)</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Okay. In preparing the assessment, with whom did the Defence Security and Vetting Service consult?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I do not have that information, Senator.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: You do not have it. And cannot get it?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I am sure we can take the question on notice and have a look.</p>	Page 125-126	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
34	Lambie	Saltmarsh Correspondence	<p>Major Gen. Westwood: I do not have a file on him. I have some working notes from my time as counsel assisting the board of inquiry 16 years ago. I have called up from archives the court martial proceedings against him, and I have some very isolated pieces of correspondence in connection with the request for the transcript of the court martial.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Could you please table those. And has Colonel Carlin ever been—</p> <p>CHAIR: Excuse me, Senator Lambie; we will just get a response to your question from Major General Westwood.</p> <p>Major Gen. Westwood: I would be happy to table the</p>	Page 77	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			correspondence with Mr Saltmarsh. This is in connection with his request for the documents. In connection with my working files for the board of inquiry, it would not, in my view, be appropriate to table those. The release of the board of inquiry itself is a matter for ministerial discretion. So far as my working notes and so on are concerned, there will be issues of legal professional privilege in connection with my dealings with the board, and there are probably also various privacy issues.				
35	Conroy	Stuart Robert – Official Dinners – Washington Trip	<p>Senator CONROY: I would find it unusual, if the Assistant Minister for Defence was meeting some senior figures, that the relevant Defence official was not in Washington for that. That would be unusual. What else would have been a higher priority for the official than looking after the Assistant Minister for Defence at some fairly high-level meetings?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not at this point have knowledge of the details of Minister Robert's program beyond the official calls.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Were there any official dinners there?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice; we can certainly get that for you.</p>	Page 80	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16
36	Whish-Wilson	Pacific Maritime Security Program - Aerial Surveillance	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I have a couple of questions about aerial surveillance of illegal fishing. Last year the international policy division did not renew a contract with Central Pacific Special Air Service, who were using Cessna aircraft to conduct an aerial surveillance over a 10,000 square kilometre region, from the east coast of Australia out to the seas of Kiribati. Can I ask what the reason was for not extending the contract? (.....)</p> <p>Mr Baxter: As I said, it was a trial that we conducted. We gained sufficient information in the 12 months of the trial. The proposed extension of the contract would have resulted in a significant cost increase to the government, and we decided that the information we had was sufficient for the purposes that we were going to apply it to, which was to design an aerial surveillance component to go with the rollout of the new Pacific patrol boats, which will start in around 2018.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In terms of how you funded that, can you give us an idea of the internal budget that you had set</p>	Page 81	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			aside for those aerial surveillance operations? Mr Baxter: I would have to take that on notice to give you the exact contract figure.				
37	Whish-Wilson	Pacific Maritime Security Program – Pre Palau Costs	Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you for clearing that up. Is the Pacific Maritime Security Program, which conducts maritime patrols, slated to provide Palau with an aerial surveillance package? Mr Baxter: At the moment we are still designing the package, but certainly Palau has accepted our offer of a new Pacific patrol boat. Subject to negotiations, we would expect that Palau will be a full participant in that program. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can you outline what those costs are expected to be for that program? Mr Baxter: It is still in development. We obviously have costs for the Pacific Patrol Boat element itself because it is subject to a tender process, but the other elements of it are still under development. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you say how much the program was before the aerial surveillance was proposed for Palau? Mr Baxter: I can give you that figure, but I would have to take it on notice.	Page 82	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16
38	Conroy	Afghanistan - Oruzgan Province	Senator CONROY: Can we clarify whether any of the district centres that fall under control or under influence? Could you take that on notice and come back to us? Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will take that on notice, so I am making sure I am matching up our definition with John Campbell's. I will put on record that our assessment is that the other district centres remain under government control, in that sense. Senator CONROY: Can we confirm whether any of Oruzgan's districts are among the 94 district centres that General Campbell said were assessed as at risk? There are three metrics. Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to take that one on notice. Senator CONROY: If you could break it down for me—	Page 91	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will break it down for you.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am happy to pause there.</p>				
39	Conroy	Supply Ships Tender – Evaluation Completion	<p>Senator CONROY: Thank you. Unfortunately I am probably going to go over a little bit of the same ground as Senator Xenophon did, so my apologies for that in advance. I did want to start with the tender for Navy's new supply ships. On 6 June 2014, the then defence minister, Senator Johnston, announced a limited tender for the supply ships, with construction to occur in either Spain or South Korea. On what date did the limited tender process open?</p> <p>(.....)</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And the shipyards and companies involved Navantia and Daewoo. I assume they have a proven track record in producing these ships on time and budget?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I think you indicated that final bids have been received back on 7 August?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What was the evaluation process following the receipt of the bids?</p> <p>Senator Payne: It is a normal tender process.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It just followed the normal tender process of evaluating the two tenders in technical evaluation working groups, separating the finances from the technical components before bringing them together. It was the normal process that we would undertake in any large acquisition.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Except submarines and apparently frigates. When did Defence conclude its assessment of the bids?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 102	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16
40	Conroy	Supply Ships Tender – Ministerial Advice	<p>Senator CONROY: Minister Payne, when you were asked in question time by Senator Cameron on 4 February 2016 to explain the time the Abbott-Turnbull government has taken thus far with the supply ships tender, you said:</p> <p>These are contracts of very significant complexity. They are commissions of very significant complexity. The government will take the time that is required to make the correct decision,</p>	Page 104	Defence	18/10/16	

		<p>and the decision will be made in due course.</p> <p>Could you explain what makes a contract to buy two supply ships based on an existing, proven design from a proven shipyard a contract 'of very significant complexity'?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Not unreasonably, the government takes the view that any significant acquisition process within the ADF—and this is a significant acquisition process—comes with a degree of complexity. I adverted to that in my response. That requires the appropriate considerations through, in this case, the tender process and, as I indicated, a decision will be made in due course.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: But it has been described as urgent. Due course does not sound like you are treating it very urgently.</p> <p>Senator Payne: The process is still underway. A decision has not yet been made, but it will be made.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: The process has been completed and you have a recommendation sitting on your desk.</p> <p>Senator Payne: The process within government is still underway.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You have a recommendation on your desk.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I did not notice you in my office earlier this evening. I said the—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I think the department have indicated that they passed it up to you.</p> <p>Senator Payne: The process within government is still underway and a decision will be made when that is completed.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You have had it for over two months—a minimum of two months.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am not sure that is correct, actually.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not think that would be—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Before Christmas was—</p> <p>Senator Payne: I do not think that is correct.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: No. I stand to be corrected, but I think Mr Gillis said the evaluation process was completed before Christmas. That is quite different to the formal consideration moving forward to government.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Unfortunately, I think you were engaged in</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>a side conversation.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, but I think—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What I asked was: has Defence provided advice seeking a formal decision from government on the successful tenderer, and the answer was yes.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, that is right.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And then I asked when and he said, 'Before Christmas.' That is two months that they have passed up their advice—</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am not sure that is right.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I will have to take that on notice because I do not specifically have the date. You just asked me for a general view. You said, 'Was it roughly this or that?' and I said—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: No, I said, 'Before Christmas?' and you said, 'Yes.' You cannot change your answer. I asked you twice and you agreed that it was before Christmas. So the formal process has passed through to the minister.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I will check that, but I do not think that is the precise timing.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Is there another stage that I am unaware of?</p> <p>Senator Payne: No. I do not think that is the precise timing; I will check that. But, as I said to you, the process is still underway and the government will make a decision.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Mr Gillis will check, but I am fairly certain that it did not go to government prior to Christmas. I think it was subsequent to Christmas, in 2016—</p> <p>Senator Payne: That is my recollection.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: that it went forward.</p> <p>CHAIR: You will confirm that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, we will, but I am fairly certain the minister has not had it since before Christmas.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: And, Senator, if I was incorrect, I apologise.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: No, I happily accept that you may have made a mistake.</p> <p>CHAIR: It will be resolved once you have given it to us on notice.</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

41	Conroy	FOI Disclosure Log – PM’s Catering Profile	<p>Senator CONROY: I would like to ask some questions about a document relating to the Prime Minister that was published on the FOI disclosure log of the Department of Defence. It was a copy of the Prime Minister's dining preferences when travelling on board his VIP aircraft. Curiously, the entire catering profile has been redacted. On what national security, commercial-in-confidence basis are the dining preferences of the Prime Minister—</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I assume it is a privacy issue, but we will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Is the FOI officer in the room?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: No, you did not actually tell us you were going down that path, so we will have to—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: On what legal basis were those exemptions justified?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: In fact, in an FOI response it would have actually said why, I would imagine. But I do not have it with me.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Was the Prime Minister consulted about the proposed release under the FOI Act of the details of his dining preferences?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Did Mr Turnbull object to the release of this information?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: [inaudible].</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Was Mr Turnbull consulted?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I cannot answer that. I will have to take that on notice. I cannot answer it right now.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Did Mr Turnbull object to the release of the information? What happens if people get to object—</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: If you would give us that list we will take that on notice and provide whatever response we can.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Did the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet provide the Prime Minister, his office, or Mr Turnbull with any assistance in responding to the Department of Defence</p>	Page 117 - 119	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

		<p>in relation to these consultations?</p> <p>Senator Payne: We cannot answer on behalf of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am asking whether or not they assisted in responding to the Department of Defence in relation to these consultations? If it came through—</p> <p>Senator Payne: That will be taken on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Was the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet or the Prime Minister's office represented by external lawyers in this consultation with the Department of Defence, and if so, which firm?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: External lawyers? For food?</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I cannot understand why it has been redacted, so I am with you!</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Minister, were you involved in any discussions with the department about this FOI request?</p> <p>Senator Payne: No.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Or your office?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Not that I am aware of, no.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: If you could check—</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes. I think the answer is no.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Did the Department of Defence have any communications with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet about this FOI request?</p> <p>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will answer that as part of the—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Can a copy of all correspondence in relation to this request between the Department of Defence and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and between the Department of Defence and the Prime Minister's office—which will be zero, on the basis of the evidence—please be provided to the Senate?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: As far back as I can remember it has been quite routine for the Prime Minister to release this information under FOI, so I am perplexed as to why all of a sudden it is not</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>being released.</p> <p>Senator Payne: We will follow that up.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: For example, I located copies of VIP dining preferences for former Prime Minister's Tony Abbott and Kevin Rudd. So both of their preferences were on the public record. In fact, they are on the Department of Defence FOI disclosure log. I see that Mr Abbott and Mr Rudd had no objection to the release of their dining preferences under FOI. So, Minister, again, why will the Prime Minister not release his dining preferences?</p> <p>CHAIR: I think the question has been taken on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am asking the minister.</p> <p>CHAIR: The minister has already indicated to you she will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I did take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Is he subject to the same rules everybody else?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Of course. I said I would take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Why would he think he is above the rules?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am sure he does not.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What does he think it is more private than previous prime ministers do?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am sure he does not. I said I would take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Does he have expensive tastes? Does he prefer French caviar on board? Does he prefer French champagne on board? What is he hiding?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I think you are descending to the level of ridicule, and I do not think that is necessary.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am just asking what the Prime Minister is hiding. Former Prime Minister's Abbott and Rudd both did not feel it was an invasion of privacy.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I have said we will come back to you. I am not familiar with the particular FOI and I will come back to you.</p>				
42	Reynolds	Leeuwin Barracks – Community	<p>Senator REYNOLDS: Mr Grzeskowiak, I have a question on the proposed disposal plans for Leeuwin Barracks. Could you give the committee an update on the process and where it is up</p>	131-132	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		Engagement	<p>to. I understand that there is a consideration of a master plan going forward. Given that it is such an historic and iconic feature of East Fremantle, and in fact of Perth, there is increasing community interest and increasing angst about the future of it, not only for the military heritage—some good, some not very good—but also for Indigenous history in the local area. Can you give us an update on where it is up to.</p> <p>(.....)</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: On notice, would you mind providing a bit more detail in terms of the process, the time line and the community engagement that has been done and planned, because it is not only the local community there—it is very much an icon of Perth—but also a lot of the communities that are now getting involved in this are the veterans' communities, particularly the naval veteran communities, and they are obviously interested in the site as well. The other question—a very quick one—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I might clarify that I will take it on notice, but I will not be able to be very specific on time lines. There are a whole range of players and time lines will be—</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: Maybe some more on the process. I understand that a master plan is being planned—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: That is right—</p> <p>Senator REYNOLDS: In terms of what the time frame for the master plan is, and the community engagement—how you are working with East Fremantle—any information that you can provide, with as much detail on the process as possible, would be very helpful.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I will give you some process information about the steps we have to go through.</p>				
43	Reynolds	Fremantle Artillery Barracks – Security Review and Provision of Staff	<p>Senator REYNOLDS: Thank you; that would be very helpful. The other one is in relation to artillery barracks, also in Fremantle. I had a visit there late last year with Minister Chester. Many people do not know it is still there, but there is quite a brilliant Army museum in the facilities there. They have gone through a recent refurbishment. The trouble is we have this fantastic bit of Australian, particularly Western Australian, military history there—I think the displays rival some of the</p>	132	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>content of the War Memorial here—but because it is a Defence facility it has still got a safe base, so it is locked up and there are no permanent staff there. The City of Fremantle and others would very much like to have a security review to see if we can get the safe base reduced, or gone altogether, so that we could open it up, because there are no active Defence establishments working out of there. I think it would be wonderful not only for domestic tourists but also for international tourists, who are now coming into Fremantle on cruise ships. So would you mind taking that on notice as well and giving us an update. There were some local undertakings that they would have a look at that security review to see whether that has happened and whether it is possible for people to see what we have there.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I will take that on notice, and any offers from the City of Fremantle to provide staff to act as access control people for the visitors that might come would be gratefully received by Defence.</p>				
44	Bilyk	Portfolio Vacancies	Please provide a list of all statutory, board and legislated office vacancies and other significant appointments vacancies within the portfolio, including length of time vacant and current acting arrangements.	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
45	McEwan	HIV PrEP Use in the ADF	<p>On 6 August 2015 the Australian Newspaper reported that the ADF was funding the supply of the pharmaceutical treatment Truvada to ADF personnel as an HIV prevention strategy (known as PrEP). The ADF stopped funding its supply in November 2015.</p> <p>a) Over what period was the ADF funding access to PrEP for ADF employees?</p> <p>b) How many ADF personnel were receiving support from the ADF to receive the treatment?</p> <p>c) Were personnel receiving access to the treatment personnel serving overseas, domestically deployed personnel or both?</p> <p>d) Why did the ADF decide, in the first instance, to finance access to the treatment for at risk personnel?</p> <p>e) Does the ADF believe PrEP is an effective strategy to lower</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>the transmission rate of the HIV virus amongst its personnel?</p> <p>f) Are there instances of other drugs that the ADF has financed for ADF personnel that have not been through the full Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) or Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme Advisory Committee (PBAC) process?</p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>i. Please provide a list of pharmaceuticals that the ADF has facilitated access to for ADF personnel prior to the finalisation of TGA and PBAC processes over the previous decade?</p> <p>If No:</p> <p>ii. Then why, did ADF decide to decide to facilitate access to a treatment that was subject to TGA consideration and subject to demonstration trials in the Australian community?</p> <p>g) When the ADF decides to facilitate access to a drug that the rest of the community doesn't have access to under the PBS, does it consult with the Minister for Defence, or the Minister for Health and/or the Department of Health and / or the TGA?</p> <p>h) Was the ADF's decision to stop financially supporting personnel from accessing PrEP prompted by the 6 August Australian Newspaper article?</p> <p>If no:</p> <p>i. Then what prompted the ADF's decision to stop financially supporting personnel from accessing the treatment?</p> <p>i) Did the former Minister for Defence, Hon. Mr. Kevin Andrews MP, question the Defence Department's decision to</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>facilitate access to the treatment?</p> <p>j) Was Senator Hon Marise Payne, Minister for Defence, consulted on the decision to cancel financial support for the treatment?</p> <p>k) Were there any representations from the Minister for Health or her office on this topic encouraging the ADF to rethink support for ADF personnel to access the treatment?</p>				
46.	Reynolds	BioShield Act and Project – Australian Defence Force	<p>a) Is the Department of Defence aware of the United States BioShield Act and Project to acquire and stockpile medical countermeasures to biological, chemical, radiological and nuclear agents for military and civilian use?</p> <p>b) Is the Department aware that the US Department of Defence has procured medical countermeasures against these threats, including the threat of the possible re-introduction of the smallpox virus?</p> <p>c) Has the Department had any engagement with the US Government on the threat of the possible release of the smallpox virus and other biological threats?</p> <p>d) Does Australia maintain the same smallpox threat assessment as our allies?</p> <p>e) Is the Department aware that US defence and government personnel and front line civilians have been vaccinated against the possible reintroduction of smallpox?</p> <p>f) Is the Department aware of recent discussions within the French Parliament & Senate regarding the smallpox threat and the need for 3rd generation vaccine?</p> <p>g) What is the process for assessing the vaccine requirements for Australian Defence Force personnel engaged in overseas operations, particularly those personnel in and around a war zone?</p> <p>h) What precautions has the Department of Defence taken to ensure that ADF personnel are protected against current and potential threats biological and chemical warfare?</p> <p>i) Has the Department of Defence given consideration to</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>protecting ADF personnel against new forms of biological and chemical warfare, and if so, what action has the Department taken to ensure that vaccines are available?</p> <p>j) What action has the Department taken to ensure that alternative vaccines are available for immunocompromised individuals?</p>				
47.	Lambie	RTI Training – Variations and Content	<p>a) Are there various types of Resistance to Interrogation (RTI) training sessions? For instance is there a training session for those to simulate capture under the Geneva Convention and a training session to simulate capture by a nation/group who operate without restrictions?</p> <p>b) If so, what is the training session name and how many training sessions have been conducted?</p> <p>c) What is the essential difference between such training sessions?</p> <p>d) Please supply a table of content for the various RTI training sessions.</p> <p>e) Please supply a list of Learning Outcomes of the various RTI training sessions.</p> <p>f) Who conducts RTI training and what are their qualifications?</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16
48.	Lambie	Halal Ration Packs	<p>a) Can we please be provided with the total cost to Government of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Development of the Halal ration packs ii. Quality assurance inspections of Halal ration packs iii. Codification and allocation of national stock number of halal ration packs iv. Upgrading the Military Integrated Logistics Information System (MILIS) to account for Halal ration packs v. The segregation, storage, transport of Halal ration packs during exercise and in times of war vi. Training of personnel of handling Halal ration packs vii. Potential legal costs and liabilities should Halal ration packs should be mishandled and wrongly issued viii. The upgrading of training management packages <p>b) Can the government please provide a breakdown by service,</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>combat role, deploy ability status the number of members of the Australian Defence force who officially identify with the Islamic religion eg. Navy, Army and Airforce</p> <p>c) Please describe the way the Islamic members of the military have been provisioned with Halal certified food in the past.</p>				
49.	Lambie	ADF Policy and Sharia Law	<p>a) Has the ADF have a policy of identifying members of the military who support the imposition/establishment of sharia law in Australia</p> <p>b) Please describe the official policy imposition/establishment of sharia law in Australia</p> <p>c) How many of the 100 members of the military who identify with the Islamic religion have indicated they support Sharia law</p> <p>d) Does the ADF consider that an indication for support of Sharia law in its members is a sign of Islamic radicalisation</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
50.	Lambie	ADF Uniforms	<p>In May 2015 I raised with the then Minister for Defence, Kevin Andrews, the withdrawal of Defence Material Organisation orders from the Workwear Group's factory in the Melbourne suburb of Footscray. I had met and stood with these highly skilled workers and their union the Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia when they were fighting to save their jobs.</p> <p>These mainly migrant women had worked for many years making high quality uniforms that our soldiers have been proud to wear. Despite the efforts of these workers, their union and myself, the Government turned a blind eye and let this factory close. Eighty workers left without a job. Australia left with one less quality local manufacturer.</p> <p>a) What is the current total annual amount spent on Australian Defence Force uniforms?</p> <p>b) What percentage of those uniforms are made in Australia?</p> <p>c) Let me be clear, I want to know what percentage are made by Australian companies but more importantly, what percentage of the uniforms are actually made here in Australia?</p> <p>d) I want to know about the whole kit; combat uniforms, dress</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			uniforms, day and exercise wear, shoes, boots, socks every bit of the uniforms we provide to our defence force and where it's made?				
51.	Lambie	RTI Course – Australian Military	<p>a) In the last 16 years did the Australian Military conduct an exercise (not a course) called Resistance to Interrogation or a similar name - run by defence intelligence organization - using SAS soldiers as subjects of interrogation?</p> <p>b) If these exercises occurred:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What number of Resistance to Interrogation exercises have been conducted each year for the last 16 years? ii. What are the number of personnel on each of these exercise's? iii. Please provide a list of all the equipment used and the total cost of each exercise? <p>c) Were SAS soldiers the only subjects of interrogation used by the ADF on these Resistance to Interrogation exercises?</p> <p>d) Are the interrogation subjects past and present told that their ADF career may suffer adversely if they do not complete the Resistance to Interrogation exercise?</p> <p>e) Do the interrogation subjects receive a pass or fail noted on their service records for Resistance to Interrogation exercise participation?</p> <p>f) Were females present or allowed to participate on these Resistance to Interrogation exercises?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. females were present can I have the total number of females in the last 16 years that have participated in the Resistance to Interrogation exercises? <p>g) Is the Resistance to Interrogation exercise designed by medical professionals to deliberately undermine the mental health of the interrogation subjects?</p> <p>h) Have any of the interrogation subjects past and present been subjected to physical assaults prior to and/or as part of the Resistance to Interrogation exercise?</p> <p>i) Were Resistance to Interrogation subjects blind folded and or physically deprived of their sight throughout these exercises?</p>	Written	Defence	22/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>j) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjected to sleep deprivation?</p> <p>i. If so on average how long were subjects deprived of sleep?</p> <p>ii. Without out providing personal details of each subject please provide a list showing how many hours each interrogation subject over the last 16 years were deprived of sleep?</p> <p>k) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjected to very loud noises for long periods of time throughout the exercise?</p> <p>l) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjects deprived of food and water ?</p> <p>m) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants uniform/clothing taken from them?</p> <p>i. Were they dressed in garb similar to hospital gowns?</p> <p>ii. Were the interrogation subjects in the course of the Resistance to Interrogation exercises effectively near naked by the end of the exercise - after pieces were removed from the hospital gowns ?</p> <p>n) Was the temperature of the rooms where the Resistance to Interrogation exercises conducted kept deliberately low to maximise discomfort for the interrogation subject, if so what was the temperature of these rooms?</p> <p>o) Were the Resistance to Interrogation subjects coerced to sit, stand, kneel in stress positions designed to cause pain over time?</p> <p>p) Were these Resistance to Interrogation exercises documented, filmed or electronically recorded in any way?</p> <p>i. If these activities were documented, filmed or electronically recorded, how many hours of these recordings are stored by the ADF?</p> <p>ii. Have these recordings been used for current or past training purposes?</p> <p>q) In the last 16 years how many ADF personnel have reported</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>either physical or mental injuries after participating in these Resistance to Interrogation exercises.</p> <p>r) Have any of the Resistance to Interrogation subjects past or present ever reported psychological symptoms like PTSD after completing these exercises?</p> <p>s) Given that the Resistance to Interrogation exercise is deliberately designed to adversely affect the mental health of the interrogation subjects, have the ADF make any effort to monitor the mental health of the participants of these exercises after they have been discharged from service?</p> <p>t) Have any of the Resistance to Interrogation subjects ever successfully committed suicide either while serving or post discharge?</p> <p>i. If so please provide detail?</p> <p>u) Are interrogation subjects ever exposed to sexual violence as part of the Resistance to Interrogation exercises?</p> <p>v) Are Resistance to Interrogation subjects ever subjected to verbal abuse, including sexual denigration by women?</p> <p>w) Does the Resistance to Interrogation exercise comply with international conventions against torture?</p> <p>i. Have the Resistance to Interrogation exercises ever been independently assessed to make sur they comply with the relevant guidelines?</p> <p>ii. Could the ADF be in breach of the Geneva Convention against torture?</p> <p>x) Which agencies or departments including the ADF were actively involved in organising, observing and or participating in the Resistance to Interrogation exercise's, please list all of the relevant agencies and or departments?</p> <p>y) Lieutenant General Angus Campbell have you read a copy of my recent adjournment speech where under parliamentary privilege - I named many high ranking ADF officers?</p> <p>i. Isn't it the case that you have worked with many of those people and are friends with many of these people</p> <p>ii. Would it be fair to say that you would have to</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			disqualify yourself from investigating these people – because of a clear conflict of interest?				
52.	Xenophon	Submarine Commanding Officers	<p>a) Noting the low number of successful submariners passing the Dutch Perisher course, what is the plan to increase the attendance and pass rate of Australian submariners endeavouring to become submarine commanding officers.</p> <p>b) The Chief of Navy has classified SECRET details as to the Navy’s submarine workforce. With reference to this recent Navy News article http://news.navy.gov.au/en/Jan2016/People/2656#.Vqq9EFKDtQc entitled “Silent service continues to build capability” which reveals the number of submarine warfare officers on the most recent course and the pass rate, please provide the boundaries to the Chief of Navy’s statement at Estimates (perhaps by way of a security grading list).</p> <p>c) At the Estimates hearing, the Chief of Defence Force stated that the issue of submarines became politicised and that too much information has been drawn out with respect to “primary capabilities”. Assuming this statement refers to the pass rate of Australian submarine Commanding Officers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Can the Chief of Defence Force explain why, in the absence of political pressure, this information was freely published in a place (the honour board in the foyer of the Submarine System Training Centre) where there is access by uncleared people or people with no need to know? ii. What is the current state of the honour board? iii. Can the Chief of Defence Force provide guidance as to the balance between the security concerns of the Executive and the fact, in law, that the Executive's primary responsibility in its prosecution of government is owed to Parliament 	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			(i.e. in some sense, the “primary capabilities” are the capabilities that the Parliament should direct more of its scrutiny). d) How will secrecy issues for personnel attending the Dutch perisher course be managed, noting the course is attended by foreign naval officers?				
53.	Xenophon	Submarines - CEP	With respect to the submarine Competitive Evaluation Process and a new Data Item Description released under a Contract Amendment: a) Please provide details of the sort of information that is being sought? b) Please provide the legal/probity advice relied upon to issue the contract amendment? If not, please provide a comprehensive public interest immunity claim with respect this request, including the nature of any harm that might be caused in relation to tendering the advice. c) Who was the approving authority for the Contract Amendment? d) Was anyone more senior than the approving authority for the Contract Amendment consulted prior to it being issued, and, if so, who was consulted?	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
54.	Xenophon	Submarines – Submarine Combat System	a) Noting a decision appears to have been made that the future submarine will be fitted to the future submarine what is the projected costs of AN/BYG-1 with respect to: i. Procurement in dollar value terms ii. Through like sustainment (including annual	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>payments) in dollar value terms</p> <p>b) Noting it is the intention to engage a Combat System Integrator to ingrate sensor and weapon components into the Command and Control System:</p> <p>i. Will the sensor system be chosen by way of tender? If not, how will they be selected?</p> <p>ii. Will the integrator have any role in the selection of the sensor or will the system integrators role be restricted to the provision of integration cost and risk information?</p> <p>c) The answer to QON 65(5) of October 2015 Estimates, in so far as it acknowledges that Australian Industry are restricted in their ability to fully participate in Step 3 and 4 of the Advance Processor Build (APB) program, seems inconsistent with the answer provided at QON 202 of May 2012 Estimates. With respect to Step 3 and 4 of the APB process, how does Defence intend complete for inclusion in the full development cycle on the same basis as United States Industry?</p>				
55.	Xenophon	Macroeconomics Report	<p>a) On what date was the document “A preliminary analysis of the economic impact of the future submarine based on the experience of the Collins program” delivered to Defence?</p> <p>b) Does this document reference a Cabinet Submission?</p> <p>c) Does this Document summarise a Cabinet Submission?</p> <p>d) Defence testified at Estimates that the model produced by Macroeconomics.com.au PTY LTD considers a number of</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			factors with respect to spill over/second order effects. Please provide a list of the factors that it considers.				
56.	Xenophon	Offshore Patrol Vessels	a) Why is it necessary for the Department to complete competitive evaluation process to select the build location of the Offshore Patrol Vessels, but that such a process is not necessary to select the build location for the Future Frigate?	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
57.	Xenophon	F-35 JSF – Interactions with the United States	<p>a) What positions and teams have Australian personnel occupied in the JSF Program Office (JPO)?</p> <p>b) What issues has Australia raised with the JSF Executive Steering Board (JESB)?</p> <p>c) How many issues raised by Australia in the JSF Executive Steering Board have been overruled?</p> <p>d) What contributions has Australia made to the JESB?</p> <p>e) What contributions has Australia made to the design of the F-35?</p> <p>f) With respect to the F-35, to what extent does Australia engage with areas of the US Department of Defense other than the JPO and JESB, such as the Office of Test and Evaluation or acquisition/costing organisations?</p> <p>g) To what extent did the Australian civilian and military bodies engage with the US Congressional Budget Office (CBO) or Government Accountability Office (GAO) in assessing costs for the F-35?</p> <p>h) To what extent has Australian civilian and military bodies considered the estimates of the GAO and CBO, which considered the US Department of Defense’s cost estimates to be unrealistic and optimistic, in determining the likely costs and delivery schedule for Australia’s F-35s?</p>	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16
58.	Xenophon	F-35 JSF – Industrial	a) What was the value of the industrial work share for the F-35 offered by Lockheed Martin in early 2002, and what parts or	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16

