

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—BUDGET ESTIMATES, 1-2 JUNE 2015
Department of Defence

Q No.	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Proof Hansard, page & hearing date or Written Q	Date rec'd	Date tabled
1.	Defence	Fawcett	Unfunded Liability for remediation of infrastructure	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Can you take that on notice as something to provide ahead of the next estimates period? A related question then is, over a number of years, I have been chasing a figure to try and identify what is the total unfunded liability for remediation of infrastructure and other areas. Finally, about a year ago, you came back to me with a figure of around \$16 billion, which indicates it has been a hell of a drought for Defence and there has been a lot of shifting and carrying of liability. What I am interested to know now, though, is: are we closing that and how much of that has been caught up? As we move into future years, I think this committee has a role to have an oversight of what is our unfunded liability. Are we closing the gap? Do we need to be speaking with the executive to make sure that funding is made available for those things that are critical? We have discussed fuel farms and things as a case in point previously.</p> <p>Mr Prior: That is correct. As I say, this white paper process is the process where the government of the day, as it has done in the past, has a look at the liability, has a look at the funds available and then makes some judgements about how much of that liability to fund and makes that document ultimately available to parliament and to the public.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Again, can I put on notice then that you come back to us prior to each estimates with an update of that unfunded liability so that we can actually monitor where that is at? Sixteen billion dollars was completely invisible to the public and to the parliament until one year ago, and I do not find that an acceptable state of play, knowing that that impacts on the effectiveness and productivity of the defence capability.</p> <p>Mr Prior: Certainly. We will have a look at that.</p>	Day 1 p.12	12/10/15	15/10/15
2.	Defence	Conroy	Air-to-air refuelling Iraq	<p>Senator CONROY: Regarding air-to-air refuelling tankers, how many air-to-air refuel missions have taken place in Iraq?</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: I will get that in a second, but they have flown over 2,000 hours.</p>	Day 1 p.17	13/07/15	13/08/15

3.	Defence	Conroy	Vetting Iraqi participants	<p>Senator CONROY: So is the ADF vetting the Iraqi participants in the training to mitigate this risk?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I will need to get back to you on the exact details of screening, but there is some screening. I do not want to mislead so I will get some details.</p>	Day 1 p.18	15/07/15	13/08/15
----	---------	--------	----------------------------	---	------------	----------	----------

4.	Defence	Xenophon	Mr Rex Patrick	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Vice Admiral Barrett, I ask these questions in the context of the first principles review and the issue of contestability, which I think is pretty fundamental and core to Defence. I think that that is itself not contestable: contestability is important. I want to continue my discussions about Navy governance and the Rex Patrick matter. Mr Patrick at this stage would rather these matters be pursued through this forum, because he is concerned about issues of principle. At the last estimates you stated:</p> <p>At the time of that discussion, there was an article that Mr Patrick wrote and the question that was discussed at the time was whether someone who was in an employable situation as a contractor would be under the same constraints as one of our own—a sailor, for instance—who may choose to make comment adverse to the service ... There was an ensuing discussion as to whether we actually had an obligation to review contractors saying those things ... What you see in the subsequent reports and responses to Senate estimates was when we came to the conclusion that that was not a path that we could or should take.</p> <p>I asked you on notice: 'On what date did Defence conclude that that was not a path we could or should take?'. You answered that the view was formed over a period of time, not a specific day. I have gone through the file. It is unclear to me as to when, if ever, that view was formed. A number of events transpired in respect of the period between when Mr Patrick wrote an article about Defence's poor estimation of submarine sustainment costs and the point at which the decision not to renew his contract was made. Can you direct me to the period when his media commentary and his ongoing work with Defence were in fact unrelated? There is an assertion that he said things in the media and it had nothing to do with his losing his contract. I cannot see that. There seems to have been a clear linkage for quite some period of time, on the documents.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: Mr Patrick did not lose his contract. The contract ran full term and was extended, I think, twice. It finished. It simply expired because the contract was no longer valid.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: We will look at that, because I do not know whether that answer will suffice in the context of other matters that were raised. Let us go through this systematically. On 15 December you, Vice Admiral Barrett, wrote an email entitled 'Media commentary' to Commodore Noonan stating, in part: 'Last week at both watches'—'at BW': both watches—'we discussed media commentary made by Mr Rex Patrick on submarines. I asked that we confirm his status as an ongoing Defence contractor ... He has made further comment today. If still employed as a contractor to Defence, then his media commentary is in conflict and will have breached his contract.' It goes on to say: '... if it does, Navy's view is that his contract be terminated.'</p> <p>Do you agree that you wrote that email?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: I do not have it before me but I am presuming—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Could you take that on notice? This is based on the briefing material that—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: Yes—and some of the other information that was provided. The concern—and I did relay this at the last estimates—was that</p>	Day 1 p.21	15/07/15	13/08/15
----	---------	----------	----------------	--	------------	----------	----------

				they contractor or even one of our own sailors, would be free to make comment in public whilst they were either working for or working in Defence.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5.	Defence	Conroy	Locally engaged staff Afghanistan	<p>Senator CONROY: Okay, I will move on. In light of the situation in Uruzgan, I would appreciate an update on Australia's lately engaged employee program for Afghans at threat due to their association with the Australian forces—which is where I would have thought you would have had a more ongoing brief to be across this specific problem, which I know you are genuinely concerned about and would be following. Could you outline how the program is administered? I assume the immigration department is responsible for the program but that defence provides advice to inform the consideration of applications by Afghans that were employed by defence.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That is right. Scott Dewar can answer in more detail.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Can you please confirm how many applications defence has been asked to consider since the program began?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Under the policy to date, more than 600 Afghan nationals—locally engaged employees and their families—have been resettled in Australia.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could you give us a breakdown of this figure year by year? I am happy for that to be taken on notice.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Understood. How many applications have been finalised?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: The 600 figure is the figure we speak about publicly. We are very careful about speaking beyond that because of—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am asking how many have been finalised.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: The 600 people have been resettled in Australia.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Oh, 600 have been completed.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Correct.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What I asked was how many applications defence has been asked to consider since the program began. So you have resettled all of those who made an application?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: No, that is not the case. There have been some—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So back to my question: how many applications have you been asked to consider since the program began?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We will need to take that on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.26	13/07/15	13/08/15
----	---------	--------	-----------------------------------	---	------------	----------	----------

			<p>Senator CONROY: I thought Mr Dewar was searching for the number in his notes, which I am sure he has.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: No, we do not have that number in our notes. We are very cautious about speaking about this program publicly and the scale of it simply because of the security risk that it could pose to people who—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I appreciate that point and will do my best to be sensitive. So you can confirm there are applications that are outstanding at the moment?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Yes, the program is ongoing.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Can you confirm if any applicants or their families have been harmed or killed while their application was under consideration?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I do not want to discuss any individual application—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I did not ask for an individual; I am just asking in general whether any family members or applicants been killed while the assessment process has been underway?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I understand the question, but I do not want to speak about—that leads us down the path towards specifics about particular cases.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I was not going to ask any further questions.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I would rather leave my answer at the program is ongoing and we have settled around 600 people.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Mr Richardson, is it possible for us to get a briefing away from the committee on this program? I am particularly concerned, given the advances of the—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will seek advice on that, and I can assure you that we will give you as much as we possibly can. If we can give you specific answers, we will give you specific answers.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am not interested in individual cases, I am just—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I understand.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am very concerned by the reports that the Taliban are making ground, particularly in an area where we had a significant presence. I am particularly concerned to ensure the safety of any and all concerned. I appreciate that and, hopefully, the government, Senator Brandis, will be able to facilitate a discussion for Mr Richardson and Mr Dewar to give us an update.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

6.	Defence	Lambie	Transgender surgery	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I am interested in learning more about the process, support and care that the Australian Defence Force gives to those members who choose to change gender. You will be aware that there is a high-profile example which has generated a lot of public debate and interest both inside and outside Defence. How many serving members of the military to date have changed their sex from male to female or vice versa?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: My understanding is the transgender population in the ADF is 18. If that is an incorrect number, I will get that to you on notice, but that is my understanding.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Thank you. What is the average cost of this process, and who is responsible for paying for this process?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Ms Skinner might have that answer, or we might take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: No, we will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. What is the average time it takes to undergo the transgender transformation, and what medical management is required?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We will need to take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: When it comes to the completion of this transformation, are they still fully combat ready, or are they medically downgraded?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I do not have any information. I will take that on notice.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: You can see where I am coming from in relation to the double standards and also the rank. When you provide those answers to me, could you break them down into whether they are non-commissioned officers or officers that requested that transgender transformation.</p>	Day 1 p.29	15/07/15	13/08/15
----	---------	--------	---------------------	--	------------	----------	----------

7.	Defence	Lambie	SGT Michael Lyddiard	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. I bring to your attention the case of Michael Lyddiard, an Australian hero and combat engineer who was blown up in Afghanistan whilst trying to defuse an improvised explosive device. Michael, as most in the room will be aware, lost his right eye, part of his right arm, two fingers from his left hand, part of his hearing—and the list goes on. Most will also know that Michael alleges the military did not act in his best interests and that three years after the explosion he received an official email advising him that there was 'no requirement for Sergeant Lyddiard to be promoted to warrant officer.' That email was followed by a medical discharge notice in October 2011 that advised him to identify a new career outside Defence.</p> <p>Michael Lyddiard is quoted as saying: All I wanted to do was my 20 years and to become a Warrant Officer. I could have worked on as an instructor, but they just refused to listen to me and ignored my best interests. My treatment by the army was worse than my injuries. I believed in loyalty and then I got the email and it destroyed me.</p> <p>Was Sergeant Michael Lyddiard given the same level of consideration and medical care by the Australian Army as an officer who wanted to change their sex? That is the question I would like answered.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I am aware of this case in general terms. I am also aware that there is currently correspondence that is in the process of being answered through the ministerial process. My understanding is that he was given full treatment and care, but I do not have the exact specifics of his case. I am not sure of the Chief of Army has any more detail.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell : I do not have any further detail. I am, like you, interested, having seen some media reporting, and have asked questions on that issue within Army. I would be confident in saying that medical needs for persons are appropriately provided to the need. You are indicating gender reassignment versus physical casualty from war. In both cases, our desire is that appropriate medical care is provided.</p>	Day 1 p.30	15/07/15	13/08/15
----	---------	--------	----------------------	---	------------	----------	----------