		Workforce Share	systems of the aircraft did this include? See http://www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/australia-reconsiders-jsf-146151/				
59.	Xenophon	F-35 JSF – Modifications	<p>a) With respect to the following link http://www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/raaf-mulls-surveillance-modifications-for-jsf-154865/</p> <p>i. Why did Australia explore the option of an additional removable fuel tank for the F-35 in September 2002?</p> <p>ii. Did the RAAF consider the range of the JSF with standard internal fuel tanks sufficient for Australia’s needs?</p> <p>iii. Why was Australia looking for addition Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities for the F-35 in September 2002?</p> <p>iv. Did Australia consider the standard ISR capabilities of the JSF adequate for Australia’s needs?</p> <p>b) What other additions or modifications for the F-35 did Australia explore in 2002?</p> <p>c) Why were the additions/modifications not adopted?</p> <p>d) What other additions or modifications for the F-35 did Australia explore, or request to the JSF programme office since 2002?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
60.	Xenophon	F-35 JSF – General Project Questions	<p>a) When did Australia first begin looking at the F-35 as a possible acquisition option for Australia?</p> <p>b) When did the RAAF first decide the F-35 was the right aircraft for Australia?</p> <p>c) What was discussed between Prime Minister John Howard and Lockheed Martin in Washington in 2002?</p> <p>d) Why did Australia cancel the competition for a new strike fighter in June 2002 despite advice from within the</p>	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>Department that the program was risky and there was insufficient information available to make a prudent decision – see http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/raaf-ignored-joint-strike-fighter-advice-20130312-2fyf7.html</p> <p>e) What has been Australia’s involvement in Norway’s development of the Joint Strike Missile, and why was Australia involved?</p> <p>f) How does Australia define a fifth generation aircraft, and what characteristics or capabilities does Australia consider to be fifth-generation?</p> <p>g) Does the Department or the RAAF consider the F-35 to be capable of supercruise?</p>				
61.	Conroy	Competitive Evaluation Process – Defence Workforce	<p>At Defence Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred: Senator XENOPHON: <i>The question asked: In regard to the answer given by the Minister for Defence to a question without notice on 23 November 2015, (Senate Hansard, p.45) , and noting the importance placed on competition in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules (CPRs)—see section 5 of the CPRs—what advice has been provided to the Minister that grounds the statement that down-selecting to two partners would 'add another three or four years to the delivery of the future submarine'.</i></p> <p><i>So I am just trying to understand why having a competitive process and having two contenders—being downselected to two contenders—would add three of four years to the future submarine process.</i></p> <p>Mr Richardson: <i>Sure.</i></p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: <i>We had a discussion at the last Senate estimates about the work that would be involved once we select an international partner to actually arrive at an understanding of the sort of submarine we will end up with, the time it will take to build it, the cost range that would be involved, the construction methods, the sustainment methods and, in fact, all of the factors that would lead into an understanding of the actual cost of the</i></p>	Written	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

		<p><i>future submarine. That would support a decision then to proceed with its more detailed design and construction. That is a process of concept design and preliminary design and, as I recall explaining at the last Senate estimates also, that is a very resource-intensive process. We will require to be engaged with the selected international partner to be involved in the various cost-capability trade-offs that will be necessary to help us retire risk and get to that understanding of the actual submarine that will be built, bearing in mind that the future submarine is a new design. Even though it may have its lineage in an existing design of some form, the amount of work that is going to be done will be equivalent to a new design process. That is, as I said, resource-intensive work, and we would end up being severely diluted if we had to do that with two international partners—or two participants, I should say—before the downselect was done to the international partner that would eventually design and build the future submarine for Australia.</i></p> <p><i>At the same time there would have to be a number of concurrent things happening. That includes the transfer of design knowledge into Australia that goes with the design process, and also preparation for the construction of the submarine using methods that are germane to the particular international partner. That is work that can be happening concurrently with the international partner if they are selected early enough, with enough information to make that selection. Our contention is that the CEP is providing us with a lot of information upon which we can judge the most suitable international partner, or inform government with the information that would help them decide on who the most suitable international partner would be to work with us to do that.</i></p> <p><i>So what I am saying there is that the time involved in working with the potential international partner to develop an understanding of those processes is lengthy. If we had to do it with two of them then, for the reasons I have just mentioned, we would conceivably add three to four years to the time it would</i></p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>take to get to the point where we would have all the information we need to make a decision on the submarine that we would build.</i></p> <p>a) What is the current size of the Defence workforce that is engaged with international partners as part of the Competitive Evaluation Process on the process of concept design and preliminary design to which Rear Admiral Sammut referred?</p> <p>b) When Defence calculated that a down-selection to two rather than one bidder “<i>would conceivably add three to four years</i>”, did Defence make any allowance for additional staff and resource supplementation? If so, please indicate in both percentage and real terms the size of the additional supplementation to staffing and resourcing that was assumed as part of Defence’s calculations.</p>				
62.	Conroy	Submarines – Future Submarines Project	<p>On 25 January 2016, The Australian published an article by Greg Sheridan entitled ‘Cautious US gives Japan edge in Subs’.</p> <p>a) Mr Sheridan’s article states that: <i>“Australian officials at the most senior level believe Canberra could experience significant difficulty getting the most advanced US combat systems for between eight and 12 new submarines unless Japan wins the lead role in the project”.</i></p> <p>The article also states that:</p> <p><i>“... there are likely to be differences about what technology they would finally offer to one choice as opposed to another.”</i></p> <p>Without reference to any particular bid or bidder, can Defence confirm whether the United States – or any US agency, entity, or supplier – has indicated that more or less advanced combat systems or technology would be made available depending on which of the three bids is</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>chosen?</p> <p>b) Mr Sheridan’s article said that: <i>“... the Americans harbour significant doubts about the German ability to protect critical defence technology from Chinese industrial espionage.”</i></p> <p>i) Without reference to any particular bid or bidder, has the United States raised concerns or questions with Australia about the potential for espionage with respect to any of the Future Submarine bidders?</p> <p>ii) Has any analysis been done by Australia, either unilaterally or in conjunction with the United States, about the potential exposure of the three bidders to espionage?</p> <p>c) Citing unnamed sources and insiders, Mr Sheridan’s article reports that the costs being quoted in public for the Future Submarine are <i>“meaningless at this stage”</i>.</p> <p>Mr Sheridan also reports that the costs of the project are starting to scare the public and as a result <i>“... the cost of maintaining the subs throughout their life, which is where the majority of the costs come in, are now routinely left off the public cost estimates for the project”</i>.</p> <p>i) What is Defence’s current cost estimate or envelope for the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>(1) In broad terms, how much of this is attributable to the design and build phases?</p> <p>(2) In broad terms, how much of this is attributable to operation and through life sustainment?</p>				
63.	Conroy	Submarines –	With respect to the Competitive Evaluation Process for the	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		Competitive Evaluation Process	<p>Future Submarines:</p> <p>a) When were each of the final bids received from the three bidders?</p> <p>b) How many clarifying questions have been asked of the bidders following receipt of the final bids? Please provide a breakdown of the number of questions asked per bidding consortia.</p> <p>c) When does Defence expect to conclude its analysis of the final bids?</p> <p>d) At Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, Secretary Richardson said:</p> <p><i>“... there will be a decision by government in the first half of next year.”</i></p> <p>i) Is it still the case that a decision will be made by Government during the first half of the year – i.e. on or before 30 June 2016?</p> <p>ii) Has Defence provided advice to Government recommending a preferred bidder?</p> <p>(1) If yes, on what date was that advice provided to Government?</p> <p>(2) If no, when does Defence expect it will provide advice to Government recommending a preferred bidder?</p>				
64.	Conroy	Submarines – Defence White Paper	Defence Minister Payne has said publicly that the Defence White Paper will be announced in the first quarter of 2016. With respect to the Future Submarine Project:	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>a) Will the Defence White Paper indicate the number of submarines that will be purchased?</p> <p>b) Will the Defence White Paper indicate whether an overseas, local or hybrid build will be adopted?</p> <p>c) How will the Defence White Paper account for the cost of the Future Submarines Project if a successful bid has not been selected at the time of the Defence White Paper's release</p>				
65.	Conroy	Iraq and Syria – Request for Additional Positions	<p>a) During Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:</p> <p><i>Senator CONROY: You have already mentioned this. The 10 additional positions in the coalition headquarters were not in response to the letter. Was that something that we were already doing?</i></p> <p><i>Air Chief Marshal Binskin: In the letter back the minister indicated that we would do that, but it was actually a separate request that came through a different channel. It all came together at the same time so, rather than consider two aspects, they were brought together.</i></p> <p>With respect to the 'separate request' that Australia received and resulted in the 10 additional positions:</p> <p>i. On what date was this request made and who made it?</p> <p>ii. Was anything else requested beyond 10 additional headquarters staff? If so, in broad terms if necessary, what was requested?</p> <p>b) Former Defence Minister Kevin Andrews said in an interview with ABC on 14 January 2016 that:</p> <p><i>"...we are training Iraqi forces, which is useful but the</i></p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p><i>reality is unless there are forces on the ground, then we're not going to defeat ISIL."</i></p> <p>He also said that:</p> <p><i>"... it's quite clear from the advice I received and that I was aware of, what the American military personnel and defence leaders were suggesting, and that was for months they were suggesting that we need forces on the ground in order to defeat ISIL."</i></p> <p>i. Did Defence provide any advice to Mr Andrews that US officials were suggesting international forces were needed on the ground in Iraq to defeat ISIL? If so, when was that advice provided, who provided it and in what form (written or verbal)?</p> <p>ii. Did Defence provide Mr Andrews with any advice about the potential deployment of Australian forces in a 'combat' or 'accompanying' role? If so, when was that advice provided, who provided it and in what form (written or verbal)?</p>				
66.	Conroy	Force Posture Initiatives	<p>a) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: <i>Someone mentioned during last estimates the "implementing arrangements". What are they? That is not the same as the cost-sharing agreement?</i></p> <p>Mr Baxter: <i>The implementing arrangements give effect to the treaty-level agreement, which we negotiated for the force posture initiatives, which came into force last year. So, hanging underneath that legally-binding document is a lot of the detail of how the initiative would work. Cost-sharing is one of the areas where we will have an implementing</i></p>	Written	Defence	04/10/16	13/10/16

arrangement sitting under the treaty. So the treaty provided for a formula that the secretary described, which is proportional use/proportional pay. So if it is a joint facility that both Australia and the United States use we will work out the proportions by which we use it, and that will determine the cost. If it is just for Australia we will pay for it; if it is just for the United States, the United States will pay for it.