8.	Defence	Conroy	Competitive Evaluation Process	<p>Senator CONROY: Mr Richardson has an excellent memory, Senator, except when it comes to who else he talks to! In what form or format did Defence provide its formal advice to government recommending a competitive evaluation process? We have established that it was not in writing; it was just your advice to the government verbally.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: As far as I am aware, in discussions. I am not aware of anything in writing, but I stand to be corrected on that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: For the purposes of transparency, could you give us, if you discover it, the title, reference number and/or transmission details of this advice and/or correspondence between Defence and government?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: If there is that advice in writing, we will provide that advice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: But you do not believe so.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I am not aware of it, but we will check.</p>	Day 1 p.32	14/09/15	17/09/15
9.	Defence	Xenophon	DART, rank of reported Service members	<p>Air Cdre Ehlers: We should please note that the definition of 'still serving' that the DART uses includes stand-by reservists—in other words, people who are not rendering active duty at the time. I am advised by the task force that the 151 have been broken down into 82 permanents, 31 reservists, 31 stand-by reservists—that is, those who are not active—and seven members of the Australian Public Service. So that is the 151.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: These are people who might have been with Defence and who are now with the APS?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Or, the allegation may have covered their behaviour as an APS person. The task force is not just open to members of the Australian Defence Force.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So there are 82 still-serving members who are regular members of the defence force?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Yes; as at the date of the referral to us.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you tell us what rank they go up to in the Air Force, the Navy and the Army?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I do not have that readily available. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you please take on notice what rank, but can you do it in a way that will not identify them, depending on their ranking.</p>	Day 1 p.38	03/08/15	13/08/15

10.	Defence	Xenophon	Reporting by serving members	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you tell how many of those there are? The feedback I get is that there are some serving members of Defence who are alleged victims, who are saying, 'I do not want this to go any further because it could affect my career.' There is a reluctance. Can you indicate how many of those who have not wanted it to go forward as complainants are still serving members?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I do not have that detail with me. You are correct that a number of victims of abuse, for various reasons—and as yet it has not been put to me personally that it is career issue—do not wish to pursue an investigation inquiry to deal with their matters. A number of complainants have talked to us, for example, in the highly successful restorative engagement program. For a victim to have their situation acknowledged by Defence through an apology and a conversation is very powerful thing. Many have never told their story, so having that come forward and having that acknowledged has been powerful. Many do not wish to pursue. I cannot have the precise numbers here for you, but we can take on notice a breakdown, noting that it is a very much evolving situation.</p>	Day 1 p.40	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	----------	------------------------------	---	------------	----------	----------

11.	Defence	MacDonald	Land 400	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: When you say that 'industry' wanted this, what do you mean by that term?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: There are a number of prime original equipment manufacturers, or prime systems integrators, that we are dealing with at the moment. We have had a number of meetings as a result of the tender release, to make sure that we are addressing any concerns that they have. We are regularly answering specific questions put to us in those sessions, and answering the questions that they put to the LAND 400 contact office as well.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: So, when you say there are a number of prime manufacturers, how many to be exact?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: We would not be too keen to go into the commercial details of the number of bids at the moment, but I can say that there are more than six or seven that have expressed interest.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: I am just wondering—the tender was to close at a certain time. By extending, do you favour one contractor over another? That is what I was getting at. I was not wanting you to be too specific. Was it all of the interested tenderers that asked for the extension? In which case, it seems to be fine.</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: Yes, they were. We had a number of queries for a much longer extension. The periods were canvassed with all of the major tenderers, and we hit upon a six week extension period which was agreed to by all of those consortia.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: All of the people you have been talking to?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: And the purpose was to see what Australian content you could get into the process?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: That was one of the requests; so that they could give us a more fulsome understanding of what they might offer up.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: What were the others then?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: Some of them wanted some additional time so that they could provide additional technical capabilities in terms of turret capacity and emerging technologies.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: And?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: I would have to take the full list of requests on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.43	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	-----------	----------	--	------------	----------	----------

12.	Defence	MacDonald	Contractors supporting LHD	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD: In discussions before on this subject, I have been told that one of the reasons for having the ships is Sydney is the ready availability of contractors and suppliers. On notice, would it be possible for you to give me a list of the types of contractors that might be envisaged to be called upon by the Navy to help with the maintenance of the LHDs over the coming years?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: Yes, I can do that. I note that the principal service support contract is maintained in a facility ashore, and we have modified the wharves to be able to do that. There are a number of other contractors that are used to support that prime contract—</p>	Day 1 p.44	28/07/15	13/08/15
13.	Defence	Conroy	Min Advice Members Expert Advisory Panel and TORs	<p>Senator CONROY: Thank you. I refer you to Defence's response to subquestion (10) of question on notice No. 35 for the Department of Defence on 25 February, which states: The expert advisory panel will be appointed by the Minister of Defence on consideration of candidates proposed by the Department of Defence. Has the department provided formal advice on candidates for appointment to the panel?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: When was that advice provided?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Was it in the last few days?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: No, it was more than a few days back.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: If anyone that is listening back in the department could assist us that would greatly assist the committee. What criteria did the department use when identifying potential candidates to be appointed to the expert advisory panel?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Has the department provided any advice to the government on the terms of reference for the expert advisory panel?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So we did consult Mr Gould and Mr Dunstall on that?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, we occasionally talk.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Only occasionally though, with beers! When was that advice provided?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I have not got a precise date, but it was a little bit back.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: In terms of a precise date, yes.</p>	Day 1 p.46-47	28/07/15	13/08/15

14.	Defence	Conroy	Mr Sean Costello appointment with DCNS	<p>Senator CONROY: When did the department become aware of Mr Costello's appointment with DCNS?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That I do not know.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Long before or just a few days before?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice. The reason I hesitate in answering that is that I will need to take on notice whether the department was advised as such, or whether it was individuals in the department who picked it up on the grapevine.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I understand the difference. During Mr Costello's tenure as chief of staff between June 2014 and January 2015, how many briefs, submissions or other pieces of formal advice did the department provide to the defence minister and his office with respect to the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: During Mr Costello's time as chief of staff, is it reasonable to assume that he would have been exposed to or have had access to, government documents, information or briefings on the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That is a fair assumption.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Without revealing the contents of any classified material, can you confirm whether any of these documents, information or briefings that Mr Costello was potentially exposed to, or had access to, were of a classified or sensitive nature?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Some certainly would have been classified.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Or sensitive? I am just trying to avoid a semantic game about, 'Well, you only asked about classified; this is sensitive.'</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Put it this way: I would put classified in the context of sensitive, by definition.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Can the department provide a manifest of the documents on the Future Submarine Project that were provided for the Minister of Defence and his office during Mr Costello's tenure as chief of staff? I am happy for that to be taken on notice.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice and some of those documents could very well be—some we may be able to, others we may not.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am not looking to go and work on the bid, it is okay.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Understood.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: No, but you will understand that, of course, those documents may answer the description of 'advice to government.'</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am just asking for the manifest, not the actual document.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: As Mr Richardson has said, we will take it on notice and consider whether a manifest would fall within the exclusion in relation to advice to government. These documents obviously have titles, for example.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I think the whole point of my question is: that is the point. Did Mr Costello accompany then Minister Johnston on any visit to domestic or foreign shipbuilders?</p>	Day 1 p.49-51	17/09/15	15/10/15
Defence Portfolio – Budget Estimates, 1-2 June 2015							13

			<p>Mr Richardson: Look, I think it is best if we take that on notice. I think he might have done, but I think rather than give you a definitive answer, we should take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I appreciate that. Did Mr Costello participate in any briefings given by the shipbuilders?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That I do not know.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: If he accompanied the minister, he probably sat in on their briefings, at a guess.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I am certainly aware of some visits simply involving a physical look around; other visits could involve a briefing. One does not automatically follow from the other.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: Nor is it the case, Senator, that just because a chief of staff accompanies a minister, they necessarily participate in all activities of the minister. I mean, they may, of course, but it does not invariably follow.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: No, that is why I am asking the question just to separate out the possibility. Was Mr Costello present during any discussions between then defence minister Johnston and French, German, Japanese or Swedish government representatives or commercial entities in which the future project was discussed?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So that is not on trips, that is just in general?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would like to turn to Mr Costello's current role as chief executive officer of DCNS Australia. In his current role, has Mr Costello had any meetings with officials from the Department of Defence, staff from the defence minister's office or with the Minister for Defence? I am happy for you to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Gould: He did participate in the meeting with DCNS, which was the clarification meeting, having issued and signed the contract. So strictly speaking, as part of the CEP and only with members of my own project, nobody else.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So he met, in his role as CEO of DCNS, with you and other colleagues?</p> <p>Mr Gould: Yes, but only members who are bound by the CEP process, nobody else—and with other officials and directors from DCNS.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So everyone who is inside the process, you met with?</p> <p>Mr Gould: That is right.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So it is not like one or two—there is probably a range of people from what you have described.</p> <p>Mr Gould: It is the people who are closely involved in the process and will continue to be until it finishes.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Senator CONROY: Could I find out when the interactions occurred, who attended and/or participated and what was the nature of these interactions—without breaching any confidences?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And could you please take on notice and provide a detailed list of all meetings between Mr Costello and the Department of Defence staff and the defence minister's office, or with the Minister for Defence also - thank you.</p>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