Senator CONROY: *So, is there just one implementing arrangement or is there more than one?*

Mr Baxter: *There is more than one.*

Senator CONROY: *Have any been negotiated yet?*

Mr Baxter: *Yes, they have. We have an implementing arrangement, for instance, on consultation.*

- i. Please provide a list of how many Implementing Arrangements have been negotiated. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what subject(s)/issue(s) it concerns, when negotiations commenced and when negotiations concluded.
- ii. Please provide a list of how many Implementing Arrangements are currently under negotiation. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what subject(s)/issue(s) it concerns, and a general assessment of the status of the negotiations.
- iii. Please provide a list of all Implementing Arrangements that are planned and/or expected to be negotiated. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what subject(s)/issue(s) it will relate to and when Defence expects to commence negotiations.

			<p>b) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Secretary Richardson said:</p> <p><i>We are still negotiating the cost-sharing arrangements with the US. At the moment, most of them have been accommodated in Robertson Barracks and they have used some of our infrastructure accommodated there. Also, some of their aircraft are at RAAF Base Darwin. There will be, over time, the need for additional infrastructure, but the cost-sharing arrangements have not yet been negotiated.</i></p> <p>With respect to the cost-sharing arrangement under negotiation with the United States:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please advise when formal negotiations began. ii. Please advise how many rounds of negotiations have occurred, including on what dates and in which locations. iii. For any planned or expected negotiation rounds, please advise when and where they are expected to occur and who is expected to participate. iv. For every negotiating round, please provide a list of all Australian and US officials involved in the negotiation. Please include their position details and indicate their role in the negotiations. v. Please provide a summary of the total funds spent by Defence on the negotiating rounds, including but not limited to flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance, catering, and ground transportation. Please provide both a total figure, and a breakdown per negotiating round. <p>c) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Senator CONROY: <i>No, that is fair. But that sounds like a lot more money than for a few new barracks for the Marines, so what are the big-ticket items in the \$1 billion to \$2 billion?</i></p> <p>Mr Richardson: <i>Your big-ticket items will be in the air enhancement because you are potentially looking at airfield extensions, widening, apron work and the like. Again this is an area well beyond my competence. I always thought that when you extended a runway all you did was dig up a bit of dirt, pour in cement and away you go, but I am told that it is a little bit more complicated than that.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What if any planning has been done on the infrastructure requirements to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives? ii. Which area(s) of Defence are responsible for infrastructure to support the US Force Posture Initiatives? Please identify which area has lead responsibility. iii. How advanced are discussions with the United States on plans for infrastructure to support the full implementation of the Force Posture Initiatives? iv. What meetings, working groups and/or negotiations have occurred between Australian and US officials with respect to infrastructure to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide a list of all such meetings, working groups and/or negotiations, including the dates, locations and attendees. Please also include position details and roles of attendees. 2. Please provide a summary of the total funds spent by Defence on meetings, working groups and/or negotiations between Australian and US officials 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>with respect to infrastructure to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives, including but not limited to flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance, catering, and ground transportation.</p> <p>v. Based on planning to date, please provide a summary of what infrastructure works Defence expects will be required to support implementation, including at which Defence facilities the works will need to occur.</p> <p>d) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:</p> <p><i>Senator CONROY: What time are we talking about for those big-ticket pieces of infrastructure—a month, six months or a year? You probably know better than anyone.</i></p> <p><i>Mr Richardson: In terms of construction time, you would not do it altogether; you would do it on a schedule. I believe you would measure it over a period of years rather than months.</i></p> <p>i. Based on current planning assumptions, what period of time does Defence expect will be required to complete requisite infrastructure to support full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?</p> <p>ii. Based on current planning assumptions, when does Defence expect to be in a position to commence construction of this infrastructure?</p> <p>iii. Based on current planning assumptions, when does Defence estimate that key pieces of infrastructure will be completed to support implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?</p>				
67.	Conroy	China Defence Relationship	a) Could Defence please provide an overview of the current state of the bilateral defence relationship with China, including a	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>summary of any key milestones in the relationship in the past decade?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How would Defence characterise the current level of strategic and senior-level cooperation? ii. How would Defence characterise the current level of practical military to military cooperation? iii. What are the potential growth areas for the bilateral defence relationship? <p>b) Could Defence please provide a list of regular bilateral meetings, activities and exercises with China?</p> <p>c) With respect to the annual Australia-China Strategic Dialogue, could Defence please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Outline the role of the Strategic Dialogue. ii. Confirm the date and location of the most recent iteration of the Strategic Dialogue. iii. Confirm the participants in the most recent iteration of the Strategic Dialogue. <p>d) With respect to the most recent iteration of the Australia-China Strategic Dialogue, including the visit to Australia by the Chief of the General Staff Department of China's People's Liberation, Army General Fang Fenghui, to attend the Strategic Dialogue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that a Chinese communique issued after the meeting said that: "The visit has produced major outcomes". What were the agreed outcomes of the Strategic Dialogue as well as General 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>Fang Fenghui's visit more broadly?</p> <p>ii. The Xinhua News Agency reported on 2 December 2015 that:</p> <p><i>“Touting the agreement on joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel as a massive win for peace in the region, Binskin said a prosperous Asia-Pacific was in the interests of both Australia and China.”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What agreements were reached with respect to joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel? 2. Were any other agreements reached beyond joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel? If so, what? 3. Was Xinhua's report an accurate description of Air Chief Marshal Binskin's comments? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Did Air Chief Marshal Binskin provide those or similar comments to the media? If so, were the comments provided in written or verbal form? ii. Please provide a copy of any written remarks or comments that Air Chief Marshal Binskin provided to the media and a list of which individuals and/or organisations were provided with those remarks or comments. <p>e) The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that: <i>“The Chinese media received a joint communique in which Senator Payne said Australia China relations were at a historical high and the talks were very fruitful. Australia placed high importance</i></p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>on friendly ties with China's armed forces."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is Defence's assessment of Australia-China relations? Are they a 'historical high'? ii. Is it the case that Minister Payne provided comments to the Chinese media that indicated that Australia-China relations were at a historical high and the talks were very fruitful? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide a copy of any comments provided to the Chinese or Australian media that are attributed to Minister Payne with respect to the General Fang Fenghui's visit and the recent Australia-China Strategic Dialogue. iii. Was Defence involved in drafting the 'joint communique' referred to by The Australian – or a similar document (regardless of its formal name)? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, please advise when was it drafted, who drafted it, who approved it, when was it sent to the Minister's office, when it was approved by the Minister's office, and who it was distributed to. 2. Please provide a copy of the document. iv. The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that: <p><i>In the advisory notes sent to the Chinese embassy, Defence said General Fang was in Canberra for the 18th annual China-Australia Defence Strategic Dialogue. "The dialogue is the cornerstone of the</i></p> 				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>Australia-China defence engagement program and provides a valuable opportunity for senior leaders to engage on a range of strategic issues and reflect on the progress of our bilateral defence engagement,” Defence said. “The dialogue is, other than ministerial counterpart meetings, the most senior Defence dialogue we hold with China.”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was contained in these notes, who drafted them, who approved them and when were they provided to the Chinese Embassy? 2. Were these notes provided to any other individual or entity? If so, please provide a list of who received the advisory notes and when. 3. Please provide a copy of the advisory notes. 				
68.	Conroy	Gulfstream G550 Acquisition	<p>According to media report, the purchase of two Gulfstream G550 aircraft was recently confirmed by Defence in a statement to the media.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) For the record – has the Australian Government agreed to purchase two Gulfstream G550 aircraft through the US Air Force? b) When did the Australian Government enter into this arrangement? c) What is the cost of two aircraft? Please provide costs for procurement and for through life support. d) According to media reports, Defence confirmed that: “The aircraft will be modified to provide an airborne intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and electronic warfare (ISREW) capability to support ADF operations for Australia.” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Does the ADF currently have any other ISREW capabilities and/or platforms? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Will the G550s replace an existing capability or platform, or will they augment current capabilities and platforms? iii) What other platforms were considered for acquisition as part of the process leading to the decision to procure the Gulfstreams? iv) What additional or unique capabilities do the Gulfstreams offer over existing capabilities? In layman's terms – why did Defence and the Government reach the view that they were required and what will they be used for? e) How long did the acquisition process take? When did it begin, when did it conclude and on what date did Government make a decision to proceed to purchase the aircraft? f) What process was used to select the Gulfstreams? Was it a two-pass process, a Competitive Evaluation Process, or some other process? g) When are the Gulfstreams due to be delivered to the ADF – and when are they expected to become operational? h) Where are the two G550s expected to be based? 				
69.	Conroy	Western Australian Bushfires – Defence Involvement	<p>With respect to the bushfires in Western Australia's south west in the first week of January 2016, was Defence asked to assist with the bushfires in any capacity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>If YES:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) What was the nature of that request, and what was the ADF's response? ii) When was Defence asked to assist? iii) Who was involved in those discussions? iv) What decision was made? v) Who made that decision? vi) Why was that decision taken? b) <u>If NO:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can Defence please confirm that no contact was made with anyone in Defence about possible ADF 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>assistance?</p> <p>ii) What assets and personnel does the ADF have available in Western Australia that could be used for bushfire assistance?</p> <p>iii) Does Defence have personnel and assets in other states that could be mobilised quickly?</p> <p>iv) Have Western Australian personnel and equipment been deployed on Defence Aid to the Civil Community (DACC) tasks related to bushfire assistance in the past three years? If so, please provide an overview of the nature of that assistance?</p> <p>v) Would the ADF have been able to provide assistance during the bushfires, if asked?</p> <p>vi) Could Defence please describe the process for responding to requests for assistance during domestic emergencies?</p> <p>vii) DACC has been utilised in a number of recent major bushfire events in Australia, including the Black Saturday bushfires in Victoria in 2009, in NSW and Tasmania in January 2013 and in South Australian in January 2015. Can Defence please provide an overview of the types of assistance provided during these bushfires?</p>				
70	Conroy	Armidale Maintenance Contract	<p>a) It was reported in the Cairns Post on 12 January 2016 that the Cairns Marine Industry had lost a major maintenance contract to Singapore. It was further reported that the sustainment of the Navy's four Armidale Class Patrol Boats based in Cairns would now be undertaken in Singapore by a Singaporean company. Is this correct?</p> <p>b) It has been reported that Navy's principal contractor, Serco, had renegotiated its sustainment contract with Defence and would end its Cairns maintenance program in 2017 – five years early. Is this correct?</p> <p>c) What was the process for tender for the sustainment contract of the Armidale Class Patrol Boats in Cairns?</p> <p>i. Did the Cairns Marine Industry have the opportunity</p>	Written	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>to tender for the contract?</p> <p>ii. What other Australian companies were afforded an opportunity to tender?</p> <p>d) In Defence's estimation, will the loss of this contract from Cairns have a negative impact on Cairns, and Australian industry?</p> <p>e) Which company/or companies in Cairns will be undertaking routine maintenance on the Armidale Class Patrol Boats?</p> <p>i. How was this work awarded?</p> <p>ii. Was there an open tender process?</p> <p>iii. Does the successful company have the capability to undertake the sustainment work?</p> <p>f) Does the loss of this work from Cairns prejudice or undermine Cairns bid for the Pacific Patrol Boat tender, which Government has said will be announced 'very early this year'?</p> <p>g) It is understood that there is a project office located in Cairns; how has this loss affected this office and what is the future of this office?</p>				
71.	Conroy	3RAR Parachute Capability	<p>a) Can Army please advise what savings were realised by the transfer of the conventional parachute capability from 3RAR to 2 Commando?</p> <p>b) What were the costs incurred through transferring the Army's parachute training school to Special Operations Command? Can Defence please advise the current status of that school?</p> <p>c) How are the former parachute ground training facilities of 3RAR being utilised?</p> <p>d) Has the upgrade of those facilities (valued at \$3 million in 2006) been undertaken?</p> <p>e) The expansion of the RAAF Air Mobility Capability through the acquisition of C-17's, C-130's and C-27J's has transformed the ADF's air-lift capability. Does this not significantly change the assumptions made regarding the viability of a conventional parachute capability in 2010?</p> <p>f) How has the cost of airborne training requirements overall for Army changed since the transfer of the parachute</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			capability to 2 Commando?				
72.	Conroy	Climate Change	<p>a) Is the Department preparing a climate change adaption strategy?</p> <p>b) Is the Department participating in any inter-departmental or inter-agency climate change working groups? If so please provide details.</p> <p>c) Has the Department undertaken any analysis of climate change impacts on military base locations, and base capacity (force posture)?</p> <p>d) With respect to the White Paper process, can Defence please advise:</p> <p>e) How has climate change been incorporated and mainstreamed into national strategic and military planning?</p> <p>f) Has there been any analysis of climate change impacts in our primary operational environment (POE) such as key neighbours like Indonesia, PNG, Philippines, and Pacific Island Countries?</p> <p>g) Has there been any analysis on how climate change impacts will impact on force structure because of increasing requirements for stabilisation operations and disaster relief?</p> <p>h) Has there been any analysis or inclusion of climate change in military doctrine (e.g. Disaster relief doctrine or aid to the civil community)?</p> <p>i) Are there any mandated renewable energy targets for military bases?</p> <p>j) Has the Department conducted any risk assessment of sea-level rises on military bases? If so, what were the findings and which bases are most at risk?</p> <p>k) Has the Department conducted any risk assessment of extreme weather on military bases? If so, what were the findings and which bases are most at risk?</p> <p>l) Are there any mandated fuel and energy efficiency goals in the purchase of major military hardware and platforms – e.g. the use of bio-fuels?</p> <p>m) Has the Department undertaken any analysis of climate change risks to critical civilian infrastructure and civilian workforce and the resultant impacts on military operations</p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			and training? If so, what were the findings? n) What sustainable procurement practices has the Department implemented – e.g. energy efficient civilian vehicle fleets, energy efficient lighting, heating, waste reduction strategies, etc.?				
73	Conroy	Fleet Maritime Services Contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the Fleet Maritime Services Contract (FMSC) currently funded from within the budget of the Royal Australian Navy? b) Is it the case that the FMSC is supported by the Contractor Asset Acquisition Program (CAAP), which represents the lease costs for vessels? c) Can Defence please advise what the cost of the FMSC and CAAP is to Navy? d) Can Defence please advise how many vessels will be built under these programs to 2020-21? e) Can Defence please advise how many vessels will be leased under these programs to 2020-21? f) Can Defence advise what opportunities exist for the Australian shipbuilding industry in the FMSC and CAAP? g) Have any of the recent inquiries into the Australian Shipbuilding Industry (i.e. Winter Review, RAND Report) contemplated the actual and potential impacts of the FMSC and CAAP on Australian shipyards? h) Is Australian industry capable of building the vessels planned under the FMSC and CAAP? i) Has the FMSC and CAAP been considered by the current Defence White Paper planning team or in the development of the forthcoming Naval Shipbuilding Plan? 	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
74.	Conroy	Priority Industry Funds and Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) With reference to Defence’s answer to Question on Notice 90 at Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, have any grants or projects requiring priority industry capability development fund (PICDF) funding been approved to date? b) How much will the current round of Defence Innovation Realisation Fund (DIRF) grants cost the Department? c) The recent report by the Defence Sub Committee of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, 	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>entitled ‘Principles and Practice-Australian Defence Industry Exports’, urged that Defence Attachés based in foreign missions should play a much stronger role in the work of the Australian Military Sales Office (AMSO). What is Defence’s response to this recommendation?</p> <p>d) Since AMSO became a function within CASG, has there been any change in its work, structure or funding? If so, what changes have been made?</p>				
75.	Conroy	Tactical Communications Network – JP 2072 Phase 3	<p>Regarding JP2072, Tactical Communications Network (TCN), and its procurement process:</p> <p>a) Can Defence confirm how many bids it received to do this work?</p> <p>b) Which companies bid for this work?</p> <p>c) What process did the procurement take – was it an open tender, limited tender, or some other procurement process?</p> <p>d) How much money did Defence spend on the tender process?</p> <p>e) Can the Department name the successful companies in JP 2072 Phase 2?</p> <p>f) Can the Department confirm that the incumbents of 2072 Phase 2 were aware that they were the sole bidder for this Phase of the programme, prior to their tender submission?</p> <p>g) The global TCN market is highly competitive, with a range of suppliers from the United States and Europe (including BAE Systems, General Dynamics, Northrup Grumman, Rockwell Collins, Selex & Thales) all of whom offer mature, battle-proven products and systems. Why did none of these global companies respond to the JP 2072- Phase 3 tender?</p> <p>h) Were there any changes to the original tender request?</p> <p>i) Was the tender designed to maximise competition by encouraging off-the-shelf existing solutions and products to be offered?</p> <p>j) Does the Department believe that the solution offered by</p>	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>the single bid is a value-for-money proposal?</p> <p>i) What is Defence’s response to suggestions that the solution offered is twice the available budget and due to the single-source position enjoyed by the bidder will involve a transfer of delivery risk back onto the Department?</p> <p>k) Can the Department confirm that in September 2014 the acquisition strategy was changed to request a complex, bespoke, top-down solution?</p> <p>l) Does Defence agree with the suggestion that this changed acquisition strategy may have had the following effects:</p> <p>i) favouring the incumbent by requiring legacy system integration;</p> <p>ii) increasing the bidding and development costs for industry;</p> <p>iii) specifying requirements that favoured incumbent products;</p> <p>iv) allowing Army’s mandated provider of data services to join a single team, which created an un-level playing field (due to higher integration risk) for potential competitors; and/or</p> <p>v) increasing programme failure risk, by failing to learn delivery lessons from UK/Europe?</p> <p>m) Does this changed acquisition strategy explain why a range of industry competitors withdrew from the competition? If not, what accounts for their withdrawal?</p> <p>n) Is it reasonable to conclude that by failing to achieve any competition in the tender for JP 2072 Phase 3, Army will:</p> <p>i) be forced to take a proprietary solution that will lock Army into a single supplier for 10+ years;</p> <p>ii) be unable to maintain competitive tension and value-for-money; and</p> <p>iii) be unable to take advantage of developments in this area in other countries?</p> <p>o) A number of expert studies, such as those undertaken by</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>RAND, assert that the key lesson learnt from the US experience of introducing ‘Battlefield Digitisation’ is to use a ‘Spiral Development’ approach to de-risk the program and to encourage sustained competition. Is it not now the case that Army – by using incremental technology insertion and a published, open architecture – could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) significantly lower acquisition and support costs; ii) rapidly insert key technology that make a difference; iii) significantly reduce operational disruption in the introduction of new systems/training; and iv) retain competitive pressure on product/technology suppliers over time? 				
76.	Conroy	Workforce – Engineering, Science and Technical Skills	<p>a) Is the Department aware of the campaign being pursued by Professionals Australia entitled: ‘Securing Defence Capability, fixing the engineering, science and technical skills crisis in Defence’?</p> <p>b) In the Department’s submission of 26 October 2015 to the Senate inquiry into the Defence Physical, Science and Engineering workforce, it was asserted that ‘Defence’s physical science and engineering (PSE) workforce is capable, meets the Government’s requirements and is well placed to meet future challenges.’</p> <p>However, the ASPI report undertaken by Dr Martin Callinan and Mr Alan Gray asserted that there were significant emerging science and technology fields that Defence had skill shortages, in terms of current and future workforce – including Information Technology, technical disciplines to support autonomous systems, modelling and simulation, and material science and engineering. Further, Dr Callinan and Mr Gray contended that Defence’s current labour force arrangements were too ad hoc, focussed on short-term service delivery and were not set against long term strategic objectives.</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>How does Defence reconcile these competing perspectives?</p> <p>c) Has the Department undertaken any work to support a human resource model that encourages mobility among the defence research and broader Australian PSE community?</p> <p>d) How does the Department intend to meet the challenges associated with anticipated retirements of a key cohort of PSE workforce over the next 5-10 years?</p> <p>e) Has there been any effort regarding better managing transfer arrangements and security clearances for those working on Defence projects? If so, please detail what has been done to date.</p> <p>f) The First Principles Review recommended stronger workforce planning. What has the Department done to implement this recommendation?</p> <p>g) Professionals Australia has called on the Government to take six actions to deal with what it describes as a ‘technical skills crisis in Defence’, in six-point-plan which can be found at: http://www.professionalsaustralia.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/PA_Securing_Defence.pdf</p> <p>What is the Defence’s response to Professional Australia’s six-point-plan?</p>				
77.	Conroy	Defence Science and Technology Group – Staffing and Capabilities	<p>a) Can Defence provide a summary of recent cuts to the civilian defence technical workforce? Please include details related to APS levels, years of experience and qualifications (particularly PhD’s).</p> <p>b) Can Defence please provide detail on what further cuts are planned? Some media reports suggest it could be thousands. Are these cuts primarily as a result of the abolition of DMO or the redesignation of DSTO to DSTG?</p> <p>c) The First Principles Review found that it could not discern a clear articulation of the value of DSTO’s contribution to defence outcomes: <i>Whilst we acknowledge that good work is being undertaken by the Defence Science and Technology Organisation, it</i></p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p><i>struggled to articulate clearly to the review team the value that it contributes to Defence outcomes. We recommend (2.16) that the Defence Science and Technology Organisation be required to clearly articulate its value proposition. This would include examples and actual amounts of value created. (– page 41.)</i></p> <p>It was understood that DSTO was required to undertake supplementary work to elucidate this aspect. Was this work completed and what were the outcomes?</p> <p>d) The First Principles Review also recommended that DSTO be moved into Defence: <i>Recommendation 2.17: The Defence Science and Technology Organisation become part of the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group.</i></p> <p>Has this recommendation now been given effect, as could be indicated by the name change to DSTG?</p> <p>(i) If so, what has changed given the Government initially elected not to adopt this recommend and why was there no announcement?</p> <p>e) Given DSTO/DSTG had major staffing cuts, budgets cuts and has been downgraded from an organisation to a group, how has its mission changed?</p> <p>f) What services and functions is DSTO/DSTG no longer performing?</p> <p>g) With the Future Submarine decision imminent, what role has DSTG played and what role is envisaged, if any, for DSTG to perform?</p> <p>h) What submarine technology expertise does DSTG still retain and how will it be deployed?</p> <p>i) At Senate Estimates in October 2015, DSTG noted that in response to the First Principles Review it had engaged a consultant to review the value of DSTO.</p> <p>(i) What is the name of this report, who was the author, and how much did the report cost?</p> <p>j) At Senate Estimates in October 2015, DSTG asserted that the report found that ‘their effort was worth billions’. Can Defence please provide further detail as to what was assessed</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			to be the value of DSTG and how this was calculated? k) Can Defence please provide a copy of the report?				
78.	Conroy	Contamination – Defence Report	With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016: <i>Senator PAYNE: I said I would come back as soon as I possibly could, Senator. As I said to you, the report was tabled on Thursday. Today is Wednesday, and I will respond to the Senate committee with advice from Defence as soon as possible.</i> a) Has Defence provided advice to the Minister regarding the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee report into the contamination at Williamstown? b) When was this advice provided? c) Has this advice been provided to new Assistant Defence Minister, Michael McCormack?	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
79.	Conroy	Contamination – Bores and Swimming Pools	With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016: <i>Mr Grzeskowiak: That has been our first priority, and so we have sampled a lot of people's bores, a lot of swimming pools and a lot of rainwater tanks—204 bores, 150 rainwater tanks and 20 swimming pools. We do not have all of the results back yet, but here are the results so far: 139 nil detects—that means no PFOS or PFOA detected—and 27 detects.</i> a) Can Defence provide an update on how many bores, swimming pools and rainwater tanks it plans to assess in total? b) How many have been assessed to date? c) What are the results of those that have been assessed?	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
80.	Conroy	Contamination – Compensation and Blood Testing	During the 22 December 2015 Senate Committee inquiry hearing in Newcastle, Deputy Secretary Estate and Infrastructure, Mr Steve Grzeskowiak said: “ <i>Certainly if there was to be something like a compensation scheme established that would be a decision for government.</i> ” a) Has Defence provided advice to Government about compensation for residents?	Written	Defence	17/10/16	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What format was this advice provided? ii. Who provided this advice? iii. When was this advice provided? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Has Defence provided advice to Government about voluntary acquisition of homes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If so, who provided this advice? ii. When was this advice provided? c) Has Defence provided advice to Government about voluntary blood testing for residents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If so, who provided this advice? ii. When was this advice provided? 				
81.	Conroy	Contamination – Community Meetings	<p>With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016: Mr Grzeskowiak: We are as engaged as we can be with the local community and we are always trying to be more engaged. We have attended every meeting of the community reference group, which is a roughly weekly meeting, since back in September last year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many community reference group meetings has Defence attended since September 2015? b) Who has been involved in these community consultations? c) How many community members attended these meetings? d) Has Defence received feedback about these meetings? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What format has this feedback been submitted? ii. Has this feedback been passed onto the Minister 	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			or Assistant Minister? e) How long does Defence plan to continue to attend these community meetings?				
82.	Conroy	Contamination – Exposure Evaluation Scheme	<p>In answer to Question on Notice 96 (3) (e) at Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, Defence said that: <i>“As a result of the above, Defence is not planning to contact members who have now left the ADF who may have been exposed to the contaminants – including families of children who previously attended the on-base child care centre at RAAF Base Williamtown”</i>,</p> <p>At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Mr Grzeskowiak said:</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We are briefing staff through our base management teams to try and explain to them this issue. We are explaining to them that there is an incredibly low risk of any exposure to people, particularly on the base. The base runs off town water, which we know is not contaminated. <u>There is a scheme in Defence, an exposure evaluation scheme.</u> People can register with that scheme if they have a concern and then they can have a chat with the doctor. So all those mechanisms are in place and in play at the moment.</p> <p>a) How many people have registered with the exposure evaluation scheme as a result of the PFOA and PFOS exposure?</p> <p>b) What means does Defence use to ensure current serving ADF members and veterans are aware of the existence of the exposure evaluation scheme?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
83.	Conroy	Defence Abuse Response Taskforce	<p>a) It has been reported that the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce (DART) will cease operations on 31 March 2016, and that taskforce funded counselling will no longer be available after 30 June 2016 (and that all approved sessions must be held by that date).</p> <p>i. What are the specific options for counselling, and its funding, that will be available to victims of sexual abuse in the ADF after this date?</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>ii. What options are available after 31 March 2016 for those who have been victims of sexual abuse in the ADF, who had not yet contacted DART, to obtain counselling and funding support?</p> <p>b) With regard to the Restorative Engagement Program, the current terms of reference for the taskforce require it to “conclude as far as possible outstanding restorative engagement conferences by 31 March 2016”.</p> <p>i. At this stage does DART expect to have concluded all outstanding restorative engagement conferences by that date?</p> <p>ii. What options exist for any conferences that have not been concluded by 31 March?</p>				
84.	Conroy	Workforce – Civilian Redundancies	<p>At Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, Secretary Richardson outlined how he saw the staffing trajectory “<i>We will have quite a number of voluntary redundancies that will kick in between now and say February or so of next year. At the same, in January and February of next year, we will have the graduate cadet and trainee intake and that will probably lead to around 250 to 270 people coming into the organisation. You put all of that together, and with our natural attrition rate, we will probably go below 17,900. When and how far, it is a bit early to tell.</i>”</p> <p>a) What are the current expectations?</p> <p>With regard to the voluntary redundancies, a report in the Canberra Times on 2 February 2016 suggested the process was now complete, with 575 redundancies, and gave some numbers in different categories.</p> <p>b) Are there plans to establish a further redundancy program?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>c) Can Defence provide the numbers of voluntary redundancies accepted?</p> <p>d) Can Defence categorise these voluntary redundancies by departmental group and by work category?</p>				
85.	Conroy	Workforce – Graduate Recruitment and Retention	<p>The same media report [Canberra Times on 2 February 2016] says there have been 250 acceptances of offers of graduate recruitment.</p> <p>a) Please provide a breakdown of work categories of the graduate recruits?</p> <p>The Department has a complex set of demands for skilled employees in a wide range of categories.</p> <p>b) Does Defence have a Workforce Strategy or strategic plan of some kind which can give senior decision makers a sense of how the workforce is tracking over the longer-term?</p> <p>c) How far ahead does the Department plan?</p> <p>d) How does the Department put such a plan together?</p> <p>The ability to retain staff is clearly crucial, and retaining new recruits is an important part of this.</p> <p>e) As new recruits go, what were the drop-out rates amongst the graduate intake for 2013, 2014 and 2015</p> <p>f) What percentage of graduates separated from the Department at or before the end of their first year, and what percentage after one year and at or before the end of their second year?</p> <p>g) Please provide a breakdown by category of graduate?</p> <p>h) What are the reasons for early separation of graduates?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
86.	Conroy	First Principles	a) With regard to the statement made at Supplementary	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		Review – Contestability	<p>Estimates on 21 October 2015 by the Secretary, “<i>Our biggest single challenge, in my view—we have several challenges—is the development of an effective capability development process which encompasses contestability. That is progressing. We are meant to have that in place by 1 February.</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is the process now in place? ii. What is the nature of the program that has been developed? iii. Has it been used or trialled on any particular projects or proposals? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, which ones? <p>b) Is RAND still working with the Department on contestability models [<i>as mentioned at Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015 by Deputy Secretary Strategy Mr Baxter</i>] or has it completed its work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If the work is completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What approach has Defence settled on? 2. What were RAND’s conclusions as to what constituted international best practice? 				
87.	Conroy	First Principles Review – CASG – Smart Buyer Model	<p>At Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, the Secretary stated with regard to a voluntary redundancy process in CASG that CASG would be “<i>going through a process of some recruitment and refreshing over the next six months</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many voluntary redundancies have been accepted by former DMO officers and how many have separated 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>so far as a result?</p> <p>b) With regard to “recruitment and refreshing” - how many new staff have been recruited so far into CASG?</p> <p>c) Has Defence completed the transfer of CASG finance functions to the Chief Finance Officer, and that of personnel and administrative functions to the Defence People Group?</p> <p>(i) Exactly which functions are involved; for example, is it limited to personnel and administrative budgets?</p> <p>d) How far has work progressed on the establishment of the “smart buyer model”?</p> <p>e) When does the Department expect CASG to be fully effective, that is, when would the transitional phase be completed?</p>				
88.	Conroy	First Principles Review – DSTG Business Model	<p>In answer to Question on Notice 15 from Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, Defence advised that “<i>Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu are assisting in the development of a <u>new investment business model</u> for DSTG, which will influence research prioritisation and that ACIL Allen Consulting undertaking an analysis of the <u>economic benefit</u> of the Defence Science and Technology Program to assist with the development of the DSTG <u>value proposition</u>”.</i></p> <p>a) What has Defence decided on with regard to the “appropriate investment business model for DSTG”?</p> <p>b) How does this model influence research prioritisation?</p> <p>c) What are the elements involved in assessing the “economic benefit” of the Defence Science and Technology Program?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>d) On what basis was “economic benefit” assessed?</p> <p>i. Economic benefit to whom: Australia as a whole, Australian defence industry, the Government as a holder of intellectual property rights, or something else?</p> <p>e) Please explain what the “DSTG value proposition” is?</p> <p>i. Is the information in the value proposition being used for consideration of privatisation or outsourcing of DSTG?</p>				
89.	Conroy	First Principles Review – Progress Report	<p>a) Has the date been set for the Minister for Defence to report progress to Government in March this year, as set out in Recommendation 6.4 of the First Principles Review?</p> <p>b) What form will the report take?</p> <p>c) Will there be a report to the Parliament?</p> <p>d) Will there be any form of publicly available information on the progress achieved as of March 2016?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
90.	Conroy	Voluntary Redundancies and Job Movements	<p>The <i>Canberra Times</i> report by Philip Thompson of 8 February 2016 entitled ‘Defence Department staff fill unwanted jobs to secure redundancy payouts’ states “<i>Documents show Defence has allowed staff to put their hands up for jobs which have sat vacant and were soon to be abolished so they could score lucrative retrenchment pay-outs.</i>” and “<i>Documents show the department’s fraud control and investigations branch believed the deals were being done <u>in good faith</u>, were in line with Australian tax law and consistent with Defence’s voluntary redundancy program.</i>”</p> <p>a) Were staff appointed to positions that were subsequently</p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			<p>abolished, allowing them to receive redundancy payments?</p> <p>b) If so, how many such cases were there?</p> <p>c) Can Defence confirm that the Fraud Control and Investigations Branch examined cases of this kind?</p> <p>i. If so, how many cases did it investigate?</p> <p>ii. Why did it conduct the investigation?</p> <p>iii. What are the details of these investigations?</p> <p>d) The Fraud Control and Investigations Branch is reported to have said that the “<i>deals</i>” were done in good faith:</p> <p>i. Does Defence agree that being “<i>done in good faith</i>” is not the same as being done in the most administratively efficient and cost effective way?</p> <p>ii. Does Defence agree that it would have made more sense for the Department to abolish the vacant positions rather than wait for them to be filled and then abolished?</p> <p>iii. Was either the Secretary or the Associate Secretary aware of these deals? If not, should at least one of them have been made aware?</p>				
91.	Ludwig	Taxi Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How much did each department/agency spend on taxis during the specified period? Provide a breakdown for each business group in each department/agency.</p> <p>b) What are the reasons for taxi costs?</p> <p>c) How much did the department spend on taxis during the</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			specified period for their minister or minister's office?				
92.	Ludwig	Hospitality and Entertainment Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What has been the Department/Agency's hospitality spend including any catering and drinks costs. b) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total hospitality spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. c) What has been the Department/Agency's entertainment spend? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. d) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total entertainment spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. e) What hospitality spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. f) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what hospitality spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. g) What entertainment spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. h) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what entertainment spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. i) Is the Department/Agency planning on reducing any of its spending on these items? If so, how will reductions be achieved? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
93.	Ludwig	Executive Coaching and	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Please provide the following information in relation to executive</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		Leadership Training	<p>coaching and/or other leadership training services purchased by each department/agency:</p> <p>a) Total spending on these services</p> <p>b) The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification</p> <p>c) The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)</p> <p>d) The names of all service providers engaged For each service purchased form a provider listed under (4), please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The name and nature of the service purchased ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) v. The total amount spent on the service vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package) <p>e) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The location used ii. The number of employees who took part on each occasion (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) iii. The total number of hours involved for all 				
--	--	---------------------	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)</p> <p>iv. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location</p> <p>f) In relation to education/executive coaching and/or other leadership training services paid for by the department what agreements are made with employees in regards to continuing employment after training has been completed?</p> <p>g) For graduate or post graduate study, please breakdown each approved study leave by staffing allocation and degree or program title.</p>				
94.	Ludwig	Staff – Staffing Profile	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Has there been any change to the staffing profile of the department/agency?</p> <p>b) Provide a list of changes to staffing numbers, broken down by classification level, division, home base location (including town/city and state)</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
95.	Ludwig	Staff – Staffing Reductions	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many staff reductions/voluntary redundancies have occurred?</p> <p>b) What was the reason for these reductions?</p> <p>c) Were any of these reductions involuntary redundancies? If yes, provide details.</p> <p>d) Are there any plans for further staff reductions/voluntary redundancies? If so, please advise details including if there is a reduction target, how this will be achieved, and if any services/programs will be cut.</p> <p>e) If there are plans for staff reductions, please give the reason why these are happening.</p> <p>f) Are there any plans for involuntary redundancies? If yes,</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>provide details.</p> <p>g) How many ongoing staff left the department/agency? What classification were these staff?</p> <p>h) How many non-ongoing staff left department/agency from? What classification were these staff?</p> <p>i) What are the voluntary redundancy packages offered? Please detail for each staff level and position</p> <p>j) How do the packages differ from the default public service package?</p> <p>k) How is the department/agency funding the packages?</p>				
96.	Ludwig	Staff – Staffing Recruitment	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many ongoing staff have been recruited? What classification are these staff?</p> <p>b) How many non-ongoing positions exist or have been created? What classification are these staff?</p> <p>c) How many staff have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
97.	Ludwig	Kitchen Appliances	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>Has the department/agency purchased, leased or rented any kitchen appliances over the value of \$1000?</p> <p>a) If yes, provide a list that includes the type of appliance, the cost, the amount, and any ongoing costs such as purchase of consumables and when the appliance was purchased?</p> <p>b) Why were the appliances purchased?</p> <p>c) Has there been a noticeable difference in staff productivity since the appliances were purchased? Are staff leaving the office premises less during business hours as a result?</p> <p>d) Where did the funding for the appliances come from?</p> <p>e) Who has access?</p> <p>f) Who is responsible for the maintenance of the appliances? How much was spent on maintenance, include a list of what maintenance has been undertaken. Where does the funding</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			for maintenance come from? g) What are the other ongoing costs of the appliances?				
98.	Ludwig	Departmental Boards	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) how often has each board met, break down by board name; b) what travel expenses have been incurred; c) what has been the average attendance at board meetings; d) List each member's attendance at meetings; e) how does the board deal with conflict of interest; f) what conflicts of interest have been registered; g) what remuneration has been provided to board members; h) how does the board dismiss board members who do not meet attendance standards? i) Have any requests been made to ministers to dismiss board members? j) Please list board members who have attended less than 51% of meetings k) what have been the catering costs for the board meetings held during this period? Please break down the cost list. 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
99.	Ludwig	Corporate Cars	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many cars are owned by each department/agency? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Where are the cars located? ii. What are the cars used for? iii. What is the cost of each car during the specified period? iv. How far did each car travel during the specified period? b) How many cars are leased by each department/agency? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Where are the cars located? ii. What are the cars used for? iii. What is the cost of each car during the specified period? 	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			iv. How far did each car travel during the specified period?				
100.	Ludwig	Contractors and Consultants	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What has been the average time period for the department/agency paid its accounts to contractors, consultants or others? b) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in under 30 days? c) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 30 and 60 days? d) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 60 and 90 days? e) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 90 and 120 days? f) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in over 120 days? f) For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency since the change of Prime Minister on September 2015? g) Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
101.	Ludwig	Corporate Cards – Charges and Misuse	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide a breakdown of any changes to employment classifications that have access to a corporate credit card. b) Have there been any changes to action taken in the event that the corporate credit card is misused? c) Have there been any changes to how corporate credit card use is monitored? d) Have any instances of corporate credit card misuse have 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>been discovered during the specified period? If so:</p> <p>e) Please list staff classification and what the misuse was, and the action taken.</p> <p>f) Have there been any changes to what action is taken to prevent corporate credit card misuse?</p> <p>g) How many credit cards available to the Minister or their office? If so, please list by classification. Have there been any misuse of credit cards by the Minister or their office? Has any action been taken against the Minister or their office for credit card misuse? If so, list each occurrence, including the cost of the misuse.</p>				
102.	Ludwig	Hire Cars	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How much did each department/agency spend on hire cars during the specified period? Provide a breakdown of each business group in each department/agency.</p> <p>b) What are the reasons for hire car costs?</p> <p>c) How much did the department spend on hire cars during the specified period for their minister or minister's office?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
103.	Ludwig	Ministerial Functions	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Provide a list of all formal functions or forms of hospitality conducted for the Minister . Include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The guest list of each function ii. The party or individual who initiated the request for the function iii. The menu, program or list of proceedings of the function iv. A list of drinks consumed at the function <p>(b) Provide a list of the current wine, beer or other alcoholic beverages in stock or on order in the Minister's office.</p>	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16