15.	Defence	Lambie	CDF remuneration	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Just about the CDF, could you verify that the Australian CDF is the highest paid officer in the world—yes or no?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I have no idea, Senator.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I very much doubt it, but maybe we could take that on notice. I do not know if we are—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Leaving aside formal pay rates, he certainly is not running companies on the side which bring him in millions of extra dollars, which a few other CDF's around the world do.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I am sure the PM is not either, but the PM is still paid a lot less.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: In any event, we will take that question on notice. I very much doubt that that is right.</p>	Day 1 p.58	30/07/15	13/08/15
16.	Defence	Xenophon	DART – serving members	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Could I just go to the Air Commodore. I am trying to establish whether there are serving members of the ADF who have been accused of sexual assault who are currently serving? Is that included in the 82 currently serving members of the ADF, who have been referred from the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce with a plausible allegation of sexual assault? We are talking about issues of sexual assault, including rape. Do the allegations relate to matters as serious as that in terms of the 82 currently serving members?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: It is not 82 cases of sexual assault.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: No, I did not say that; I said there are 82 serving members—because it was distinguished very helpfully—of the 151 those who are in the regular Defence Force. How many of those 82 individuals have been accused? I emphasise the word 'accused', after the Defence Abuse Response Task force forwarded these matters to the CDF of sexual assault?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Short answer to that is: yes. I have taken it on notice to give you a breakdown of the 151. I do not have that with me right now. As the acting chief said, we keep that information the closely held.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you at least let me know your numbers by the end of the day.</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I shall attempt to.</p>	Day 1 p.64	07/08/15	13/08/15

17.	Defence	Conroy	German representative - Subs	<p>Senator CONROY: Great. Who has represented the German side during these discussions?</p> <p>Mr Gould: It is the campaign leader from TKMS, the German submarine company, whose name I do recall. His name is Manfred Klein.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Just to confirm, TKMS is a corporate entity?</p> <p>Mr Gould: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What has been the nature of the consultations to date? The same—</p> <p>Mr Gould: Exactly the same as I described with the French.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You mentioned that you first went individually just after the 20th?</p> <p>Mr Gould: I can check the date for you, but it was after the 20th.</p>	Day 1 p.77	13/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------------	---	------------	----------	----------

18.	Defence	Ludlam	Global Change and Energy Sustainability	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Understood. Thank you for that. I might do a bit of follow-up once we have had the chance to review the document itself.</p> <p>Last February the then Chief of Army, Lieutenant General Morrison, stated that the impact of climate change needed to be factored into future military plans. You have also provided some quite useful responses to the questions on notice that I put on 16 March, so I am just going to put some follow-up questions to you. Are you aware of those matters?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I am happy to take the questions, but I am not aware of the specific questions on notice that have been replied to.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: On answers 2 and 3 I will just ask for some more information, if I could. You have let us know that in 2013 the secretary and CDF established the Global Change and Energy Sustainability Initiative. Could you tell us a little bit about that, please?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will pass to the vice chief, if he knows anything, but I do not know anything to tell you on that issue.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Have you ever heard of that initiative?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes, I have, but I do not know any detail to offer you.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I am happy for whoever feels most qualified to take it on.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Sure.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Like the Chief of Army, I have not got great detail, other than of course from my time as Chief of Navy: the biofuels initiative that we were working on with the US Navy and also the wave power generation pilot that is being conducted in Western Australia at the moment.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Which I am a big fan of.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: But I do not have any greater detail than those things that I have been involved with in the last few years.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could I just ask, because time is short, for any information you can provide to us on the Global Change and Energy Sustainability Initiative. What is in that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: It sounds pretty impressive. I will just read to you the answer to my question No. 3: 'The senior systems scientist for joint systems research working in the DSTO's Joint and Operations Analysis Division strategic analysis cell'—God help us if that has its own acronym—'has a specific work focus on generating potential scenarios including extreme weather events.' That was looking to what climate change does to the environments that the ADF works in. Can you provide us, on notice if you like, with what that is likely to generate, what that program of work is and what they are producing for you.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will take that on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.84	17/09/15	15/10/15
-----	---------	--------	---	---	------------	----------	----------

19.	Defence	Ludlam	ASD – PJCIS and telecommunication s legislation	<p>Senator LUDLAM: I might just put two more questions, because we are not getting very far here. When was the last time ASD appeared before the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security? Take that on notice, if you want to be precise.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We will take that on notice, but it was certainly within the last three months.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Finally, and you might have to take this on notice also: can you point out to me where in the Intelligence Services Act, if that is what you take to be the relevant legislation for the purposes of this sort of conversation, I would get guidance on whether the hacking of millions of people's mobile phones, or the browsers and the apps that run on those phones, would be precluded or included within legitimate, lawful activities?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: There are different pieces of legislation—</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I am happy to be directed to anything you think is relevant.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: In terms of the specific question you are asking, I have not got it in my head. But the relevant pieces of legislation for ASD generally: you have the Intelligence Services Act, you have the Telecommunications Act—</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: And the TIA Act, so there would be those three.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That is right.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Can you point to the relevant parts of those statutes?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I have not got the legislation with me.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I know that. That is fine.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Quite obviously, I am not in a position to do that on the run.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: On notice will be acceptable. I am trying to get you to narrow to those sections of the act that would give me guidance as to whether that kind of activity was legitimate or not, because if it is clearly spelt out in the act that ASD cannot do that, as I say, I will not waste your time.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Okay. We will take that on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.86	13/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	---	---	------------	----------	----------

20.	Defence	Canavan	Talisman Sabre & Hamel	<p>Senator CANAVAN: I have a few detailed questions in regard to Exercise Talisman Saber and Exercise Hamel in 2013. I think that you perhaps were made aware of these questions, and if you have any answers I would appreciate them as soon as possible. However, I understand that they are detailed, and if you need to take them on notice, that is fine. I have four questions relating to both exercises, and I seek answers for both. They go to the costs of carrying out some aspects of those training exercises. The first question is: what stores, by type and quantity, were transported to Rockhampton and the Shoalwater Bay Training Area by road, air and/or sea? Are you able to provide that kind of information?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think that would take us through to the end of tomorrow evening, if I was to try to answer that.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Could you take that on notice? In summary form would be fine.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think I will have to do that. Obviously there was a significant amount of material used in Talisman Saber. What was the other exercise that you mentioned?</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Hamel. The same question for Hamel.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: And the same answer.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: What locations were the stores collected from? I am sorry, I did pass these questions on through the minister's office, so if you have not seen them—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I have not seen the questions. I am sorry about that.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: What financial costs were incurred in moving stores by road, air and/or sea, and then returning them from Rockhampton and the Shoalwater Bay Training Area? Could you take that on notice? And my final question in this line is, what financial costs were incurred in moving stores by road to where they could then be loaded onto aircraft and/or ships for movement to and then returning from Rockhampton and Shoalwater Bay Training Area?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I will take all of those on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.87	15/07/15	13/08/15
21.	Defence	McGrath	Support by local community to Tully	<p>Senator McGRATH: They are pretty general questions. I recently visited Tully.</p> <p>Senator McGRATH: In terms of the connectivity with the local community, are you able to comment on the support the local community gives to the facilities there?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I do not have the detail to offer you something substantive, but I am very happy to take it on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.97	15/07/15	13/08/15

22.	Defence	Conroy	Seaward Village – Army Special Forces Survey	<p>Senator CONROY: Is anyone from Defence here? They are all out of the room at the moment. Who would I speak to in Defence?</p> <p>Mr Howman: I understand it has been undertaken by Army.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Somebody has come to join us at the table. Are you from Defence?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I am the Deputy Secretary of Defence Support and Reform. As part of that portfolio, I manage the department's commercial relationship with DHA. Defence has conducted a survey. It has been led by Army Special Forces Command. I have not seen the results of that survey. I am sure they will be passed to DHA at some point in the not too distant future. Special Forces Command were very keen to take the lead with the families of the people there. My understanding is that, as we go forward, DHA will become more and more deeply involved with the community through the normal process of—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: As I said, there is probably some confusion about surveys. You heard me discussing this earlier. I do not really consider five focus groups attended by military high command as a survey.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: No—I do not think the Special Forces Command survey went that way, but I am not across the detail of it; I just know that it has been done. I would need Army to comment in detail on how it was done.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Someone might be coming to your rescue. I hope he does not have the details of this sort of information handy, otherwise I would be very concerned. I am just talking about a survey conducted by, we are told, Army Special Forces Command—a survey that consists of five focus groups.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I might have to take this on notice. ...</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would be concerned if the entire question of a survey—and I am sure you are very familiar with the barracks; I am sure you lived there—</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would be very concerned if that were considered a survey of the families. As you would understand, there is reticence to express views directly when you are standing in front of your partner's superior officers. This is not something that should get elevated to that level. I am hoping that there is a commitment to try a little bit more outreach to the families, possibly by a mail-out seeking their views that could be considered confidential, so that people could give you their blunt assessment. Maybe no-one responds and, therefore, you could take that as, 'Hey, it's actually going okay.' I am just seeking your views on whether or not there is another process that could be followed up. There was probably a bit of a misunderstanding between Mr Howman and I originally, but a year has gone by and I am just trying to get some finality to it.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will look to the question of the form and the degree to which it presents a neutral and encouraging environment for people to speak freely.</p>	Day 1 p.101	13/07/15	13/08/15
Defence Portfolio – Budget Estimates, 1-2 June 2015				21			

23.	Defence	Conroy	Security Assessment Seaward Village	<p>Mr Howman: I do not know the answer to anything with regard to security. That is a Defence requirement.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Do you know which areas of Seaward Village could see into the Campbell Barracks? Have you been to visit?</p> <p>Mr Howman: I have been there many times, yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I assumed you would have. I have seen maps of your concept. From looking at your maps, could you identify which areas of Seaward Village would be able to see into Campbell Barracks?</p> <p>Mr Howman: That work is being undertaken by Defence. I understand that the security review will be done by about midyear.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: But my point is you must be able to identify that. You have been there many times. I have been there once. I had a wander around and I could quickly work out which parts could oversee the barracks. It is quite a steep walk. But you are familiar with the areas that could see into Campbell Barracks?</p> <p>Mr Howman: It depends on what you define as the barracks. If you look at the on-base living quarters, you can see every one of those houses from every spot on Seaward Village.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: That is a very fun answer, but I am sure you know I am not asking quite that question.</p> <p>Mr Howman: I do note Defence are doing a security review and they will determine what is of a secure nature, I would imagine.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Okay. I understand that, as you have mentioned, Special Operations Command is conducting a security assessment of the redevelopment due by 30 June in a few weeks. Is that on track as far as you know?</p> <p>Mr Howman: I am not involved in that project.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I believe it is the Defence Security Agency that is conducting the review. As I am advised, it is on track to be completed.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Do you know what the scope of the assessment is?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I will just read these out, and you can probably take them all on notice. Does it include the village and its perimeters?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I believe it is both the village and the barracks.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Who is being consulted as part of the assessment? I assume the families are not being consulted except as part of the process, but which security experts have you called in?</p> <p>Senator Brandis: Before you go on, I am told that you received a briefing from General McLaughlin about this a week or so ago and that in the course of that briefing it was explained to you why for security reasons it was not appropriate to pursue the detail of the security review in Senate estimates. I do not think anything you have said so far sounds to me—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I trust the judgement of General Campbell.</p>	Day 1 p.107	30/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	--	---	-------------	----------	----------

			<p>Senator Brandis: I just thought I would put on the record that you already have been briefed on this and cautioned about not asking any questions that might be inappropriate from a security point of view.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am confident General Campbell will sufficiently make sure his answers do not cause any national security threats.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I would not trivialise it. We are not talking about national security threats; we are talking about threats to the security of the locality.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am very conscious. The reason I am asking these questions is because I am trying to ensure the security of the families as I am sure General Campbell will be, having probably lived there.</p> <p>Senator LINES: Perhaps Senator Brandis is not aware this has been plastered over the media in Western Australia in fine detail.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: If you are able to, General Campbell, could you tell us who is being consulted as part of that process?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And has any preliminary feedback from this assessment come through yet.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I am not aware of any, and I would expect to be receiving the review when it is complete.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am happy for either of you to answer. I would have thought a security assessment should have been the first thing you did when you began the planning for a concept. There is no point spending a lot of taxpayers' money—and you spent quite a bit of your own money going through the planning processes, concept stages, maps, diagrams and all of that. I would have thought security was the first priority, so I am just trying to understand why in the liaison between you and Army, given that this has been going for four years, as I think you mentioned, security was not the first issue that was dealt with—why we have got to the stage where security is being tacked onto the end.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

24.	Defence	Conroy	Cost to backdate ADF pay to Nov 2014	<p>Senator CONROY: How much would it have cost to backdate the increase of 6 November, make the increase truly over the life of the agreements and to have made the absolutely unconditional statement that they are unique and crucial for the whole life?</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I do not have that calculation in front of me, so I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Ms Skinner?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We would need to take that on notice. I do not have that—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Oh, surely you would be able to—</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I can do some maths, but I would rather get it properly prepared for you.</p>	Day 1 p.118	14/09/15	17/09/15
25.	Defence	Conroy	Departures from the ADF since 1 Nov 2014	<p>Senator CONROY: I come to a couple of points you have made. You may want to take these on notice. Could you provide the committee with how many departures there have there been from the ADF since 1 November and how many recruitment applications have you had since 1 November. I think you have indicated, but to align the date with March: how does this compare with the same period in the previous year?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I may need to either hunt through the data here or take it on notice, especially data from a specific date.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am happy for you to take it on notice.</p>	Day 1 p.119	15/07/15	13/08/15
26.	Defence	Lambie	ADF separation rate from Jan 2011-present	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Along with that, would you be able to supply the discharge rate from—</p> <p>Ms Skinner: The separation rate?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Yes, the separation rate from January 2011 over the last four years. That would be great, thank you.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We can do that.</p>	Day 1 p.119	15/07/15	13/08/15

27.	Defence	Xenophon	Ex gratia payments – Sea King	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Just to save time, could you please take on notice these propositions. The first is whether ex gratia payments were paid for the families of the nine. There were some 60 individuals. Of course, that is not an issue; I commend the government for doing so. The second is that those payments were based on broad common-law principles in addition to the statutory payments, but also in respect of common-law payments. The third is that the rules were changed in early 2014 for Shane Warburton and Scott Nicholls, in that there was no longer an ex gratia process, but it was changed to an act-of-grace process. In other words, my understanding is that the families of the nine who died in that terrible helicopter accident were given ex-gratia payments—you will take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Cunliffe: I will take that question on notice. I am delving into the recesses of the time and I do not recall.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I accept that and you were good enough to come to me during the break. If I can note: I have tried to go through the appropriate channels, through both the defence minister and the assistant minister, and I have had to resort going through this process in estimates. My understanding is that the former defence minister, Senator Johnston, asked for advice in a joint process of getting independent senior counsel to provide advice as to what the claims for both Mr Nicholls and Mr Warburton were worth based on common law principles, which I understand were similar to the process in respect of an ex-gratia process. Could you confirm that? And, again, I am happy for you to take this on notice.</p> <p>My understanding is that senior counsel gave a range of what the potential damages could be and that in Mr Nicholls' case at least the claim made by the lawyers for Mr Nicholls was at the lower end of the range, but it is being still stuck over a four-year process. Actually, I should correct that. I am not sure whether the senior counsel's advice or that process was instigated by former defence minister Johnston or former defence minister Smith—you may want to clarify that.</p> <p>Mr Cunliffe: Aspects of what you have raised I can comment on; some aspects I honestly cannot. I will seek a clearer articulation of the totality, bearing in mind that we are talking about a period in excess of 10 years potentially in the process.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: That is the nub of why Mr Nicholls is understandably quite upset.</p> <p>Mr Cunliffe: I do stress again, as I mentioned before, that the backdrop here is that the legislated schemes which apply in these cases have been given full effect to matters for veterans' affairs, not for me—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am terribly sorry, I must take issue with you in respect of the fact that issues of ex-gratia payments for the families of the nine who were killed in that terrible accident were made. But it seems a different process has been adopted for the two survivors and that was changed. That was only announced last month, actually, when the lawyers were aware that the process had changed.</p>	Day 1 p.124	12/10/15	15/10/15
-----	---------	----------	----------------------------------	--	-------------	----------	----------

28.	Defence	Conroy	LAND 400 - Timeline for acquisition of vehicles	<p>Senator CONROY: What was the original time line for acquisition of these vehicles?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Caligari: I would have to take that on notice. For the original time line, we are talking about probably back to the 2006 era.</p>	Day 2 p.8	15/07/15	13/08/15
29.	Defence	Conroy	M113 currently in service	<p>Senator CONROY: How many ASLAVs and M113s are currently in service with the Army?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: There are approximately 270 ASLAVs currently in service.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: And M113s?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: I would have to take M113s on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am told it is roughly 700. Does that figure sound approximately right, without holding you to it?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: Approximately. But I would have to take it on notice.</p>	Day 2 p.9	15/07/15	13/08/15
30.	Defence	Conroy	LAND 400 – changes to requirements	<p>Senator CONROY: When compared with the original requirements for the vehicles, has there been any reduction in terms of capability sought through the request for tender?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: We have been engaging with industry quite significantly on this particular project. There have been a couple of suggested changes from industry that would make our requirement set more manageable from a military off-the-shelf approach. We have canvassed those recommended changes with the other bidders and we have also talked to Army about it. Off the top of my head, there have been two changes and they have been articulated on the LAND 400 website and advised to industry. Essentially, we are talking about some very technical specifications about the coverage of the ballistic protection angles that have been indicated to us are perhaps too aspirational for a military off-the-shelf vehicle. We have had a good look at that, talked to other people in industry who share that same concern. We have been gone to Army and talked to them about whether or not it still met their requirements and because we are seeking a MOTS vehicle, we have reduced those requirements slightly.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Both of those changes have that have been identified by industry revolve around the ballistic protection angles?</p> <p>Major Gen. McLachlan: I am not aware of the second one of the top of my head, I can take that on notice and get back to you.</p>	Day 2 p.11	28/07/15	13/08/15

31.	Defence	Conroy	AWD – Forensic audit	<p>Senator CONROY: Yes, thank you. I wanted to come back, just briefly, to LAND 400 and the M113. Sorry, I can come back to that again. I wanted to get an update on the AWD project and the so-called forensic audit of the AWD. I refer to Defence's response to question on notice 58 from the additional estimates hearing on 25 February 2015. In its response, Defence advised that a comprehensive cost and schedule review was expected in late April 2015, at which time an update on the cost and schedule of the AWD project could be provided. I presume this is a reference to the so-called forensic audit. Should I equate the two—the comprehensive cost and schedule review?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: That is correct. That is our understanding of the forensic audit. It is the comprehensive cost review.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So you did not call it a forensic audit; you called it a comprehensive cost and schedule review.</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: That is what we have been calling it, or in Defence terms the CCR, a comprehensive cost review.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Did you conduct that?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: It was conducted through the alliance as part of the AWD reform activity.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Who put the title of 'forensic audit' on it, given you did not?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I think it is just a discussion, occasionally, in the steering committee—just the language that was used. The steering committee is run by—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: When was the first time it appeared on paper as a forensic audit?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I am not aware. In discussions in the steering committee, they did not necessarily just use the language 'comprehensive cost review'. That is made up by Finance personnel as well as us, so it was just a term.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I accept that 'comprehensive cost and schedule review' is a mouthful and was reduced to the acronym CCSR, I think—</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: CCR, by us, if you like acronyms.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I get that the conversation that would have been being taken would have been around the CCR. I am just wondering who dubbed it, in a press release, 'forensic audit.' I am just looking to know whether you wrote a document with a title 'forensic audit' at any stage.</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I would have to go back and have a look at all the documentation that has gone through the steering committee.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am willing to take a guess, but I am happy for you not to want to be put in a difficult position. So could you take on notice: did any document that you prepared have the title 'forensic audit'?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I will take that on notice.</p>	Day 2 p. 17-18	08/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	----------------------	---	-------------------	----------	----------