			Breakdown by item, quantity and cost.				
104.	Ludwig	Red Tape Reduction	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Please detail changes to structures, officials, offices, units, taskforce or other processes has the department dedicated to meeting the government's red tape reduction targets?</p> <p>i) What is the progress of that red tape reduction target</p> <p>b) How many officers have been placed in those units and at what level?</p> <p>c) How have they been recruited?</p> <p>d) What process was used for their appointment?</p> <p>e) What is the total cost of this unit?</p> <p>f) What is the estimated total salary cost of the officers assigned to the unit. _</p> <p>g) Do members of the unit have access to cabinet documents?</p> <p>h) Lease list the security classification and date the classification was issued for each officer, broken down by APS or SES level, in the red tape reduction unit or similar body.</p> <p>i) What is the formal name given to this unit/taskforce/team/workgroup or agency within the department?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
105	Ludwig	Building and Land Leases	<p>a) How much land (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government corporation within each portfolio own or lease?</p> <p>b) Please list by each individual land holding, the size of the piece of land, the location of that piece of land and the latest valuation of that piece of land, where that land is owned or leased by the Department, or agency or authority or Government Corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>this question please ignore land upon which Australian Defence force bases are located. Non Defence Force base land is to be included)</p> <p>c) List the current assets, items or purse (buildings, facilities or other) on the land identified above.</p> <p>(i) What is the current occupancy level and occupant of the items identified in (3)?</p> <p>(ii) What is the value of the items identified in (3)?</p> <p>(iii) What contractual or other arrangements are in place for the items identified in (3)?</p> <p>d) How many buildings (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government Corporation within each portfolio own or lease?</p> <p>e) Please list by each building owned, its name, the size of the building in terms of square metres, the location of that of that building and the latest valuation of that building, where that building is owned by the Department, or agency or authority or Government corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to this question please ignore buildings that are situated on Australian Defence force bases. Non Defence Force base buildings are to be included).</p> <p>f) In regards to any building identified in Q4, please also detail, the occupancy rate as expressed as a percentage of the building size. If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining space used?</p>				
106.	Ludwig	Contracts for Temporary Staff	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How much did the department/agency spend on temporary or contract staff?</p> <p>b) How many temporary or contract staff have been employed?</p> <p>c) What is the total number of temporary or contract staff currently employed?</p> <p>d) How much was paid for agencies/companies to find temporary/contract staff?</p> <p>e) Have there been any changes to the policies/criteria that govern the appointment of contract staff?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
107.	Ludwig	Departmental	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		Printing	<p>a) Please list all documents that have been printed at the expense of the department/agency where 500 or more copies have been produced? Please include the total number produced as well.</p> <p>i. How many of these printed documents were also published online?</p> <p>b) Has the Department/Agency used external printing services for any print jobs?</p> <p>i. If so, what companies were used?</p> <p>ii. How were they selected?</p> <p>iii. What was the total cost of this printing by item?</p>				
108.	Ludwig	Communications Staff	<p>For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following:</p> <p>a) How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location.</p> <p>b) How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location</p> <p>c) How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location</p> <p>d) How many are graphic designers?</p> <p>e) How many are media managers?</p> <p>f) How many organise events?</p> <p>Have these arrangements changed since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015? If yes, please detail.</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16
109.	Ludwig	Departmental Reviews	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many new reviews (defined as review, inter-departmental group, inquiry, internal review or similar activity) have been commenced? Please list them</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the date they were ordered ii. the date they commenced iii. the minister responsible iv. the department responsible v. the nature of the review vi. their terms of reference vii. the scope of the review viii. Who is conducting the review ix. the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review x. the expected report date xi. the budgeted, projected or expected costs xii. If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public <p>b) For any review commenced or ordered, have any external people, companies or contractors being engaged to assist or conduct the review?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If so, please list them, including their name and/or trading name/s and any known alias or other trading names ii. If so, please list their managing director and the board of directors or equivalent iii. If yes, for each is the cost associated with their involvement, including a break down for each cost item iv. If yes, for each, what is the nature of their involvement v. If yes, for each, are they on the lobbyist register, provide details. vi. If yes, for each, what contact has the Minister or their office had with them vii. If yes, for each, who selected them viii. If yes, for each, did the minister or their office have any involvement in selecting them, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If yes, please detail what involvement it was 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. If yes, did they see or provided input to a short list 3. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur 4. If yes, did this involve any verbal discussions with the department 5. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur <p>c) Which reviews are on-going?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please list them. ii. What is the current cost to date expended on the reviews? <p>d) Have any reviews been stopped, paused or ceased? Please list them.</p> <p>e) Which reviews have concluded? Please list them.</p> <p>f) How many reviews have been provided to Government? Please list them and the date they were provided.</p> <p>g) When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?</p> <p>h) What reviews are planned?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. When will each planned review be commenced? ii. When will each of these reviews be concluded? iii. When will government respond to each review? iv. Will the government release each review? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, when? If not, why not? 				
110.	Ludwig	Commissioned Reports	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many reports (including paid external advice) have been commissioned by the Minister, department or agency?</p> <p>i) Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>b) How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental or external staff were involved in each report and at what level?</p> <p>c) What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?</p>				
111.	Ludwig	Board Appointments	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Please detail any board appointments made to date.</p> <p>b) What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?</p> <p>c) Has the department instigated of changed its gender ratio target and/or any other policy intended to increase the participation rate of women on boards? If yes, please specify what the target and policy is for each board.</p> <p>d) Please specify when these gender ratio or participation policies were changed.</p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16
112.	Ludwig	Ministerial Stationery Requirements	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How much has been spent by each department and agency on the government (Ministers / Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio to date?</p> <p>i) Detail the items provided to the minister's office.</p> <p>ii) Please specify how many reams of paper have been supplied to the Minister's office.</p> <p>b) How much has been spent on departmental stationery requirements to date.</p> <p>c) Has any customised stationery been requested or provided to the Minister or Ministerial Staff? If yes, please include a photo/scan, detail the type of stationery, date it was requested,</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			date it was provided and the cost.				
113.	Ludwig	Ministerial IT	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Other than phones, ipads or computers – please list the electronic equipment provided to the Minister’s office.</p> <p>a) List the items b) List the items location or normal location c) List if the item is in the possession of the office or an individual staff member of minister, if with an individual list their employment classification level d) List the total cost of the items e) List an itemised cost breakdown of these items f) List the date they were provided to the office g) Note if the items were requested by the office or proactively provided by the department</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
114.	Ludwig	Media Subscriptions	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>(a) What pay TV subscriptions does your department/agency have?</p> <p>i. Please provide a list of channels and the reason for each channel. ii. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? iii. What is provided to the Minister or their office? iv. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?</p> <p>(b) What newspaper subscriptions does your department/agency have?</p> <p>i. Please provide a list of newspaper subscriptions and the reason for each.</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? iii. What is provided to the Minister or their office? iv. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? <p>(c)What magazine subscriptions does your department/agency have?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please provide a list of magazine subscriptions and the reason for each. ii. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? iii. What is provided to the Minister or their office? iv. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? <p>(d)What publications does your department/agency purchase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please provide a list of publications purchased by the department and the reason for each. ii. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? iii. What is provided to the Minister or their office? iv. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 				
115.	Ludwig	Departmental Meetings – Total Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How much has the Department/Agency spent on meeting costs? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events, including any catering and drinks costs. b) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total meeting spend from to date. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>any catering and drinks costs.</p> <p>c) What meeting spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.</p> <p>d) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what meeting spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including any catering and drinks costs.</p>				
116.	Ludwig	Media Training	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total spending on these services ii. An itemised cost breakdown of these services iii. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification iv. The number of employees who have utilised these services and their employment classification v. The names of all service providers engaged vi. The location that this training was provided <p>b) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (1), please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The name and nature of the service purchased ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) v. The total amount spent on the service vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>complete package)</p> <p>c) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:</p> <p>d) The location used</p> <p>e) The number of employees who took part on each occasion</p> <p>f) The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)</p> <p>g) Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location</p>				
117.	Ludwig	Consultancies	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many consultancies have been undertaken? Identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the arrangement, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc). Also include total value for all consultancies.</p> <p>b) How many consultancies are planned for this calendar year? Have these been published in your Annual Procurement Plan (APP) on the AusTender website and if not why not? In each case please identify the subject matter, duration, cost and method of procurement as above, and the name of the consultant if known.</p> <p>c) Have any consultancies not gone out for tender?</p> <p>i. List each, including name, cost and purpose</p> <p>ii. If so, why?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
118.	Ludwig	Provision of Equipment – Minister's Office	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) For departments/agencies that provide mobile phones to</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of mobile phone has been provided and the costs?</p> <p>i) Itemise equipment and cost broken down by staff or minister classification</p> <p>b) Has electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency? If yes provide a list of:</p> <p>c) What is provided?</p> <p>d) The purchase cost.</p> <p>e) The ongoing cost.</p> <p>f) A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc).</p> <p>g) A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.</p>				
119.	Ludwig	Provision of equipment - Department	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Has electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency to departmental staff? If yes provide a list of:</p> <p>b) What has been provided?</p> <p>c) The purchase cost.</p> <p>d) The ongoing cost.</p> <p>e) A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc).</p> <p>f) A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.</p>	Written	Defence	22/04/16	04/05/16

120.	Ludwig	IT Equipment - Computers	<p>a) List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the Ministers office as provided by the department, listing the equipment cost and location and employment classification of the staff member that is allocated the equipment, or if the equipment is currently not being used</p> <p>b) List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the department, listing the equipment cost and location</p> <p>c) Please detail the operating systems used by the departments computers, the contractual arrangements for operating software and the on-going costs</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
121.	Ludwig	Departmental Travel Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Is the minister or their office or their delegate required to approve all departmental and agency international travel?</p> <p>b) If so, under what policy?</p> <p>c) Provide a copy of that policy.</p> <p>d) When was this policy implemented?</p> <p>e) When is the minister notified, when is approved provided?</p> <p>f) Detail all travel (domestic and international) for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).</p> <p>g) Detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals). Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel.</p> <p>h) What date was the minister or their office notified of the travel?</p> <p>i) What date did the minister or their office approve the</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>travel?</p> <p>j) What travel is planned for the rest of this calendar year? Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel.</p>				
122.	Ludwig	Departmental Grants	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) What guidelines are in place to administer grants?</p> <p>b) How are grants applied for?</p> <p>c) Are there any restrictions on who can apply for a grant? If yes, please detail.</p> <p>i) Can these restrictions be waved? If yes, please detail the process for waving them and list any grants where the restrictions were waved.</p> <p>d) What is the procedure for selecting who will be awarded a grant?</p> <p>e) Who is involved in this selection process?</p> <p>f) Does the minister or the minister's office play any role in awarding grants? If yes, please detail.</p> <p>ii) Has the minister or the minister's office exercised or attempted to exercise any influence over the awarding of any grants? If yes, please detail.</p> <p>g) Provide a list of all grants, including ad hoc, one-off discretionary grants awarded to date. Provide the recipients, amount, intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the electorate and state of those locations.</p> <p>h) Update the status of each grant that was approved prior to the specified period, but did not have financial contracts in place at that time. Provide details of the recipients, the amount, the intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			electorate and state of those grants.				
123.	Ludwig	Departmental Rebranding	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Has the department/Agency undergone a name change or any other form of rebranding? If so:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please detail why this name change / rebrand were considered necessary and a justified use of departmental funds? b) Please provide a copy of any reports that were commissioned to study the benefits and costs associated with the rebranding. c) Please provide the total cost associated with this rebrand and then break down by amount spent replacing: d) Signage. e) Stationery (please include details of existing stationery and how it was disposed of). f) Logos g) Consultancy h) Any relevant IT changes. i) Office reconfiguration. j) How was the decision reached to rename and/or rebrand the department? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Who was involved in reaching this decision? ii. Please provide a copy of any communication (including but not limited to emails, letters, memos, notes etc) from within the department, or between the department and the government regarding the rename/rebranding. 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
124.	Ludwig	Media Monitoring Services	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office during the specified period? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Which agency or agencies provided these services? ii. What has been spent providing these services during the specified period? 	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Itemise these expenses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency during the specified period? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Which agency or agencies provided these services? ii. What has been spent providing these services during the specified period? iii. Itemise these expenses 				
125.	Ludwig	Ministerial Procedure Manuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does the minister's office have a procedure manual for communication between the minister's office and the department? If yes, please provide a copy and: b) When was the manual last updated? c) Who is responsible for updating the manual? d) Who is the manual distributed to? e) Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the department? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
126.	Ludwig	Enterprise Bargaining Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please list all related EBAs with coverage of the department. b) Please list their starting and expiration dates. c) What is the current status of negotiations for the next agreement/s? Please detail. 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
127.	Ludwig	Existing Resources Programs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many projects, work, programs or other tasks has the department started as a consequence of government policies or priorities that are required to be funded 'within existing resources'? b) List each c) List the staffing assigned to each task d) What is the nominal total salary cost of the officers assigned to the project? e) What resources or equipment has been assigned to the 	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			project?				
128.	Ludwig	Conditions of Government Contracts and Agreements	<p>a) Do any contracts managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticising Government policy? If so, please name each contact. When was it formed or created?</p> <p>b) What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?</p> <p>c) Do any agreements managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations on restrictions on advocacy or criticisms of Government policy? If so, please name each agreement. When was it formed or created?</p> <p>d) What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?</p> <p>e) For each of the contracts and agreements, are there any particular reason, such as genuine commercial in confidence information, for this restriction?</p> <p>f) Have any changes to financial or resource support to services which advocate on behalf of groups or individuals in Australian society been made? If so, which groups? What was the change?</p> <p>g) Has any consultation occurred between the Department/Agency and any individuals and/or community groups about these changes? If so, what consultation process was used? Was it public? If not, why not? Are public submissions available on a website?</p> <p>h) If no consultation has occurred, why not?</p> <p>i) Did the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary meet with any stakeholders about changes to advocacy in their contracts and/or agreements? If so, when? Who did he/she meet with?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
129.	Ludwig	Statutory Review Provisions	<p>Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a statutory review provision/s. For each, please provide:</p> <p>a) What work has been done towards preparing for the</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>review? If none, why not?</p> <p>b) Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the review</p> <p>c) When did/will this work begin?</p> <p>d) When is/was the review due to commence.</p> <p>e) What is the expected report date.</p> <p>f) Who is the minister responsible for the review</p> <p>g) What department is responsible for the review</p> <p>h) List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision.</p> <p>i) List the terms of reference.</p> <p>j) What is the scope of the review.</p> <p>k) Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligation for the selection of the person to conduct the review?</p> <p>l) What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review?</p> <p>m) When was the Minister briefed on this matter?</p> <p>n) What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter?</p> <p>o) List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review</p> <p>p) Will the the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when?</p>				
130.	Ludwig	Sunset Provisions	<p>a) Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a sunset provision/s. For each, please provide:</p> <p>i. What work has been done towards preparing for the activation of sunset provisions? If no work has commenced, why not?</p> <p>ii. Has any consideration been given to delaying or alerting the sunset provisions?</p> <p>iii. Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the sunset provisions becoming active</p> <p>iv. When did/will this work begin?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>b) Will there be any reviews of or relating to the legislation before or after the sunset provision is enacted? If yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. When is/was the review due to commence. ii. What is the expected report date. iii. Who is the minister responsible for the review iv. What department is responsible for the review v. List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision. vi. List the terms of reference. vii. What is the scope of the review. viii. Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligations for the selection of the person to conduct the review? ix. What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review? x. When was the Minister briefed on this matter? xi. What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter? xii. List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review xiii. Will the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when? 				
131.	Ludwig	Legal Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) List all legal costs incurred by the department or agency b) List the total cost for these items, broken down by source of legal advice, hours retained or taken to prepare the advice and the level of counsel used in preparing the advice, whether the advice was internal or external c) List cost spend briefing Counsel, broken down by hours spent briefing, whether it was direct or indirect briefing, the gender ratio of Counsel, how each Counsel was engaged (departmental, ministerial) d) How was each piece of advice procured? Detail the 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			method of identifying legal advice				
132.	Ludwig	Vending Machines	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:Has the department/agency purchased or leased or taken under contract any vending machine facilities?</p> <p>a) If so, list these b) If so, list the total cost for these items c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure d) If so, where were these purchased e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased f) If so, what is the current location for these items? g) If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
133.	Ludwig	Self Initiated Work	<p>a) Does the department have a program for staff to engage in self-initiated work (projects, plans etc that are devised by staff without being directed by the minister's office or department management)? b) Please list all ongoing projects. For each, please detail: c) When did the project commence? d) When is it expected to conclude? e) What will the total cost of the project be? f) Where did the money for the project come from? g) Where is the project based?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
134.	Ludwig	Staff Awards	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Has the Department / Agency given out awards to staff for any reason? If yes:</p> <p>i. What was the reason for the awards? ii. What was the criteria for the awards? iii. What form did the award take? (e.g. Certificate, gift vouchers etc)</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>iv. How much was spent on the award?</p> <p>b) How were the awards presented?</p> <p>c) Who presented the awards?</p> <p>d) Was there a ceremony or party for the awards? If yes:</p> <p>i. Where was it held?</p> <p>ii. Was there a fee for the venue? If yes, how much?</p> <p>iii. How much was spent on catering?</p> <p>iv. How many people attended?</p> <p>v. Did the minister attend?</p> <p>vi. Did the minister's staff attend? If yes, how many?</p>				
135.	Ludwig	Change Management	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:Has the Department/Agency engaged in a policy of Change Management? If yes:</p> <p>a) Please detail the policy.</p> <p>b) When was the policy introduced?</p> <p>c) What are the goals of the policy?</p> <p>d) How much was spent on consulting for the policy and who was contracted for this consultation?</p> <p>e) How much was spent implementing this policy?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
136.	Ludwig	Code of Conduct - Department	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) Please provide a copy of the departmental staff code of conduct.</p> <p>b) Have there been any identified breaches of this code of conduct by departmental staff?</p> <p>i. If yes, list the breaches identified, broken by staffing classification level.</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. If yes, what remedy was put in place to manage the breach? If no remedy has been put in place, why not? iii. If yes, when was the breach identified? By whom? When was the Minister made aware? iv. If yes, were there any legal ramifications for the department or staff member? Please detail. 				
137.	Ludwig	Fee for Services	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Have any existing services provided by the department / agency moved from being free to a user-pay service? Have any additional fees been placed on existing services? If yes please provide a list and include: b) Name of the fee and a short description of what it covers. c) How much is the fee (and is it a flat fee or a percentage of the service). d) The date the fee came into place. e) Were any reviews requested, commenced or complemented into the benefits and drawbacks of attaching the fee to the service? If yes, please detail and provide a copy of the review. f) What consultation was carried out before the fee was put into place? g) How was the fee put into place (e.g. through legislation, regulation changes etc)? h) What justification is there for the fee? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
138.	Ludwig	Documents Provided to Minister	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Excluding policy or correspondence briefs, how many documents are provided to the Minister's office on a regular and scheduled basis? Including documents that are not briefs to the minister and do not require ministerial signature. b) List those documents, their schedule and their purpose (broken down by ministerial signature and office for noting documents) c) How are they transmitted to the office? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) What mode of delivery is used (hardcopy, email) for those documents? e) What level officer are they provided to in the minister's office? 				
139.	Ludwig	Merchandise or Promotional Material	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has the department purchased any merchandise or promotional material? b) List by item, and purpose for each item, including if the material is for a specific policy or program or for a generic puporse (note that purpose) c) List the cost for each item d) List the quantity of each item e) Who suggested these material be created? f) Who approved its creation? g) Provide copies of authorisation h) When was the Minister informed of the material being created? i) Who created the material? j) How was that person selected? k) 11. How many individuals or groups were considered in selecting who to create the material? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
140.	Ludwig	Internet Domain Usage – Minister's Office	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Please provide a breakdown of the domain usage for the 50 most utilised (by data sent and received), unique (internet) domains accessed by the minister's office. Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Domain name of the website being accessed (or IP address if the Domain is unavailable in the tracking system). b) Amount of data downloaded and uploaded to the site. c) Number of times the site was accessed. 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
141.	Ludwig	Ministerial Website	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>a) How much has been spent on the Minister's website?</p> <p>i) List each item of expenditure and cost</p> <p>b) Who is responsible for uploading information to the Minister's website?</p> <p>c) Have any departmental staff been required to work outside regular hours to maintain the Minister's website? Please detail.</p>				
142.	Ludwig	Report Printing	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Have any reports, budget papers, statements, white papers or report-like documents printed for or by the department been pulped, put in storage, shredded or disposed of? If so please give:</p> <p>a) details;</p> <p>b) name of report,</p> <p>c) number of copies,</p> <p>d) cost of printing,</p> <p>e) who ordered the disposal,</p> <p>f) reason for disposal</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
143.	Ludwig	Freedom of Information Requests - Quantity	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many requests for documents under the FOI Act have been received?</p> <p>b) Of these, how many documents have been determined to be deliberative documents?</p> <p>c) Of those assessed as deliberative documents:</p> <p>i) For how many has access to the document been refused on the basis that it would be contrary to the public interest?</p> <p>ii) For how many has a redacted document been provided?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
144.	Ludwig	Ministerial Motor	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Has	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