32.	Defence	Conroy	AWD – Forensic audit – Media Release	<p>Senator CONROY: When did Defence first become aware of the forensic audit report and by what means? I am talking about the joint press release of 22 May.</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I did not see the press release prior to it going out.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Secretary?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not believe so, but I will check.</p>	Day 2 p.18	15/09/15	17/09/15
33.	Defence	Conroy	AWD – Comprehensive Cost and Schedule Review (CCR)	<p>Senator CONROY: Could I get a list of everybody who participated in preparing the CCR, including observers? It does not have to be now. I am happy for it to be on notice.</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: Yes, we would have to take that on notice. Obviously there were numerous parties involved.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So the CCR went to the finance department? That was the lead agency?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: The CCR was presented to the AWD reform steering committee, on which I sit, along with General Manager Land and Maritime, Col Thorne, who is also at the table. There are also senior executives from the Department of Finance on that reform steering committee.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: But earlier you said that the reform process is—</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: It is being led by Finance, supported by us.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So Finance is above the AWD steering committee, as it is the lead?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: Finance is leading the steering committee. It chairs the steering committee.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Can I get a list—it does not have to be now—of who is on the AWD steering committee?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: We can do that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am not trying to be a pedant, but the CCR was invoked—somebody said—for the purposes of the AWD. So this is a report that was invoked and prepared and handed ultimately, through the steering committee, to Finance, who were chair of the steering committee. I am not trying to be a pedant. I am just trying to understand where it worked its way up to. Secretary, did you receive a copy ultimately?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Of the?</p> <p>Senator CONROY: CCR.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would need to check.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: The Minister for Finance ended up with a copy and I think the Minister for Defence ended up with a copy. It is a joint press release. I am just trying to track its movements.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will check.</p>	Day 2 p. 19	17/09/15	15/10/15

34.	Defence	Lambie	Time spent in warzones	<p>Senator LAMBIE: In speaking with hundreds of young veterans, it has become apparent to me that many of the 70,000 Australian soldiers have done multiple tours in war or war-like zones. Some young diggers have had to undertake in excess of six tours in 10 years. That means, with eight-month tours, some have spent four years or more in a war zone in a decade. This compares with one year for the majority of our Vietnam veterans. We all know about the terrible health problems which hit that group of brave young men and the physical and psychological issues they have carried with them throughout their lifetimes, so I am keen to find out more about the time that our young diggers have spent in war zones, armed beyond the wire. Can I please be provided with statistics which detail the amount of time over the last 15 years our young diggers have spent in the war zone on average, and can they also be broken down? For example, how many spent one year, two years or three years in a war zone all up. Are there official studies commissioned by the Department of Defence or other government departments that examine the link between the time spent in a war zone and the rate and severity of mental illness and injury in our diggers?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: The first question we will take on notice. I note that it is not just an Army issue; it is an ADF issue of multiple deployments on active service.</p>	Day 2 p.27	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------	--	---------------	----------	----------

35.	Defence	Lambie	Steyr rifles	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. I have some questions from yesterday in reference to some replies Admiral Griggs gave me over the Steyr rifle and Lieutenant Saltmarsh.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I refer to your response to question 5. When were the Steyr rifles introduced into service in the military?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Campbell: I will take that on notice and get back to you.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: From my recollection, it was the mid-nineties, I thought. You have given me statistics of malfunctions that happened between 1998 and 2009, but I thought those weapons were introduced sometime in the mid-1990s. If that was the case, I am wondering whether there were any other malfunctions from the date they were brought into service until 1998?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: If I am not mistaken, I think the question you asked was about malfunctions prior to 2009. Was that the question?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Malfunctions prior to 1998. You gave me the statistics from 1998 to 2009, but I—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Yes, but I think your question was about the statistics for malfunctions prior to 2009. Is that correct? I think that is written above the answer.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Can I have any malfunctions that happened with that style of weapon from when it was first introduced into service?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will confirm that the data you were given yesterday goes back to the introduction into service of the weapon. If not, we will provide more detail.</p>	Day 2 p.31	30/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	--------------	---	---------------	----------	----------

36.	Defence	Lambie	Legal issue – Lt Saltmarsh	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I refer to my question about who sent Lieutenant Saltmarsh copies of the autopsy photos and why they were sent. Your response, in part, said:</p> <p>It cannot be established with certainty how former trooper Saltmarsh came into possession of the autopsy photographs of Corporal Jones but it is likely these were disclosed to him through his legal counsel in connection with either or both of the board of inquiry or the court martial.</p> <p>In researching this reply, did you contact either Trooper Saltmarsh's defence counsel or prosecuting officer?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I am not sure who was consulted and I do not think the Chief of Army would be sure who was consulted either. We tried to get you the best answer we could in the shortest time frame possible.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: The defence counsel and prosecuting officer were not asked? They were not contacted in relation to that question?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: What I said was that we were not sure. If that is an important issue for you, we will endeavour to find that out for you today.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Is it correct that Colonel Russell Pearce, who today is the director of Defence Counsel Services, was the officer prosecuting the case against Marcus Saltmarsh?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I will check for you.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Are you aware that, in the last few days, Colonel Pearce had a conversation with Mr Saltmarsh and assured him that neither defence counsel nor he gave those autopsy photos to Mr Saltmarsh? I notice that you have consulted with Major General Westwood. Did you ask him specifically whether he authorised the release of those autopsy photos and did he deny doing that? I am assuming, since they have clearance details here and his name is on it—did you specifically ask him that question on whether he authorised the release of those autopsy photos?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think we would have asked him the question that you asked us.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: He denied doing that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not know what happened in the discussion and I am not going to verbal anybody. We will take it on notice, we will find out and we will endeavour to get back to you.</p>	Day 2 p.31	30/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	----------------------------	--	---------------	----------	----------

37.	Defence	Lambie	Incorrect discharge	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Have Defence considered any cases through DART to undertake at their own initiative a retrospective medical discharge in circumstances where it appears the member should not have been discharged administratively or at own request?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Without going into the details of the restorative engagement program, which as we said yesterday we think is one of the key mechanisms of the whole DART process, I can safely say there have been a number of changes of status of discharge as a result of the restorative engagement program.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Would you be able to provide me a number on that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not think that is within the spirit of the program. We are quite constrained in what we can say about what happens in the program.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I am not asking for names and dates; I am just asking for the number of how many people who have been abused have been discharged incorrectly in the past and now how many people have had that discharge category changed to medical discharge.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will discuss this with the DART, but the DART owns the process. We will see what information they are comfortable with us releasing. Obviously victim confidentiality is crucial. I know you do not want names, but we need to make sure that those people who are going through the restorative engagement program have total confidence that their confidentiality will be respected in all manner. So I will talk to the DART. We will take it on notice and we will get what information we can back to you, but I can assure you I have been involved in a number of cases myself where people have had their discharge method changed to a medical discharge.</p>	Day 2 p.34	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	---------------------	---	---------------	----------	----------

38.	Defence	Lambie	List of persons charged with abuse in the last three years	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. What prejudice is there to Defence to allow DART to investigate current or former ADF members who have experienced abuse that occurred prior to April 2011. For example, the Skype cut-off for being able to make claims to DART on and after 31 May 2013. Basically, do they object to DART continuing to operate after May 2013? Do you object to DART continuing to operate to be a deterrent to sexual predators? If you do, why?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: It is not a matter of objecting to anything. The government has decided that the DART will conclude its operations at the end of June. You heard the Attorney yesterday talk about consideration of extensions and those sorts of things. We believe that we have now in place a series of measures and programs that act as an effective deterrent, because it would have been totally reprehensible of us to just rest on the fact that there was a DART. We needed to take action ourselves. That is why we developed the pathway to cultural change program. That is why we brought in restricted reporting. That is why we established the Sexual Misconduct Prevention & Response Office. We have, I think, taken over the last couple of years on numerous occasions very public, demonstrated action in terminating or disciplining people in the ADF who have continued with abuse. So I think we very much have—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Do you think I could have a list of that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: A list of what?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: A list of what you just described in reference to people being charged with abuse over the last three years.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think we could probably provide you with some—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Without names, obviously.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Yes—with some statistics around that. But there is no doubt that across all three services there has been very clear action taken on a range of unacceptable behaviour issues.</p>	Day 2 p.34-35	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	--	---	------------------	----------	----------

39.	Defence	Xenophon	Allegations of sexual assault	<p>Senator XENOPHON: These are follow-up questions in relation to matters that were raised yesterday. Air Commodore Ehlers was put on notice. I appreciate he was as helpful as he could be and he wanted to have a considered view in respect of this. The question that I asked yesterday was of the 151 members of Defence, and that included a number of reservists—I think there were 81 reservist members currently—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: There are 82</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Sorry?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: There are 82.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Thank you, Vice Admiral. There are 82 serving members of Defence in the regular Defence forces who have had matters referred from DART—the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce—based on the standard of plausibility. That is not the same as the balance of probability—we will make that clear, and I want to be fair about that. There was obviously a filtering mechanism in respect of that so that DART has referred the matters to the Chief of Defence, and I understand that Vice Admiral Griggs is acting CDF and that that information is tightly kept.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not have total visibility. That is the point I was trying to make.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: No; I respect that. But Air Commodore Ehlers, you have been closely involved in this. One of the specific questions that I asked was how has Defence dealt with those matters? Obviously, if it is abuse involving bullying and harassment at one end—and I am not minimising that at all—and at the other end it involves a sexual assault, how is that dealt with? What protocols are in place? The specific question that I asked you was up to which ranks were involved in terms of the highest ranks involved in respect of that? You are shaking your head. Is that a bad sign, Air Commodore? I am hoping it is not a bad sign. Also, how many allegations of sexual assault involve those 82 currently serving members in our Defence forces?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I have not been able to get you a good answer today. The fact of the matter is that this—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Respectfully, you have had a day.</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Yes, I have. I have also been—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: You have been busy on other stuff.</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Busyness is not the issue. It is a matter of getting the fidelity of the information. Basically, this will require going through the file records of each of those referrals to tally up. I do not have statistical information readily at hand. The breakdown of the 151 was based on advice that I have received from the DART.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes.</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I trust that advice and I have no issue with it. But I do need to go through those 110 recommendations and tally up the questions that you specifically asked. It is not in my normal record or spreadsheet that is tracking these areas.</p>	Day 2 p. 32-33	03/08/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	----------	-------------------------------	---	-------------------	----------	----------