		Vehicle	<p>the minister been provided with or had access to a motor vehicle? If so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the make and model? b) How much did it cost? c) When was it provided? d) Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met? e) What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as maintenance and fuel. f) Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met? g) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine if a minister is entitled to a motor vehicle. h) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail. i) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a minister is to use a motor vehicle they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses. j) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail. 				
145.	Ludwig	Ministerial Staff – Motor Vehicles – non MoPS	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>Outside of MoPS Act entitlements, have any of the Minister’s staff been provided with a motor vehicle? If so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the make and model? b) How much did it cost? c) When was it provided? d) Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met? e) What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>maintenance and fuel.</p> <p>f) Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met?</p> <p>g) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine this entitlement to a motor vehicle.</p> <p>h) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail.</p> <p>i) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a motor vehicle is to be used that they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses.</p> <p>j) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail.</p>				
146.	Ludwig	Lobbyist Register Meetings	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) List all interactions between the department/agency with any representative listed on the lobbyist register</p> <p>b) List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting</p> <p>c) List all interactions between the Minister/parliamentary Secretary and/or their offices with any representative listed on the lobbyist register during the specified period. List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting.</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
147.	Ludwig	Workplace Assessments	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How much has been spent on workplace ergonomic assessments?</p> <p>i) List each item of expenditure and cost</p> <p>b) Have any assessments, not related to an existing disability,</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>resulted in changes to workplace equipment or set up?</p> <p>c) If so, list each item of expenditure and cost related to those changes</p>				
148.	Ludwig	Freedom of Information – Overall Statistics	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>a) How many FOI requests were received to date.</p> <p>b) How many of those requests were finalised within the regular timeframes provided under the FOI Act?</p> <p>c) How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AA of the FOI Act?</p> <p>d) How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AB of the FOI Act?</p> <p>e) How many of those requests were finalised out of time?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
149.	Ludwig	Multiple Tenders	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>List any tenders that were re-issued or issued multiple times:</p> <p>a) Why were they re-issued or issued multiple times?</p> <p>b) Were any applicants received for the tenders before they were re-issued or repeatedly issued?</p> <p>c) Were those applicants asked to resubmit their tender proposal?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
150.	Ludwig	Market Research	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>(a) List any market research conducted by the department/agency:</p> <p>i. List the total cost of this research</p> <p>ii. List each item of expenditure and cost, broken down by division and program</p> <p>iii. Who conducted the research?</p> <p>iv. How were they identified?</p> <p>v. Where was the research conducted?</p> <p>vi. In what way was the research conducted?</p>	Written	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii. Were focus groups, round tables or other forms of research tools used? viii. How were participants for these focus groups et al selected? ix. How was the firm or individual that conducted the review selected? x. What input did the Minister have? xi. How was it approved? xii. Were other firms or individuals considered? If yes, please detail. 				
151.	Ludwig	Departmental Upgrades	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:Has the department/agency engaged in any new refurbishments, upgrades or changes to their building or facilities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) If so, list these b) If so, list the total cost for these changes c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure d) If so, who conducted the works? e) If so, list the process for identifying who would conduct these works f) If so, when are the works expected to be completed? 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
152.	Ludwig	Wine Coolers, Fridges and Eskies for alcoholic beverages	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Has the department/agency purchased or leased any new wine coolers, or wine fridges or other devices for the purpose of housing alcohol beverages, including Eskies?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) If so, list these b) If so, list the total cost for these items c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure d) If so, where were these purchased e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased f) If so, what is the current location for these items? g) If so, what is the current stocking level for each of these 	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			items?				
153.	Ludwig	Office Plants	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:Has the department/agency purchased or leased any office plants?</p> <p>a) If so, list these b) If so, list the total cost for these items c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure d) If so, where were these purchased e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased f) If so, what is the current location for these items?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
154.	Ludwig	Office Recreation Facilities	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:Has the department/agency purchased or leased or constructed any office recreation facilities, activities or games (including but not limited to pool tables, table tennis tables or others)?</p> <p>a) If so, list these b) If so, list the total cost for these items c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure d) If so, where were these purchased e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased f) If so, what is the current location for these items? g) If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
155.	Ludwig	Building Lease Costs	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>(a) What has been the total cost of building leases for the agency / department?</p> <p>(b) Please provide a detailed list of each building that is currently leased. Please detail by:</p> <p>i. Date the lease agreement is active from.</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Date the lease agreement ends. iii. Is the lease expected to be renewed? If not, why not? iv. Location of the building (City and state). v. Cost of the lease. vi. Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency/ department. <p>(c) Please provide a detailed list of each building that had a lease that was not renewed during the specified period. Please detail by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Date from which the lease agreement was active. ii. Date the lease agreement ended. iii. Why was the lease not renewed? iv. Location of the building (City and state). v. Cost of the lease. vi. Why the building was necessary for the operations of the agency / department. <p>(d) Please provide a detailed list of each building that is expected to be leased in the next 12 months. Please detail by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Date the lease agreement is expected to become active. ii. Date the lease agreement is expected to end. iii. Expected location of the building (City and state). iv. Expected cost of the lease. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has this cost been allocated into the budget? v. Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency / department. <p>(e) For each building owned or leased by the department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the current occupancy rate for the building? ii. If the rate is less than 100%, detail what the remaining being used for. 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

156.	Ludwig	Advertising and Marketing Services	<p>Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:</p> <p>(a) How much has been spent by the department / agency on marketing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. List the total cost ii. List each item of expenditure and cost iii. List the approving officer for each item. iv. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process. v. Which firm provided the marketing? <p>(b) How much has been spent by the department / agency on government advertising (including job ads)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. List the total cost ii. List each item of expenditure and cost iii. Where the advertising appeared iv. List the approving officer for each item. v. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process. vi. Detail the outlets that were paid for the advertising. <p>(c) What government advertising is planned for the rest of the financial year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. List the total expected cost. ii. List each item of expenditure and cost. iii. Where the advertising will appear iv. List the approving officer for each item. v. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process. vi. Detail the outlets that have been or will be paid for the advertising. 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
------	--------	------------------------------------	--	---------	---------	----------	----------

			(d) Provide copies of approvals for advertising, including but not limited to, approvals made by the Prime Minister or his delegate, the Minister or their delegate, or the Department or their delegate.				
157.	Ludwig	Procedure Manual – Departmental	<p>a) Does the department have a procedure manual for communication between the department and the minister? If yes, please provide a copy and:</p> <p>b) When was the manual last updated?</p> <p>c) Who is responsible for updating the manual?</p> <p>d) Has the minister’s office had any input into the content of the manual? If so, please detail.</p> <p>e) Who is the manual distributed to?</p> <p>f) Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the minister or the minister’s office?</p>	Written	Defence	04/04/16	04/05/16
158.	McEwan	Mefloquine Dosage - ADF	<p>Senator McEWEN: What dosage of mefloquine is prescribed to ADF members prior to and during deployment?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: They receive the standard dose of mefloquine. We do give a loading dose, from a Defence perspective. The reason is that we have a duty of care to protect our members from malaria, which is obviously a disease of great significance that can and does kill people on a regular basis. So we want to be sure that they have protection before they go away, as with all of our drugs. It also, of course, gives us an opportunity, under observation, to check whether they have any side-effects from the medication.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: When you say 'standard dose', is that the TGA approved dose?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: What is the additional loading dose, either percentage wise or milligram wise, or however you measure that?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Smart: It is three different doses. I do not</p>	Page 119	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			have that, so I will take that on notice.				
159.	Conroy	Stuart Robert – Departmental Awareness	<p>Senator CONROY: Who was acting for Mr Robert on each date of that leave approved?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CONROY: In the case of this trip to China, was the department informed?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take on notice whether the department was informed. We were aware that the minister was in Beijing simply because he was designated to represent the Defence minister at a meeting in Singapore immediately after Beijing.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So the department/you were aware that he was in Beijing?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: At some point, we became aware. I would need to let you know. But I think it was simply in the context of the arrangements.</p>	Page 19-20	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16
159.	Conroy	Stuart Robert – Departmental Awareness	<p>Senator CONROY: Who was acting for Mr Robert on each date of that leave approved?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CONROY: In the case of this trip to China, was the department informed?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take on notice whether the department was informed. We were aware that the minister was in Beijing simply because he was designated to represent the Defence minister at a meeting in Singapore immediately after Beijing.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So the department/you were aware that he was in Beijing?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: At some point, we became aware. I would need to let you know. But I think it was simply in the context of the arrangements.</p>	Page 19-20	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16
160	Conroy	Shipbuilding – Supply Ships	<p>Senator CONROY: Am I also correct that Defence estimates the cost for the first two supply ships as \$1 billion to \$2</p>	March 17 2016 Page 4	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

		Cost	<p>billion, with a further \$1 billion to \$2 billion for the third vessel?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to refer that too.</p> <p>Mr Nicholl: I would have to take that on notice, Senator</p>				
161	Conroy	Shipbuilding – Preferred Tenderer	<p>Senator CONROY: On what date did the government make its decision to select Navantia as the preferred tenderer, and on what date were Navantia and Daewoo notified of the decision?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice. Navantia and Daewoo were advised over the last several weeks. That was very recent. The actual decision was taken within a couple of weeks of that, prior.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Prior, did you say?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes. You have the decision; then you have—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Who makes that decision? Is it the Defence Capability and Investment Committee?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: No, not the decision. The Defence Capability and Investment Committee is the committee in Defence—which has now been replaced by the investment committee—that considers the final proposal going to the minister and the government.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: On what day did the Defence Capability and Investment Committee make a decision?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Mr Nicholl?</p> <p>Mr Nicholl: I could not give you a specific date. I will take it on notice and follow up.</p>	March 17 2016 Page 4-5	Defence	18/10/16	
162	Conroy	Shipbuilding – AWD	<p>Senator CONROY: Do you dispute the testimony to a Senate committee on 21 July 2014 by the then Chief Executive of Defence SA, Mr Andrew Fletcher, who said that the necessary upgrades could be made for between \$20 to \$50 million and would only take between 12 and 24 months?</p>	March 17 2016 Page 6	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Senator Payne: I have not seen that evidence, but I am happy to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Mr Fletcher also told the Senate committee that upgrades at Techport could be done while modules were built and the supply ships assembled—in other words, that the upgrades would not hamper the build. Do you dispute that?</p> <p>Senator Payne: As I said, I have not seen that evidence. As we all know, we also have the ongoing construction of the three Air Warfare Destroyers at the shipyards as well. I do not know whether Mr Fletcher took that into account. I will take the question on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: He was the Chief Executive of Defence SA at the time. I am sure that he would be familiar with the AWD builds.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am not canvassing the role of Mr Fletcher—whom I do not know—then, now or otherwise. I am simply saying that I am not sure what was in Mr Fletcher's mind. In fact, I could not possibly be required to be sure what was in Mr Fletcher's mind. I will have a look at the evidence which was given, take that on notice and provide you with a response.</p>				
163	Conroy	Shipbuilding – Preferred Tenderer – Internal Processes	<p>Senator CONROY: What was the internal Defence decision making process for selecting Navantia as the preferred tenderer? We were asking a little bit about this before. Was the matter considered by the Defence Capability and Investment Committee? I think we said it was.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You chair that, Mr Richardson. Were you there for this decision?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What was your role in the process, if I can ask this without spending too much time on it—so, concisely. I did ask what date did it consider the matter and</p>	March 17 2016 Page 8-9	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>finalise the matter earlier.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I had an initial discussion with people involved prior to the Defence Capability and Investment Committee meeting. In the meeting itself, a presentation was made by the group head or service chief—whoever is relevant—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So Vice Admiral Barrett did that?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I cannot recall now. Very often it is. Then we go around the table. We have each of the service chiefs there, the CDF, the VCDF and the group heads. We have relevant other people who know the detail of the particular matter more than others. They are there to provide input and to respond to any questions and the like. From there, it goes to the minister and then normally to the NSC.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: There were a few acronyms tossed in there. Vice Admiral Griggs, were you part of that process?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I am not sure I was at that particular meeting.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You are on that committee?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I am on the committee, yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: But you do not make the presentation?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: No.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You would have in the old days, before you were promoted?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Generally.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Does anyone else remember who made the presentation? Was it Vice Admiral Barrett?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice.</p>				
164	Conroy	Submarines – Communication System	<p>Senator CONROY: I will probably come back to that particular line of questioning. We have talked about a combat system, so I now want to talk about a communication system. Which Australian communication system is going to be fitted?</p> <p>Mr Nicholl: I would have to take on notice the specific</p>	March 17 2016 Page 13	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>details of that, but it is common with all the other communication systems we have fitted across the Australian fleet—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would hope so!</p> <p>Mr Nicholl: which I believe are Australian sourced.</p>				
165	Xenophon and Conroy	Australian Content	<p>Senator XENOPHON: It is not being pedantic. There must be some rigor in terms of how you define Australian content. The government made a statement about \$100 million for the supply ships. Can you tell us not only how that figure is derived, but how you work out whether it is Australian content or not. How do we know that it is not 50 per cent, 60 per cent, 70 per cent of something that was built overseas and imported into the country? There is no specificity in terms of what Australian content is. There must be some easy definition, so that you can put us out of our misery on this. You are going to put me out of my misery on this. I just want to know what the definition of Australian content is? Can someone tell me what 'Australian content' means for the purpose of the \$100 million reference in relation to the supply ships.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think the safest way to do this is to take that on notice, because—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You cannot even tell us something as basic as that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: It is not a matter of whether it is basic or not. We do not want to mislead you in any way. We will get you an answer on those exact—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am not suggesting you want to mislead us at all, Vice Admiral. But I would have thought, given that the government said there would be \$100 million worth of Australian content, that there would have been an assumption as to what Australian content is before that announcement was made.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I am sure there was.</p>	March 17 2016 Pages 13-15	Defence	18/10/16	