			<p>Senator XENOPHON: In respect of that, what time frame do you think will be required to provide that level of detail that was requested yesterday? What is a reasonable time frame from your point of view? What do you think an approximate time frame would be?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: I will not be able to do it today.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: No, that is fine. Would it be in the next couple of weeks?</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: The next couple of weeks? Definitely. I just want to assure myself of the most honest answer and go through those files.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And I want to put on the record that I do appreciate your concerns about the fidelity of the information. But insofar as some of the allegations concerned gravely serious allegations of sexual assault, of rape, you indicated that there were some allegations involving people who are still currently serving. The allegations have been made based on that threshold of DART, which is lower than the balance of probability. Can you at least indicate how many cases are involved in respect of that?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I cannot. The issue, for example, is definitional within a sexual assault and the circumstance of each. It actually requires reading through individual statements to understand the exact circumstances of the alleged abuse. It gets to timing and it gets to the actual circumstances. When I receive an abuse claim, it does not come in a neat categorised heading—for example, the task force refers to matters of sexual abuse—sexual abuse is a broad range of types of abuse. You have asked us to categorise, quite correctly, along the lines of sexual assault, sexual harassment et cetera. I want to make sure I get the most straight answer. I think, Senator, you actually used the word 'rape'?</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes.</p> <p>Air Cdre Ehlers: Which is again a category or subcategory of sexual assault. So I need to make myself very certain, having read each of those statements, to make sure I give you the most honest and straight answer.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Thank you, Air Commodore.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

40.	Defence	Lambie	Restorative engagement conferences	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I refer to the Defence Abuse Restorative Engagement Program. Is part of that making apologies to the victims?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: That is certainly a key component of the restorative program.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Is that done by high-ranking officers in the forces?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: It is done by officers who have been through the appropriate training for restorative engagement. It is done at a rank level between colonel equivalent right up to the Chief of Defence Force. All of the chiefs, we have all done a number of restorative engagement conferences. There has been some criticism that bringing in the colonels is too low a rank. We actually think that the most powerful long-term cultural change aspect of the restorative engagement program is having our future senior leaders, 10 or 15 years hence, involved in this program now. I can assure you that sitting there for two or three hours with these victims of abuse is a life-changing event for most people. We think an exceptionally powerful way to get this message through to the future leadership of the ADF is by exposing them to this process now, exposing them to the issues and really deeply changing their views about this.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Could I have on notice how many of those have been done face-to-face and how many of them have been done in other ways. I actually thought they were supposed to be done face-to-face, but I have seen—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: They are done in the way that the victim would like them to be done. Overwhelmingly, they are done face-to-face. But I understand there are some instances where that has not occurred—at the request of the individual concerned, not at our request.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I realise that. Could I have the number of victims who have been through that process.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will talk to the task force and find out what they are happy for us to release.</p>	Day 2 p.38	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------------------	---	---------------	----------	----------

41.	Defence	Gallacher	Martin Place seige	<p>Senator GALLACHER: I will now move to the Martin Place siege, just to get an understanding of the role, if any, of the ADF. We understand the sensitivities and the fact that there is a coronial inquiry, but it is basically to find out, if we can, what time the ADF was briefed about the Martin Place siege initiative.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not have that detail available. We would have to take that on notice, and that would obviously be subject to those sensitivities that you talked about.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: And while you are there, could you advise on notice who briefed you?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: If we can do that.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: By whom was the ADF briefed about the Martin Place siege?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will give you what we can on that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Did you provide advice to the New South Wales police in relation to weapons or ammunition that should be used in the action at the Lindt Cafe?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I will take that on notice, again subject to the sensitivities of current proceedings.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Did the ADF consider the weapons and ammunition used by the New South Wales police to storm the Lindt Cafe appropriate?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not think it is appropriate for us to answer that question.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Were you asked by anybody about the appropriateness of weapons or ammunition?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I do not believe so, but again we will answer what we can on notice, subject to the fact that there is an inquiry going on.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Did you provide advice in relation to tactics that might be used to storm the cafe?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I will repeat my same answer. I suspect that we will simply not be able to answer a number of these things.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I may be wrong but I seem to remember questioning either at the last Senate estimates or the Senate estimates before which went right through this in some detail. I think answers were provided.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I have only been a senator for four years, and if I had not got the fact that estimates can be repetitive I would be a bit more foolish than Senator Brandis thinks I am.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We can only repeat our answers.</p>	Day 2 p.47	23/06/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	-----------	--------------------	---	---------------	----------	----------

42.	Defence	Gallacher	Manifest of visits to ASC	<p>Senator GALLACHER: What I would like you to take on notice, if you could, please, is a comprehensive manifest of all visits to the ASC over the last 12 months by foreign delegations or companies that are subsidiaries of foreign organisations, including dates and times; delegation attendees' names, organisations and roles; government and ASC representatives names, organisations and roles; the visit programs; details of visit invitations and approvals; and all correspondence between the department, the ASC, the Prime Minister's Office and/or any ministers' office in relation to visitations to ASC.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Some of that we would not be able to provide.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: If you take it on notice, you can tell us—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We will take it on notice. Also, it is really a question for Finance and ASC; however, we will take it on notice and we will consult and see what is possible.</p>	Day 2 p.51-52	15/07/15	13/08/15
43.	Defence	Gallacher	Staff in CIOG Security Branch	<p>Senator GALLACHER: How many staff do you have?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: The exact number in my security branch I would have to check. It is in the order of about 60 people at the moment. If you want the exact number, I can get that.</p>	Day 2 p. 53	13/07/15	13/08/15
44.	Defence	Gallacher	Details of fraud – fuel card	<p>Mr Brown: A fuel card had been obtained by a member of the public and then used.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: To what value?</p> <p>Mr Brown: It was \$585,000.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: A fuel card to the value of \$585,000?</p> <p>Mr Brown: Yes.</p> <p>CHAIR: Was it not protected by a pin?</p> <p>Mr Brown: I cannot answer that. I will have to find out—potentially not.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Over what time frame is that fuel purchased?</p> <p>Mr Brown: Again, I will take that on notice. If my memory serves me correctly, it was about 12 months but I would rather take it on notice.</p>	Day 2 p. 54	13/07/15	13/08/15

45.	Defence	Gallacher	Details of fraud – fuel card – processes and actions taken	<p>CHAIR: I have two questions. First of all: what was lacking by way of an audit process that allowed \$585,000 to be accumulated on the card? The second question is: what action has been taken to ensure such an event does not occur again?</p> <p>Mr Brown: The first thing is the second question: what is going to prevent that problem going forward? It would be a reconciliation between the card and the vehicle and bringing that back. We did do the investigation back at the time. I cannot remember all the specific details, but there were very specific recommendations about that reconciliation. Again, I am happy to get that information to you on notice. In terms of the fuel, the audit reconciled or identified that you need to monitor the fuel consumption in relation to the specific vehicle. There were recommendations made along those lines as well. Again, I will get those back to you.</p> <p>CHAIR: Since that event has occurred, have the new processes that have been put into place been tested to ensure, as you quite rightly say, that there is some sort of reconciliation between the card and the vehicle or type of vehicle against which the card is allocated?</p> <p>Mr Brown: Nothing has been brought to my attention, as the Chief Audit Executive, about any frauds or excessive use, but that does not mean to say that there has not been any. Again, I can certainly check with the appropriate area, which would be the logistics area.</p>	Day 2 p. 55	13/07/15	13/08/15
46.	Defence	Gallacher	Details of fraud – fuel card – Expenditure approval	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Just on that same line, having had a very small experience of managing about 15 fuel cards, they are at the top of any manager's board patterns in respect to inadvertent or inappropriate use. Are you telling me that someone was able to get hold of one of your cards and spend half a million dollars? How do you pay your bills? Who ticked off on that expenditure?</p> <p>Mr Brown: I will have to get the details of the review. You are quite right to raise those concerns.</p>	Day 2 p. 56	13/07/15	13/08/15

47.	Defence	Gallacher	Details of fraud recovery investigations	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Excellent. Now, I just want to leave you with some questions on notice in respect of this matter. If you could refer to subquestion 5 of question on notice 51 from the Department of Defence additional estimates 25 February 2015. The department reports that of 322 investigations finalised during the 2013-14 financial year, only 44 resulted in a recovery of money. This sort of supersedes an earlier request for details: could you please provide the committee with a detailed manifesto of the investigations, including all relevant material in each investigation, details of the investigating authority, the evidence collected during these investigations, and the finding of each. I am very happy for this to go on notice. So, 322 but 44 recovering.</p> <p>These figures suggest that money is recovered in less than 14 per cent of the investigations. Would that be a low recovery ratio? I know we traversed this earlier about people not having any money and you do not know where to go, but given that you have dedicated people, as you said—people who either want to be in uniform or in the public service resourcing the army, and they are well paid, they have leave and all those sorts of things—why would we have such a low recovery if someone has done the wrong thing?</p>	Day 2 p. 57	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	-----------	--	--	----------------	----------	----------