		<p>(.....)</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I think that further to that, Mr Richardson, you made mention—and thank you for at least giving some further details of that—of components made in Australia. How do you define 'made in Australia'? Is it 51 per cent local content? What does 'components brought together in Australia' mean? Does that mean that if you import products you include the value of those imported products?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I certainly would need to take that degree of detail on notice. That is beyond my level of knowledge.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So just to be clear: the \$100 million has not been secured yet. It is still in negotiation.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That is the estimated value. What the government put out—what the minister stated—was very much on the recommendation of the Department of Defence. There will be detail sitting behind that—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: That is what we are trying to get to.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: and we will—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You seem unclear.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: take that on notice. I have provided the detail that we can. We will take that on notice and provide you with further detail.</p> <p>(.....)</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am just clarifying that the \$100 million is still up for negotiation. I think this is what you said, Mr Richardson—you have not finalised it yet.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It is our estimate. It is \$100 million. The minister made that statement on our advice, and we believe that is an accurate statement.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Except you do not actually have a definition of what 'Australian made' would be. So to satisfy Senator Xenophon and us, what you have counted as Australian content we would count as Australian content?</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			Mr Richardson: I have provided you with the information that we have, and I have said that we would take the more detailed questions on notice.				
166	Xenophon	Shipbuilding – Australian Work	<p>Senator XENOPHON: All up, by value, how much work was carried out in Australia on the LHD?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I understand it was about a \$3 billion program. Would it be fair to say that about 25 per cent of the work was done here?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Does that seem a reasonable figure?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Okay, but it is more than five per cent, isn't it?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: It is more than five per cent, but it is a very different program.</p>	March 17 2016 Page 16	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16
167	Xenophon	Shipbuilding – Unsolicited Proposal	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Going to issues of time available, are you aware that both ASC and BAE made, as I understand it, unsolicited offers to Defence or perhaps to Defence Materiel to say, 'We can build three for the price of two'? My understanding of the ASC offer was that the first ship was to be built in Korea with about 20 per cent of the value here in Australia, and then there would be a reversal where the majority of the value was going to be in Australia for the remaining two ships. Are you aware of any of those? It is something I have alluded to previously with you, Mr Richardson.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Dalton: I am not personally aware of it.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Were you aware of that, Mr Nicholl?</p> <p>Mr Nicholl: No, I was not.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think that is incorrect—it was two ships in Korea and one in Australia.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But this was an offer that was made by ASC?</p>	March 17 2016 Page 16-17	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>Senator Payne: There was an unsolicited proposal, yes.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: When was that unsolicited proposal from ASC made?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I am not sure. I think it was in the middle of 2013 or thereabouts.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Minister, could you please take on notice what assessment was carried out of that proposal and how it was dealt with?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes, sure.</p>				
168	Xenophon	Shipbuilding- Decision Making	<p>Mr Richardson: That is right, yes.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Are you in a position to be able to table the advice as it passed through the various Defence decision-making committees—for instance the defence capability committee or the Defence Capability and Investment Committee?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice, because there could be certain confidentiality around that. I would just need to check.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But on notice could you provide details on what you say the price differential would have been.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Sure.</p>	March 17 2016 Page 17	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
169	Xenophon	Naval Shipbuilding Plan	<p>Senator XENOPHON: You may want to take this on notice because I know, Minister, you made reference to the Defence Teaming Centre and that Mr Chris Burns made reference to this back in August last year: the Defence Teaming Centre undertook an analysis that showed that South Australia could get just \$8 billion of the promised \$39 billion for surface shipbuilding. I am very happy for you to take that on notice, but that does indicate a fairly small proportion of that.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I think you have referred to that before, Senator. If I thought you were glass half-empty, it has nothing on that analysis.</p>	March 17 2016 Page 34	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>Senator XENOPHON: So you are calling me an optimist now?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Well it is a chameleon-like environment, the politics of the Senate, isn't it, Senator Xenophon? I did indicate in the chamber today that I thought Mr Burns's comments in relation to the naval shipbuilding plan, which I saw published this morning, were in fact very relevant and I think you will see I endorsed them.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am just trying to establish whether Defence is able to refute that—</p> <p>Senator Payne: I will take that on notice because, obviously, I was not in this role at the time. I will take that on notice and come back to you.</p>				
170	Conroy	Shipbuilding - Jobs	<p>Senator CONROY: No, I am saying that Minister Andrews claimed 500 new jobs. Of what you have described, some of those jobs already exist and have existed for a while. I am asking you where the new jobs have been created since 20 February.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We in fact are in the process of recruiting a significant number of additional people, particularly in the design area, and quite a number of those jobs will in fact be in South Australia.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could you give me a definition of 'significant number' and 'quite a few in South Australia'. Can you give me some breakdowns there. Is it 36?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: No.</p> <p>Senator Payne: If you want details, we will take that on notice. We have that detail.</p>	March 17 2016 Page 42	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16
171	Xenophon	Shipbuilding and Submarines	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I can put them verbally on the record, and that might be useful, and then maybe put a couple of supplementary ones on notice. I will run through them and please interrupt if there is a lack of clarity with respect to the questions. Could I ask for a rough order budget for this preferred system—that is, the AN/BYG-1—being</p>	March 17 2016 Page 44-45	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		<p>transferred from Collins to the Future Submarines? Obviously that would include issues of software and hardware costs. I note that the cost to purchase and install the six systems in Collins was \$139 million. That was question on notice No. 2487 in July 2015. So there is a reference point there. (.....)</p> <p>Another one: we know from Defence answers that we pay 15 per cent of the joint program cost, or \$20 million per annum—question on notice No. 2487 July 2015—for the evolving development program that excludes Australian companies—</p> <p>Mr Cochrane: I do not believe that that was our response. Senator XENOPHON: Wasn't it? Mr Cochrane: It does not exclude Australian companies. Senator XENOPHON: That was my interpretation of the response. I think your response made reference to 15 per cent or \$20 million? Senator Payne: We will deal with that in our response. Senator XENOPHON: Yes, as to whether it excludes Australian companies or not. With 12 submarines, would this likely go up to 25 to 30 per cent? Would that be in the order of \$35 million to \$40 million per annum? And I am just trying to establish whether you think that is a reasonable ballpark figure. In terms of sonar, which is an important part, obviously, of a submarine combat system, how much in broad terms of this would be allocated for in this \$5 billion? I note that the white paper states that the Collins sonar upgrade would be \$750,000 million to \$1 billion. Are you looking at moving that system from Collins to future submarines as they are for the command and control system? If I could put that on notice. (.....)</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: For periscopes and optronics, how</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>much for that? For communications—and I know it is not an apples for apples comparison—my understanding is that the communications upgrade on the eight Anzacs is marked at \$500 million to \$700 million. With respect to communications, it is an area where interoperability is important. Will there be any restriction on the country of origin of this supplier? I presume, if it were the case, it would be a US or NATO country. I just ask because of interoperability. In terms of the electronic surveillances, what will the cost of the electronic surveillance system be? I understand that the Anzac upgrade is listed at \$250 million. I am just trying to establish that. (.....)</p> <p>Finally, as to weapons, at the top level—and I understand there are issues of national security—we do know that, in terms of the Mark 48 torpedoes, the cost of the Collins torpedoes was \$427 million in ANAO report. How much reuse would there be? With the harpoon anti-ship missiles, the anti-aircraft missiles, the Tomahawks and the mines, in so far as this information does not compromise national security I think the ANAO did make reference to the costs involved. I do not necessarily want to know how many missiles, for those that want to do us harm, but I just want to get an idea of that. (.....)</p> <p>In terms of integration, the plan seems to be that either Raytheon or Lockheed will be the integrators. If you can just provide details of the tender out for the integrated role—</p> <p>Mr Cochrane: What kind of details would you be after, Senator? Senator XENOPHON: Is there a tender for the integrator? Mr Cochrane: There is a limited tender.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Senator XENOPHON: So that is between Raytheon or Lockheed—is that right?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So it is out of them two—okay. I might put some questions on notice in respect of the command and control system because there was a situation back in, I think, 2001 where the Germans missed out because there was a decision made for the US system to be used—which, I understand, was much more expensive, but I think there were some strategic decisions made.</p> <p>Mr Cochrane: I might just correct that, if I may, Senator. The comparisons we have indicate that it certainly is on a par. The expense of that system that you just indicated would have been about the same as the purchase and adaptation of AN/BYG-1 into Collins.</p> <p>Senator Payne: We can expand on that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But a decision has been made on the AN/BYG, but you cannot tell me what the cost is of that?</p> <p>Senator Payne: We will come back to you on notice. I appreciate the detail that you are putting on the record. Thank you.</p>				
172	Xenophon	Shipbuilding – Australian Based Companies	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I guess the issue is: I am just trying to understand how the procurement rules and the tender processes work for this, because \$5 billion to \$6 billion, albeit over a 30-year period, is still a significant amount of money. On notice, through you, Minister, if we can get some details of the tender process—</p> <p>Senator Payne: All right. Yes—certainly.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: because there has been an issue with local defence contractors—Australian-based companies—where they have expressed concern in the past over tender processes for that down the supply chain where they felt</p>	March 17 2016 Page 45	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Australian industry participation has been unnecessarily limited. This is something that goes back over a number of years.</p> <p>Senator Payne: We will come back to you on that.</p>				
173	Gallacher	Defence Industry Policy Statement	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Can you please detail the 35 Defence industry programs that were cancelled as part of the <i>Defence industry policy statement</i> to fund new initiatives.</p> <p>CHAIR: Read them out.</p> <p>Ms Louis: The programs fall under a number of different categories across innovation, business government, engagement and skilling. Maybe if I just talk to the key ones, they would be along the lines of the Capability and Technology Demonstrator Program—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: When are you going to tell us which ones were cancelled?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Senator Gallacher, could you possibly at least give the officer sufficient respect to let her commence her answer?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I thought the question was fairly straightforward. I did not get the idea that I was going to get an answer.</p> <p>CHAIR: Thanks, Ms Louis. You can continue.</p> <p>Ms Louis: Continue reading them out?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes, thank you, Kate.</p> <p>Ms Louis: Next is the Defence Materials Technology Centre, then the CDG Priority Industry Capability Innovation Program, the Defence Innovation Realisation Fund, the RPDE—which is the Rapid Prototyping, Development and Evaluation Program—the Defence Industry Innovation Board, the Australian Industry Capability Program, the Defence Industry Innovation Centre, the Defence Industry Innovation Centre Advisory</p>	March 17 2016 Page 47	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Committee, the Defence Export Unit, the Australian Government Defence Export Support Forum and the Joint Strike Fighter Industry Program. You can see there are quite a few. Also, the DMO Global Supply Chain Program, a number of the environmental working groups, the Capability Development Advisory Forum, the DMO Business Access Offices. If you would like me to keep going, the skilling programs include Skilling Australia's Defence Industry, DMO School Pathways, the DMO Defence Engineering Internship Program, the DMO sponsoring the Re-engineering Australia Foundation, the DSTO undergraduate scholarship programs and so on. The idea is that all of these are not, obviously, being stopped immediately or anything like that. We are looking at these and bringing them under the two broad initiatives in the industry policy statement.</p> <p>Senator Payne: If I may interrupt, would you like to explain those, please?</p> <p>Ms Louis: Certainly. We did a very comprehensive consultation process in the industry policy statement. A lot of the feedback to us was that these programs were quite fragmented. They needed to be brought together under a strategic leadership. We are looking at the two initiatives announced in the industry policy statement: the new innovation approach and the new Centre for Defence Industry Capability.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That is the complete list? The whole 35 have been itemised there?</p> <p>Ms Louis: I must admit, I abbreviated some of them that come under groupings, but I can give you the whole list—</p> <p>Senator Payne: We will take further detail on notice for you, Senator.</p>				
174	Gallacher	Defence Industry Policy - Cost	Senator GALLACHER: Fantastic. The recognition of the defence industry as a fundamental input to capability, FIC,	March 17 2016 Page 48	Defence	20/04/16	04/05/16

			<p>has been well received and is supported by Labor. Does the department have any plan to map the scale and capabilities of the defence industry across Australia?</p> <p>Ms Louis: We certainly do. The Defence Industry Policy Statement notes that we will be developing an industry capability plan for government consideration. It goes exactly to that heart. We do think we need to map the industry capabilities in a more strategic way than we have previously.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Just the nuts and bolts of that—who would be conducting that activity?</p> <p>Ms Louis: That will be conducted by the Centre for Defence Industry Capability, obviously with very close links with Defence. It is important to work with Defence in identifying those sovereign capabilities and then the industrial capabilities that underpin those.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is there any estimation of the cost of that activity?</p> <p>Ms Louis: No. I would have to take that on notice.</p>				
175	Conroy	Naval Shipbuilding Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can Defence please outline the scope and purpose of the enterprise-level Naval Shipbuilding Plan? 2. In the Ministerial foreword to the 2015-16 Defence Budget brochure, then Defence Minister Andrews stated that: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“In conjunction with the White Paper, the Government will publish a fully costed 10 year Defence Investment Plan, a Defence Industry Policy Statement and an enterprise-level Naval Shipbuilding Plan.”</i></p> <p>Was this commitment to release the Naval Shipbuilding Plan in conjunction with the Defence White Paper based on, or consistent with, advice from Defence at the time?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) Did Defence subsequently recommend to</p> 	Written	Defence	18/10/16	

			<p>Government that the Naval Shipbuilding Plan not be released in conjunction with the Defence White Paper?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>If YES:</u> On what date was this recommendation made to Government? What was Defence's rationale for delaying release of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan? ▪ <u>If NO:</u> When did Defence first become aware that the Government would not release the Naval Shipbuilding Plan in conjunction with the Defence White Paper? <p>3. Will the Naval Shipbuilding Plan contain any new shipbuilding and/or financial commitments above and beyond what is contained in the 2016 Defence White Paper?</p> <p>4. Which area of Defence is responsible for drafting the Naval Shipbuilding Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many staff are dedicated to drafting the Naval Shipbuilding Plan? b) When did drafting of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan commence? c) When is drafting of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan expected to conclude? d) Has the Naval Shipbuilding Plan and/or a draft of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan, either in part or whole, been considered by or provided to the Minister for Defence, the Prime Minister and/or the National Security Committee of Cabinet? If 				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			so, on what date(s) did that occur?				
			e) When does Defence anticipate that the Naval Shipbuilding Plan will be released?				
176	Conroy	Future Submarines – Advice to Government	<p>1. On 2 March 2016, a spokesperson for former Prime Minister Abbott said:</p> <p><i>“As prime minister, Defence advised Mr Abbott that it was feasible for Australia's new submarines to start entering service in the second half of the next decade” .</i></p> <p>(Ref: http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-03-02/defence-leak-to-be-investigated/7214470)</p> <p>Is it correct that Defence provided this advice to Mr Abbott? If so, when?</p> <p>2. During a spill-over hearing of Additional Estimates on 3 March 2016, Secretary Richardson said:</p> <p><i>“We have consistently advised government that it was highly unlikely that the first of the Future Submarines could be delivered by 2026 and that an extension of life for the Collins class submarine would almost certainly be required.”</i></p> <p>Did Defence ever provide advice to the Abbott Government – notwithstanding the potential for increased risk, cost and/or schedule slippage – that the first of the Future Submarines could potentially be delivered in the 2020s?</p>	Written	Defence	22/09/16	13/10/16
177	Conroy	Future Submarines – Competitive Evaluation Process and Submarine Requirement	<p>1. The 2016 Defence White Paper confirms that Australia will acquire 12 Future Submarines.</p> <p>a. On what date were the participants in the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process advised that the build would be for 12 submarines?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>b. What was the baseline requirement for the number of submarines that participants were asked to meet when the Competitive Evaluation Process commenced last year?</p> <p>i. Has this requirement changed at any point and, if so, when?</p> <p>2. It was revealed during Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016 that Defence had changed the contractual terms for the participants in the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process through the issuing of a Data Item Description – a DID.</p> <p>In response to Senator Xenophon’s questioning during Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Rear Admiral Sammut said:</p> <p><i>“We have asked for more information and we put that out in the form of a DID, yes.”</i></p> <p>a. Why was the DID issued?</p> <p>b. What additional information was requested from the participants?</p> <p>c. Was it the case that one of the participants did not meet the original requirements of the Competitive Evaluation Process? If so, which participant was it?</p> <p>d. Have any further DIDs been issued in addition to the one revealed during Additional Estimates on 10 February? If so, when and what did they pertain to?</p>				
178	Conroy	Future Submarines – Design and	The Government has said that the outcomes of the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process will be announced in 2016. Page 89 of the Integrated Investment Program lists	Written	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

		Construction	<p><i>“Future Submarine Program – Design and Construction”</i> as commencing in 2018.</p> <p>a. Given the results of the Competitive Evaluation Process will be announced in 2016, why does the ‘Design and Construction’ phase not commence until 2018?</p> <p>b. What will occur between the Competitive Evaluation Process announcement in 2016 and the start of the ‘Design and Construction’ phase in 2018?</p>				
179	Conroy	Future Submarines – Rolling Acquisition Program	<p>Paragraph 4.28 of the Defence White Paper states in part that:</p> <p><i>“... the Government has decided to implement a rolling acquisition program for Australia’s submarine fleet”.</i></p> <p>a. Can Defence please explain what a ‘rolling acquisition program’ involves?</p> <p>b. How does a ‘rolling acquisition program’ differ from a ‘continuous build’ program?</p> <p>c. What implications will a ‘rolling acquisition program’ have for the Future Submarine contract? How will it be structured?</p> <p>d. Under the ‘rolling acquisition program’, will Government place an order for 12 submarines – or will the submarines be purchased in smaller, separate batches?</p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16
180	Conroy	Future Submarines – Rolling Acquisition Program -	<p>Paragraph 4.29 of the Defence White Paper states in part that:</p> <p><i>“As part of the rolling acquisition program, a review based on strategic circumstances at the time, and developments in submarine technology, will be conducted in the late 2020s to</i></p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		Review	<p><i>consider whether the configuration of the submarines remains suitable or whether consideration of other specifications should commence”.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Could Defence please expand on the purpose of this review? b. Will the review of the “<i>configuration of the submarines</i>” extend to fundamental elements such as hull design – or will it be limited to systems and sensors? c. Under this approach, could Australia end up with a fleet comprising different variants of Future Submarine? d. What impact does Defence assess this approach might have on sustainment and training? Does it have the potential to increase cost and complexity by having different variants of the Future Submarines? e. If the review finds that the configuration should be changed or updated, would those changes be integrated into the first submarine of the fleet or would they be integrated in later ‘batches’ of the submarines? 				
181	Conroy	Defence Industry Programs	1. Can Defence please detail the 35 defence industry programs that were cancelled and/or redirected as part of the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement to fund new initiatives?	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
182	Conroy	Centre for Defence Industry Capability	1. According to the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement, the Centre for Defence Industry Capability is funded at \$23 million per year “ <i>which will be redirected from existing defence industry programs funding</i> ”. Can Defence please advise which existing programs have been cancelled and/or redirected to fund the Centre for Defence Industry	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Capability?</p> <p>2. Can Defence please explain how the Centre for Defence Industry Capability represents a change in activity or scope of work in the Defence industry space?</p> <p>a) How has the ‘Australian Industry Capability’ program changed?</p> <p>b) How has the ‘Global Supply Chain’ program changed?</p>				
183	Conroy	Fundamental Inputs to Capability – Defence Industry	<p>With respect to the recognition of Defence industry as a Fundamental Input to Capability, does Defence have any plans to map the scale and capabilities of Defence industry across Australia?</p> <p>a) Who will be conducting this activity?</p> <p>b) How much will this cost?</p> <p>c) How will the work remain up-to-date rather than static into the future?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
184	Conroy	Integrated Investment Program	<p>With respect to the 2016 Integrated Investment Program, can Defence please explain:</p> <p>a) What strategies Defence is committed to so that it remains a ‘smart customer’?</p> <p>b) How such a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) heavy acquisition program works to promote Australian defence industry or realise the objective of self-reliance?</p> <p>c) How this FMS heavy acquisition program works to support Australian research and development?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) What steps Defence is taking to promote a stronger exchange of personnel between itself and Defence industry? e) What steps the Services are taking in enabling men and women in uniform to transition between Defence and industry? f) Why the Integrated Investment Plan provides none of the level of programmatic that industry has seen previously? g) Why the Integrated Investment Plan uses inflation adjusted figures in its cost estimates? h) What is intended regarding an online ‘Defence Capability Guide’ to be published by the VCDF – and when it will be published? i) What will be the difference between the Defence Capability Guide and the Integrated Investment Plan? 				
185	Conroy	Defence Industry Policy Statements – Culture and Processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 30 of the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement talks about changed culture and processes and declares that “Defence will change its culture and business processes” and it will “systemically remove barriers to innovation”. Could Defence please explain what these statements mean in practical terms? 2. Some commentators have observed that the leadership of Australian Defence Industry and the leadership of Defence are aligned in their thinking regarding developing deep partnerships between defence and industry, and that the real adversary to this policy is found in the ranks of middle-management in CASG. How does Defence respond to this observation? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