48.	Defence	Gallacher	Upgrades and RAAF Base Williamtown and RAAF Base Tindal	<p>Senator GALLACHER: We go to the upgrade of facilities. I think that is where I met you, Air Vice Marshal Deeble. I misquoted; I thought it was only \$1.5 billion, but it is \$1.6 billion worth of upgrades in facilities and infrastructure at Williamtown and RAAF Base Tindal. Can you please provide on notice detail and costed information about the specific facility and upgrade work that the \$1.6 billion will fund? Are the planning and construction of the upgrades at RAAF Base Williamtown on track to be completed prior to the delivery of the first two aircraft in December 2018? We would like on notice a description of the project with detailed costed information on specific facility and upgrade and then, secondly, whether the planning, construction and upgrades of Williamtown are on track as we speak to be completed prior to the delivery of the first two aircraft</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Deeble: I am happy to take the detail on notice, but I can confirm that the sod-turning work has commenced at Williamtown at this point in time. There is a significant amount of work that needs to be undertaken at Williamtown to support the aircraft when they come into service and, while we are tracking the risks associated with that, we believe that that will be in time to support the ramp-up of the capability in the Williamtown environment.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Could the committee also get a detailed time line of all upgrades, facilities and infrastructure at RAAF Base Tindal with reference to the anticipated delivery dates for each batch of the F35As over the course of the program? Is there any risk that these facility and infrastructure upgrades will not be completed in time for the aircraft delivery?</p> <p>Air Vice Marshal Deeble: I would be more than happy to coordinate that with DSRG in terms of those aspects. At this point in time, we believe that the Tindal works will meet our requirements for the ramp-up of the capability at 75 Squadron.</p>	Day 2 p. 60	13/07/15	13/08/15
49.	Defence	McEwen	Initiation and approval for SPA flights for HRH Prince Harry	<p>Senator McEWEN: Can you walk me through the approval process for such a flight? Who would have initiated the request to use the special purpose aircraft?</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: There are a number of approval authorities for special purpose aircraft: the Prime Minister, the Governor-General, the Minister for Defence. The Minister for Defence delegates a number of those approvals to Air Force. I do not have exact knowledge of who approved this particular flight.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Will the process of applying for the flight be included in the report that is to be tabled?</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: No, it will not, but I could take on notice who approved that.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: If you could take on notice who initiated and who approved the flight, that would be good.</p>	Day 2 p. 63	17/09/15	15/10/15

50.	Defence	McEwen	Correspondence with PM's office regarding SPA flight for HRH Prince Harry	<p>Senator McEWEN: ... Do you know if there was any correspondence between the Prime Minister's office, or any other minister's office, in relation to this particular flight?</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: I would not know that. Again, as I stated, I do not have particular knowledge on individual flights. The VIP flies a significant number of hours each year, carrying the Prime Minister and various heads of government. I do not normally look at each individual flight. I would have to take that on notice as well.</p>	Day 2 p.63-64	15/07/15	13/08/15
51.	Defence	McEwen	Entitled persons – travel on SPA	<p>Senator McEWEN: In terms of entitled persons, all members of the British monarchy are entitled persons—is that right? Is there a hierarchy? Does it go down to any level? Do you have to be in line for the throne at some stage?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We can check that.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I do not know that we know the answer to that. We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will take that on notice.</p>	Day 2 p. 64	15/07/15	13/08/15
52.	Defence	Gallacher	Costs – C17 Globemaster	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Could I just talk about the C17A Globemasters. The Prime Minister announced on 10 April 2015 that the government would be acquiring two additional C17A Globemaster aircraft, as well as funding associated equipment and facilities. The acquisition figure quoted by the Prime Minister was \$1 billion. Can we have some underpinning verification of whether that is an accurate figure? How did you arrive at \$1 billion? It is a particularly round figure.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I think it was an approximation.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That is why I am asking.</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: If I can just give rough figures: each of the aeroplanes is probably around \$350 million, with associated spares and support equipment for those two aircraft. Then there is a large part for extra tarmac and an additional hangar at Amberley to do maintenance for the C17s. That is about \$300 million worth.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Could we get on notice a detailed breakdown of the \$1 billion, including the associated equipment and facilities?</p>	Day 2 p. 64	13/07/15	13/08/15
53.	Defence	Gallacher	Amberley – relocation of fire training apron	<p>Senator GALLACHER: And you are adding the 17th Construction Squadron to Amberley as well.</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: Amberley is a pretty busy base these days.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That has necessitated moving the fire training apron.</p> <p>Air Marshal Brown: I would need to check on that.</p>	Day 2 p. 64	15/07/15	13/08/15

54.	Defence	Gallacher	Property sales	<p>Senator GALLACHER: If we look in the forward estimates, we see negative net proceeds in 2016-17 and 2017-18 and a small positive in 2018-19. Have you just picked all the low-hanging fruit? Why are you looking forward and having negatives and a small positive in 2018-19?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: The negatives, of course, represent receipts into the department. Certainly in terms of the small parcels of land that we have available there is a finite number of those, and we have made good progress in the last year or so and hope to in the next year or so in disposing of some of those parcels. I might ask the CFO if he can give us some insight into the positive figure in 2018-19.</p> <p>Mr Prior: I do not have the list in front of me but I could obtain the list of the property sales—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps, because I am not completely across this, we could put that on notice and if you could give us the detail of that.</p>	Day 2 p. 67	15/07/15	13/08/15
55.	Defence	Xenophon	Details of RAND report	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Who made that decision to limit the RAND report to just look at ships?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That was the view within Defence and by government.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Was that the view of the DMO, Mr Gould?</p> <p>Mr Gould: I did not commission the RAND report, but—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: No, but did the DMO have a view about the RAND—</p> <p>Mr Gould: I have a view about the issue you have raised about the synergy or symbiosis between surface and submarine building. I do recall, in Barrow-in-Furness, trying to substitute for a lack of submarine building by building surface ships and it contributed nothing whatsoever.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: What was this? Sorry, I did not hear.</p> <p>Mr Gould: Barrow-in-Furness, in the United Kingdom. We had a gap in submarine building. We tried to maintain skills by building surface ships, but we did not conserve submarine skills by doing that.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am grateful for your raising that. Would you mind providing some further details on notice in respect of that, with references to reports or whatever it might be? That might be useful in the context of this process.</p> <p>Mr Gould: I can do that.</p>	Day 2 p. 71	13/07/15	13/08/15

56.	Defence	Gallacher	Expenditure on IT systems and infrastructure	<p>Senator GALLACHER: We are asking where you spend the \$1.2 billion per year on IT systems and infrastructure—that is the question.</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: So we spend that on a variety of services. We procure from market vendors—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Do you spend \$1.2 billion?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: We spend approximately \$1.6 billion across the department.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Fair enough. So you spend \$1.6 billion and, in that 1.6, obviously, we have got the size of it. What is the scope of it? Is it spread across the 400 properties that you have in the Defence estate? How do you spend that much?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: It is spread across all the activities that Defence undertake take both domestically and in support of operation overseas.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Let's ask some detailed questions: what would you spend with IBM on infrastructure?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: I can get a breakdown of what we spend with each of the individual vendors but I do not have that with me.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: If you take on notice: IBM, Telstra, Lockheed Martin server design, Unisys and Fujitsu. Are there any significant IT providers other than those I have just listed?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: Microsoft and Oracle would be the other two obvious ones.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps we can include those.</p>	Day 2 p. 73-74	13/07/15	13/08/15
57.	Defence	Gallacher	Milestones – Server location project	<p>Senator GALLACHER: I understand there is a plan within the department to consolidate 280 server locations into 11 locations—is there some progress and time line for delivery of this project?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: Yes. On that project, we signed that agreement with Lockheed Martin on 3 September last year. The initial operational handover was on time on 13 March this year and ISC for that capability is currently on schedule for 4 September this year.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: You are meeting the milestones for success in this project?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: We are to date, yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Are those milestones available to the committee?</p> <p>Dr Lawrence: Yes; I do not see why not.</p>	Day 2 p. 74	13/07/15	13/08/15

58.	Defence	McEwen	Cadet numbers	<p>Senator McEWEN: I am sorry, I know we have got DMO in but I just wanted to ask a few questions about cadets. Can somebody please provide the current size of each of the three cadet forces—obviously, Navy, Army and Air Force—and the number of cadets and staff in each cadet force?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Thank you, and how do those numbers compare with previous years?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We will give you some trend data in the answer, but the short answer is the cadet numbers are increasing.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Increasing, okay. Have there been any new cadet units established in any of the three forces in the past three years?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: There have been but just for completeness, we will get that to you on notice.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Have there been any units disbanded?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: I think there may be one or two.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Would you put that in the answer, thank you. With regard to the cadet youth development framework that was established in 2002, how has that framework been received within ADF and by other youth organisations with which you liaise about it?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Generally, I think very well. We will get you a full answer.</p> <p>Senator McEWEN: Could you include in that answer what youth organisations you liaise with about the cadet framework.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Certainly.</p>	Day 2 p. 78-79	15/07/15	13/08/15
59.	Defence	Gallacher	Life of type – fleet due to be replaced by Hawkei	<p>Senator GALLACHER: When is that fleet due to reach the end of its useful life? When do you expect to have to replace a third of it? What is the life of the fleet overall?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I am looking to see whether I have that information. I do not have it in front of me. I will have to come back to you on that.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So you will give us on notice the—</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: The expected life of type of the Land Rover fleet?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes. You are replacing one-third of the fleet. When is that fleet expected to reach the end of its life?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: I will take that on notice.</p>	Day 2 p.81	23/06/15	13/08/15

60.	Defence	Conroy	Mr Costello – Probity arrangements	<p>Senator CONROY: Now, given Mr Costello's knowledge, which even you, Mr Richardson, concede could include sensitive—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: and confidential material of the Future Submarine Project. What measures have you taken to limit his involvement in the Future Submarine Project, including the competitive evaluation process?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not believe any measures have been taken to limit his engagement, insofar as he is an employee of the French company and his engagement with us is strictly within that framework.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I can add to that answer: I have been advised that, as one would expect in a case of this kind, arrangements have been put in place within DCNS to ensure that Mr Costello does not have any conflict of interest, or that there are no circumstances in which knowledge that he acquired in his former capacity is used in a way that would put him into a conflicted position. These arrangements are very common in industry, you may know. You have heard the evidence from the department that a probity adviser from within my department of the Australian Government Solicitor has been appointed to police any probity or conflict of interest issues. There is no suggestion from the probity adviser that they have identified anything problematic in the arrangements that have been made by DCNS to protect Mr Costello from any suggestion of a conflict or lack of probity.</p> <p>What I think I will do is, having made that contribution, I will take your question on notice. Obviously, I am not in any ministerial capacity intimately acquainted with those arrangements are, but I have been assured that they exist. Subject to any commercial-in confidence-issues that might arise, I will try to provide you with a fuller account that might satisfy you about the integrity arrangements that have been implemented by DCNS to protect Mr Costello.</p>	Day 1 p. 51	30/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	--	---	----------------	----------	----------