186	Conroy	Integrated Investment Program – Explosive Ordnance Facilities and Munitions	<p>Page 61 of the Integrated Investment Program refers to \$300-\$400 million that will be spent on Explosive Ordnance Facilities and Munitions between 2017 and 2027.</p> <p>a) With reference to Figure 4.1 of ANAO Report No. 26 of 2015-16 (<i>Defence's Management of the Mulwala Propellant Facility</i>), can Defence please advise what proportion of ADF demand for propellant is met by the Mulwala and Benalla production?</p> <p>b) Can Defence please advise what proportion of ADF demand for munitions is met by the Mulwala and Benalla production, including but not limited to the following lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9mm; ▪ 5.56mm; ▪ 12.7mm MP; ▪ AP/APIT; ▪ 20mm; ▪ 25mm; ▪ 30mm; ▪ 40mm; ▪ 81mm; ▪ 155mm; ▪ Renewed Grenades; and ▪ Others. <p>c) Can Defence please advise which production lines of ammunition and munitions are not produced at the Mulwala and Benalla production facilities and, as a consequence, must be purchased from elsewhere?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From where are they purchased and what is the value of these purchases? ▪ What are the barriers to this demand being satisfied 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
-----	--------	---	--	---------	---------	----------	----------

			<p>by the Mulwala and Benalla production facilities?</p> <p>d) Has Defence undertaken any strategic study into its ammunition and munitions requirements? Please provide details of dates, authors and a summary of any conclusions reached.</p> <p>e) Has Defence considered how it might promote the long term sustainability of the Mulwala and Benalla production sites by either expanding the product range, or the volumes, of munitions produced at these facilities?</p> <p>f) Does Defence, with respect to the Major Munitions Contract (MMC), have a policy objective of promoting additional product lines at Mulwala and Benalla to satisfy ADF demand, or is it considering Direct Contractor Supply (DCS) or Foreign Military Sales (FMS)?</p>				
187	Conroy	Defence Budget – Percentage of GDP	<p>1. Did the medium-term projections of the Budget that were published in the 2015-16 Budget include the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24?</p> <p>2. Did the medium-term projections of the Budget that were published in the 2015-16 MYEFO include the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24? Or did the medium-term projections in the 2015-16 MYEFO reflect the outcomes in the Defence White Paper (2 per cent of GDP in 2020-21)?</p> <p>3. Can Defence confirm that the additional expenditure required to achieve Defence spending of 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24 – or 2020-21, if it had been assumed in the 2015-16 MYEFO – was already built into the medium-term projections in the Budget? That is, already accounted for in the Budget bottom line going forward?</p> <p>a) <u>If YES</u>: Given that the additional expenditure had already been built into the medium-term</p>	Written	Defence	22/09/16	13/10/16

			<p>projections, can Defence explain how much of the \$29.9 billion is actually new funding? Can Defence provide a profile of this 'new' funding, year-by-year, over the forward estimates and the medium-term to 2025-26?</p> <p>b) <u>If NO</u>: Can Defence explain how the medium-term projections reflected the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP, but that it was not accounted for in the Budget bottom line?</p> <p>4. Given that Defence spending will reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2020-21, which is three years earlier than was originally committed to, what factors have allowed for this to occur earlier? For example, did the change to the rate of economic growth over the medium term from 3.5 per cent to 3 per cent mean that it would be easier to reach the 2 per cent of GDP level?</p> <p>5. When was the decision made to bring forward the date at which 2 per cent of GDP was reached in terms of Defence spending?</p> <p>6. When was the decision made to decouple Defence funding from the percentage of GDP concept?</p> <p>7. What factors, apart from Government policy decisions to change the funding profile for Defence, could act to either increase or decrease Defence funding?</p> <p>8. Can Defence please detail what percentage of GDP that Defence spending will be equal to in each of the following years: 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26?</p> <p>9. Will the increased expenditure change the 2015-16 MYEFO projection for the budget returning to surplus in 2020-21?</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>10. Will the increased expenditure change the 2015-16 MYEFO medium-term budget projections, which had the budget in surplus to the level of 0.2 per cent of GDP in 2021-22, then 0.4 per cent of GDP in 2022-23, and then returning back to 0.2 per cent of GDP in 2025-26?</p> <p>11. If all of this funding is ‘new funding’ or ‘new expenditure’, has it been subject to the Government’s fiscal strategy which is outlined on page 18 of the 2015-16 MYEFO, which states that <i>“new spending measures will be more than offset by reductions in spending elsewhere in the budget”</i>?</p> <p>a) <u>If YES</u>: Does this mean that there are more than \$29.9 billion in cuts to spending as a result?</p> <p>b) <u>If NO</u>: Why has this spending been exempt from the Government’s fiscal strategy?</p>				
188	Conroy	Defence Budget – External Cost Assurance	<p>1. Page 178 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“Collectively, around 80 per cent of the Defence budget has been externally cost assured by private sector experts, with the remaining budget subject to internal cost analysis and assurance.”</i></p> <p>Can Defence please outline which elements of the Defence Budget comprised the “around 80 per cent” that was “externally cost assured by private sector experts”?</p> <p>a) Please detail who these private sector experts were.</p> <p>b) Were these private sector experts paid to conduct this cost assurance? If so, what was the cost?</p> <p>c) When did they commence this cost assurance?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) When did they complete the cost assurance? e) Were they given a reference to cost assure all of the Defence Budget? f) What factors led to the fact that they could not cost assure around 20 per cent of the Defence Budget? <p>2. Which elements of the Defence Budget comprised the around 20 per cent that was not externally cost assured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Who conducted the internal cost analysis and assurance? b) What proportion of the sustainment budget was externally cost assured? c) What is the 20 per cent that was not externally cost assured made up of? d) Why could this 20 per cent expenditure not also be externally cost assured? 				
189	Conroy	Defence Budget – Department of Finance	<p>1. As part of the formulation of the new Defence budget, as well as costings for the capability investments that are detailed in the Defence Integrated Investment Program, was the Department of Finance involved in any of the work in relation to this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Did Finance agree to the costings for the capability investments detailed in the Defence Integrated Investment Program? If not, why not? 	Written	Defence	29/09/16	13/10/16

			2. Can Defence please explain why there is \$700 million in additional expenditure (excluding operations) in 2016-17 but then nothing in 2017-18?				
190	Conroy	Defence Budget – New and Approved Programs	<p>In the Defence Integrated Investment Program document, there are graphs which show the indicative acquisition windows of key approved and new programs (pages 27, 39, 65, 77, 93 and 105).</p> <p>a) Can Defence please provide the details of the estimated expenditure, year-by-year, for each of the items listed there, including funding profiles and the indicative start and end dates for each?</p> <p>b) Where relevant, can Defence please provide details of when individual platforms would be acquired for each of the items?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
191	Conroy	Defence Budget - Defence Industry Policy Statement	<p>In the Defence Industry Policy Statement, there are three particular initiatives that are funded – the Centre for Defence Industry Capability, the Defence Innovation Hub, and the Next Generation Technologies Fund.</p> <p>a) Can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure for each of these initiatives, year-by-year, through to 2025-26?</p> <p>b) Can Defence please outline how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives?</p> <p>c) Specifically for the Centre for Defence Industry Capability initiative, can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure, year-by-year, through to 2025-26 for the following elements and sub-elements, and identify how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives:</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Industry Development Stream ▪ Australian Industry Capability facilitation function ▪ Delivery model of skilling programs, including the “Skilling Australia’s Defence Industry” program ▪ Defence Engineering Internship Program ▪ Schools Pathway Program ▪ F1 in Schools/Subs in Schools ▪ Defence Industrial Capability Plan ▪ Defence Innovation Portal ▪ Business Competitiveness and Exports • Global Supply Chain Program • Team Defence Australia <p>d) Specifically for the Defence Innovation Hub initiative, can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure, year-by-year, through to 2025-26 for the following elements and sub-elements, and identify how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capability Technology Demonstrator ▪ Rapid Prototyping Development and Evaluation ▪ Defence Innovation Realisation Fund ▪ Priority Industry Capability Development Fund ▪ Chief Information Officer Innovation Program ▪ Defence Materials Technology Centre 				
192	Conroy	South China Sea	<p>Paragraph 3.9 of the Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“Our third Strategic Defence Interest is in a stable Indo-Pacific</i></p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16

			<p><i>region and rules-based global order which supports Australia's interests. The Indo-Pacific includes North Asia, the South China Sea and the extensive sea lines of communication in the Indian and Pacific Oceans that support Australian trade. A stable rules-based regional order is critical to ensuring Australia's access to an open, free and secure trading system and minimising the risk of coercion and instability that would directly affect Australia's interests. A stable rules-based global order serves to deal with threats before they become existential threats to Australia, and enables our unfettered access to trading routes, secure communications and transport to support Australia's economic development."</i></p> <p>a. Does Defence consider that China's recent actions in the South China Sea – including land reclamation and militarisation of maritime features – represent a challenge to a stable rules-based regional order in the Indo-Pacific region?</p> <p>b. Does Defence consider that China's recent actions in the South China Sea – including land reclamation and militarisation of maritime features – are contrary to the third Strategic Defence Interest identified in the Defence White Paper?</p>				
193	Conroy	Defence White Paper - APS Workforce	<p>1. Paragraph 6.59 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>"Defence will develop a 10-year Strategic Workforce Plan in 2016. The Strategic Workforce Plan will set out the skills Defence needs and detail how Defence will attract, retain and develop its people."</i></p> <p>a) What is the status of the Strategic Workforce Plan?</p> <p>b) When will the Strategic Workforce Plan be finalised?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will it be publically released? If not, why not? Will it be a classified document? Will the entire plan be classified? <p>2. The Australian Public Service ‘Skills Census’ is currently under way in Defence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the Skills Census a part of the Strategic Workforce Plan, or is this a separate process? b) Has the Skills Census begun? What is the timeframe for completing the Skills Census? c) Was there any consideration given to completing this Skills Census and Strategic Workforce Plan before the Defence White Paper was completed – so that these documents could feed into the 2016 Defence White Paper? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why didn’t this happen? <p>3. Paragraph 6.16 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“The Defence White Paper provides for a future Australian Public Service (APS) workforce of around 18,200 Full Time Staff Equivalent (FTE), down from 22,300 FTE in June 2012.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the current Full Time Staff Equivalent of the Department? b) Given both the Strategic Workforce Plan and the Skills Census are yet to be completed, how was the figure of 18,200 FTE decided on? 				
194	Conroy	Defence White Paper -APS	Paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 of the 2016 Defence White Paper state:	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		Workforce – Priority Positions	<p><i>“Within this total workforce of around 18,200 FTE, enhancements to intelligence, space and cyber security capabilities will involve 800 new APS positions.”</i></p> <p><i>“These new APS positions in areas of high priority will be offset by ongoing reductions elsewhere in the APS workforce.”</i></p> <p>a) In what areas will the ongoing reductions occur?</p> <p>b) Over what timeframe will the ongoing reductions occur?</p> <p>c) Is it the case that 800 new positions are being created, and 800 will be lost through ‘ongoing reductions’?</p> <p>d) How many individual staff who are currently employed in the positions that will be lost does Defence estimate will be able to transfer across to the new ‘higher priority’ positions?</p> <p>e) How many ‘separations’ – that is, job losses – does Defence expect as a result of this process, including resignations, retirements, redundancies (both forced and voluntary) and sackings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Over what timeframe will these separations occur? ▪ In what areas will these separations occur? 				
195	Conroy	Defence White Paper -Enterprise Agreement – Staff Retention	<p>Paragraph 6.33 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“We will continue to ensure that the employment offers to Defence staff remain competitive to attract and retain the right number of people with the right skills Defence requires.”</i></p> <p>Earlier this month staff in Defence rejected the proposed Defence</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>Enterprise Agreement 2016-2019.</p> <p>a) Does Defence agree that there is a disconnect between, on the one hand, making a commitment in the White Paper to retain staff through attractive employment offers, and on the other hand, not coming to the table with an enterprise agreement that Defence staff are willing to accept?</p> <p>b) Given this commitment in the Defence White Paper, what changes will be made to the proposed agreement and negotiating process to ensure that the Defence Enterprise Agreement 2016-2019 does attract and retain staff?</p>				
196	Conroy	Defence White Paper -ADF Workforce - Reallocations	<p>Paragraph 6.8 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“The transition to the future force will require the reallocation of around 2,300 existing ADF positions to higher priority activities.”</i></p> <p>a) Where will these positions be reallocated from?</p> <p>b) What will be the process for deciding where these positions will be reallocated from?</p> <p>c) Over what timeframe will these reallocations occur?</p>	Written	Defence	14/09/16	15/09/16
197	Conroy	Defence White Paper - Recruitment Strategies – Submariners	<p>Paragraph 6.9 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“The larger maritime and anti-submarine force will require an increase of around 800 ADF positions, with further growth beyond the decade to operate the larger submarine fleet in particular”</i></p> <p>a) Can Defence please provide any more detail about the</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>recruitment strategies to meet this goal?</p> <p>b) When does Defence expect to reach this goal of 800 new positions?</p> <p>c) How does Defence intend to retain these additional 800 positions given historical challenges with retention, particularly for the submarine force?</p>				
198	Conroy	Defence White Paper -Defence Budget – Personnel	<p>1. Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that the proportion of Defence budget allocated to personnel will reduce from 37 to 26 per cent.</p> <p>a) What is the rationale behind this decrease?</p> <p>b) What modelling was this based on and who did it?</p> <p>c) How will this decrease be achieved?</p> <p>2. Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper also states that Defence operating costs will remain at 7 to 9 per cent of the Defence Budget. What modelling is this based on and who conducted the modelling?</p> <p>3. Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper also states that the proportion of the Defence budget allocated to sustainment will increase from 25 to 28 per cent. What modelling is this based on and who conducted the modelling?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
199	Conroy	Defence White Paper -Defence Estate	<p>Paragraph 7.32 of the 2016 Defence White Paper discusses Estate Rationalisation and says it will be considered on a ‘case by case basis.’</p> <p>a) Is any part of the Defence estate currently being considered for sale?</p>	Written	Defence	17/10/16	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>If YES</u>: What are the sites/bases/assets and what is the timeframe? ii. <u>If NO</u>: Can Defence confirm there is currently no consideration of the sale of any part or parts of the Defence estate? 				
200	Conroy	Defence White Paper - Defence Enablers – Single Service Delivery System	<p>Paragraph 7.31 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to Defence enablers such as information management and the Defence estate being fully integrated within a single Defence service delivery system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What does this integration involve? b) Where is this process up to? c) Do you anticipate that this integration will result in job losses, including for staff employed by contractors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>If YES</u>: How many, from where and over what timeframe? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
201	Conroy	Defence White Paper -Defence Workforce – Job Consolidation	<p>2. Paragraph 7.36 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that Defence will further consolidate its other enabling corporate services such as finance, human resource management and administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many job losses does Defence envisage this further consolidation will lead to – both in terms of civilian jobs and contractors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. For APS job losses, what level(s) will they occur at? ii. What is Defence’s estimated breakdown of part-time and full-time job losses? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Where will these job losses occur in terms of geographical location(s)? iv. Will voluntary redundancies be offered? v. If not enough voluntary redundancies are taken, will there be forced redundancies? vi. <u>If NO jobs losses are anticipated:</u> How will the consolidation work occur without job losses? 				
202	Conroy	Defence White Paper -One Defence Behavioural Model	<p>Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to the implementation of the One Defence Behavioural Model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What does the One Defence Behavioural Model strive to achieve? b) Can Defence please provide an update on its implementation? c) Has the new performance management system been implemented yet? d) Will all Defence personnel be managed under this new performance management system – both military and civilian? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
203	Conroy	Defence White Paper - Performance Management System	<p>1. Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states:</p> <p><i>“Defence will institute a performance management system that links employees’ roles and actions to Defence’s goals and deliverables.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In practical terms, what will this actually mean for Defence staff – both APS and ADF? 	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			2. Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to “ <i>improved performance measures</i> ”. What will these measures be?				
204	Conroy	Defence White Paper - First Principles Review – Defence Committees	<p>Paragraph 7.17 of the 2016 Defence White Paper commits to reducing the number of Defence committees.</p> <p>a) Has this process begun?</p> <p>i. <u>If YES:</u> Which committees have been eliminated so far?</p> <p>b) What is the timeframe for this process?</p> <p>c) Which committees will be eliminated?</p> <p>d) What is the process for determining which committees will be eliminated?</p> <p>e) What process is being put in place to ensure that as the number of committees reduces, the gender balance across committee membership improves?</p>	Written	Defence	26/04/16	04/05/16
205	Conroy	Defence White Paper - Future Force Design	<p>Paragraph 7.20 of the 2016 Defence White Paper commits to establishing a permanent future force design function.</p> <p>a) What will be the role of future force design function?</p> <p>b) What will be the composition of the future force design function – both in terms of staff and other resources?</p> <p>c) What is the timeframe for establishing the future force design function?</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16
206	Conroy	Defence White Paper – Contestability	1. Paragraph 7.21 of the 2016 Defence White Paper outlines a new internal contestability function.	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

		Function and Quality of Advice	<p>a) Can Defence please provide more detail about the contestability function? For example, what does it mean, and for who?</p> <p>b) Does this function exist yet, and if not, what is the timeframe for implementation?</p> <p>2. Paragraph 7.23 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that Defence will improve the strategy and policy advice to Government.</p> <p>a) How would Defence describe the current quality of the advice to Government?</p> <p>b) What aspects of the current level of advice need improving?</p> <p>c) Has there been a particular piece of advice that has been deemed sub-standard?</p> <p>d) How did this particular statement in the 2016 Defence White Paper come about?</p>				
207	Conroy	Staff Transition – DMO to CASG	<p>Can Defence please provide an overview of how the transition from DMO to CASG is progressing?</p> <p>a) How many or what percentage of DMO staff are now working in CASG?</p> <p>b) Of the DMO staff who are not now working in CASG, how many are elsewhere in the Department of Defence, and how many have left the Department altogether?</p> <p>c) What were the roles of those staff who have left Defence?</p> <p>d) What was the breakdown of part-time and full</p>	Written	Defence	03/05/16	04/05/16

			<p>time, and what level were they?</p> <p>e) Of those staff who have left Defence, can Defence please break down that figure into numbers of resignations, retirements, redundancies and sackings?</p> <p>i. Of the redundancies, how many of these received a redundancy package?</p> <p>ii. Of these redundancies, how many were voluntary?</p> <p>iii. If there were any non-voluntary redundancies, what were the circumstances surrounding those?</p> <p>iv. Of the retirements, did anyone receive an ‘incentive to retire’ payment? If so, what were the circumstances surrounding the decision to make those payments?</p> <p>v. If there were sackings, were they on grounds of misconduct or incompetence? Can Defence please provide details of the circumstances surrounding these?</p> <p>f) Have any contractors or non-ongoing staff within DMO had their contracts terminated in the transition to CASG? If so, how many?</p> <p>i. Were any contracts ended or terminated earlier than specified in the contract?</p>				
208	Conroy	Defence White Paper –	Paragraph 7.39 of the 2016 Defence White Paper outlines reporting on the implementation of the First Principles Review,	Written	Defence	17/10/16	

		<p>Minister's Reports to NSC</p>	<p>including that the Minister will make annual reports on the progress of the implementation to the National Security Committee of Cabinet.</p> <p>a) Has the first of these annual reports occurred yet?</p> <p> i. <u>If YES</u>: When did it occur?</p> <p> ii. <u>If NO</u>: When is it due to occur?</p> <p>b) Is any aspect of the reporting on the implementation going to be made public, including the Minister's annual reports and/or the regular reports of the Oversight Board?</p> <p> iii. <u>If NO</u>: Is this because this reporting is classified? If so, which parts are expected to be classified?</p>				
--	--	----------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--