61.	Defence	Xenophon	DART – Recommendation on complainant timeframes for making claims	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Could I go to the issues of the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce and the matters that were raised earlier. While we hear from the Air Commodore, I do want to ask a question of the Attorney directly. I put to the Attorney the recommendation made by the Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade References Committee in its October 2014 report <i>Processes to support victims of abuse in Defence</i>. Recommendation 1 was: The committee recommends that the Australian Government extend the activities of the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce to support victims of abuse in Defence, including allowing new complainants to make claims up to 30 June 2015. It has now been over seven months, Attorney. I am not trying to ambush you on this—I think I indicated this to you before, during one of the breaks. When could we get a response in respect of that? Does the Australian government have a position in respect of that?</p> <p>Senator Brandis: There are a couple of things to say about that. First of all, as perhaps you are aware, the task force counselling and restorative engagement program, which is one of the principal methods by which these grievances come to be aired, has been funded—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am not being disrespectful, Attorney, but I am really short of time. There is a specific question.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I am coming to that. But the implication of the question is that everything comes to an end in June 2015, and I am pointing out to you that one of the most important elements—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Maybe I did not express my question clearly enough, and I am very sorry if I have not. The unanimous recommendation of the committee, held by the coalition, opposition and crossbench senators, was that victims of abuse should effectively be able to make a claim up until 30 June 2015. The cut-off date was for abuse before 11 April 2011 and to be reported by 31 May 2013. There is fair gap there, so there is a specific issue.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: That is a matter, as advised, that is before government and it is under consideration.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: It has been seven months. When do you think we could hear from—</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I have to ask the Minister for Defence about that.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Could you take that on notice with some urgency?</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I will do that for you.</p>	Day 1 p. 63-64	10/08/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	----------	---	--	-------------------	----------	----------

62.	Defence	Xenophon	SEA 1000 – Probity plan	<p>Senator XENOPHON: In answer to question on notice 2115, you advised that 'a comprehensive probity plan has been developed'. Is that comprehensive probity plan available to this committee?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: Yes, the probity plan as well as all the other documentation relating to the competitive evaluation process will be made available to the expert advisory panel.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And to this committee?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: To the expert advisory panel?</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: No; to this committee of the Senate.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It is a little unusual.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: We will consider that. I will take that question on notice.</p>	Day 1 p. 128	13/07/15	13/08/15
63.	Defence	Lambie	DART – Cases since 2011	<p>Senator LAMBIE: No, I am actually asking the DART to provide that information now, not the CDF. I am asking the DART to provide how many cases they have had since the initial close of 2011.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: The DART is not at the table. You are asking the government whether the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce will provide the data you are requesting. Is that right?</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That is correct—since it closed its door.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: I will take that on notice.</p>	Day 2 p. 35	15/07/15	13/08/15
64.	Defence	Conroy	Defence Force Review Remuneration Tribunal	<p>Senator CONROY: Is the Defence Force Review Remuneration Tribunal very busy? Does it do a lot of hearings?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I defer to my colleague for specific details, but they do take hearings on special salaries cases such as clearance divers and other things like that. It is not only that they look at the workplace remuneration arrangement once every three years. They do take a range of other pay related matters.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Fuel allowance, maritime allowance, divers allowance.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You must put in submissions on those. Are they looking at any of them at the moment?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Yes, they are.</p> <p>Senator Brandis: We will take this on notice and we will provide you with a copy of the hearing list of the tribunal.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am sure the officers at the table could tell us if there were any other active, ongoing allowance conditions being considered by them.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: There are some but I think we would be best to get you a proper list.</p>	Day 1 p. 120	15/07/15	13/08/15

65.	Defence	Conroy	Red card occurrences	<p>Vice Adm. Griggs: As we pointed out last time, we talked through the process in the combined air operations centre about the go, no-go decisions on targeting. This is a routine thing and it occurs all the time.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I am wanting people to understand that it is very much part of the routine. How many times has this occurred? Happy for you to take that on notice.</p>	Day 1 p. 11	15/07/15	13/08/15
66.	Defence	Conroy	South China Sea-artillery	<p>Senator CONROY: I would like to make some inquiries about what seem to be some rising tensions in the South China Sea. I appreciate that this is a delicate matter that is receiving a lot of attention and those at the table may be limited in what they can say. There have been reports in the past few days that China placed artillery pieces on some of the features it claims in the South China Sea, although they may have since been removed. Has anyone at the table been able to verify whether these reports are accurate?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We saw the report out of the US and we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of that report.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So we believe that there were artillery pieces put onto the 'feature', if we can use that word, and they have now been removed—or they have not been removed?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: On the latter, I do not know the answer to that question. I have not seen reports of them being removed or not. I am only aware of the report out of the US that they were there and, as I said, we have no reason to dispute the accuracy of that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Is it possible for us to determine, overnight perhaps, if the report that they have been removed is also true?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We can inquire. Whether we will be able to do it I do not know.</p>	Day 1 p. 115	15/07/15	13/08/15
67.	Defence	Back	Change in APS numbers from 2011-12	<p>CHAIR: Would it be possible, Secretary—if I may break in there, Senator Conroy—to give us an indication from, say, 2011-12 through to now of the change in Defence APS numbers, please? Can you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Sure, we can do that.</p>	Day 1 p. 124	15/07/15	13/08/15
68.	Defence	Lambie	Compensation paid to civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan	<p>Senator LAMBIE: ... My next question is: how much compensation was paid to civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan, and under what conditions was money given to civilians? I am asking about cases where our guys destroy property, or they want to be able to go in and take over a house, or they want to pay money to take over a paddock. I want to know how much taxpayers money has been spent in the past 13 years to achieve this.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice.</p>	Day 1 p. 30	15/07/15	13/08/15

69.	Defence	Gallacher	Fuel card fraud	<p>(1) What are the procedures of use for an issued fuel card?</p> <p>(2) How are fuel card expenditure acquitted?</p> <p>(3) At what point did the problem become a red flag?</p> <p>(4) Is there a mechanism such as a card limit that is in place?</p> <p>(5) If there is a card limit what is it?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
70.	Defence	McGrath	HMAS Tobruk – Hervey Bay dive wreck proposal	<p>I refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - page 38 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2015-16: ‘... HMAS Tobruk is due to decommission in June 2015.’ - page 200 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2015-16: ‘... planning and instigating the disposal of HMAS Tobruk.’ - pages 73-74 of the Supplementary Budget Estimates on 22 October 2014 regarding questions about the use of decommissioned naval vessels as dive wrecks. <p>(1) What is the progress of the planned decommissioning of HMAS Tobruk?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) What is the process that will take place, or is taking place? (b) What is the cost? <p>(2) Has the Defence Materiel Organisation formed a view as to whether it is feasible to use the decommissioned HMAS Tobruk as a dive wreck in Hervey Bay?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) If yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) What is the view? (ii) What factors have led to this view? (b) If no: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) What factors are currently being considered in forming the view? 	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
71.	Defence	Rhiannon	Official Development Assistance (ODA) Transparency	Please provide details (projects) of all annual ODA eligible expenditure by the department over the last five years?	Written	30/07/15	13/08/15

72.	Defence	Rhiannon	Australia/Israel Military Exports	<p>(1) What was the 2013/2014 total for Australian military exports?</p> <p>(2) Are there Australian-based arms dealers exporting arms to the United States? If so what companies engage in this trade and what do they export?</p> <p>(3) Are there Australian-based arms dealers exporting arms to Israel? If so what companies engage in this trade and what do they export?</p> <p>(4) What is the total in the last financial year for Australian-based arms dealers exporting arms to US and to Israel?</p> <p>(5) Since 2007 the federal government has invested in boosting Australia's arms exports. Initially called the Defence Export Unit, it was rebranded and relaunched in 2012 as the Australian Military Sales Office. Questions in 2013 Senate estimates revealed that the initiative had helped achieve industry contracts totalling over \$760 million. What is the value of the contracts in 2013/2014?</p> <p>(6) An Australian subsidiary of Elbit – an Israeli arms company - Elbit Systems of Australia (ELSA) operates out of Port Melbourne Victoria and it is reported it “was established to serve the needs of the Australian Defence Forces (ADF) and serves as a venue to provide technology from abroad to Australia.” What type of contact does Elbit in Australia operate under?</p> <p>(7) When is this contract due to expire?</p> <p>(8) What countries has Elbit exported its products to?</p> <p>(9) Does Elbit Systems of Australia manufacture arms or components of arms?</p> <p>(10) If they do manufacture arms or arms components in Australia have any of these products/equipment been exported to Israel?</p> <p>(11) Have any of these products/equipment been used in the 2014 Gaza war?</p> <p>(12) What equipment has the Australian government bought from Elbit since Elbit was set up in Australia? Could this be presented in a table form with information provided on product, year purchased, number of units purchased, price per single unit, overall price.</p>	Written	15/09/15	17/09/15
73.	Defence	Rhiannon	Heron Remotely Piloted Aircraft	<p>Since 2010, the Australian military has been flying the Israel Aerospace Industries (IAI) built Heron Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) in the Middle East Area of Operations, based at Kandahar airfield in Afghanistan. The Heron is also used for RPA training at Woomera training ground in South Australia. Is the Heron RPA is still being used by the Australian military?</p>	Written	13/07/15	13/08/15

74.	Defence	Rhiannon	Peacekeeping	(1) Is Australia still engaged in multilateral peace keeping forces in Israel? (2) What are those operations and how much money is Australia contributing towards each operation, annually and since they commenced?	Written	05/08/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	----------	--------------	---	---------	----------	----------

75.	Defence	Xenophon	Defence Minister's speech on shipbuilding on 31 March 2015	<p>In a speech by the Defence Minister on 31 March 2015, he said: <i>The Australian naval ship building industry that will build our next generation of frigates will need to be a different industry. The industry currently isn't internationally competitive in terms of its productivity, and if this does not change it will not be sustainable. Australian taxpayers currently pay a price premium of at least 30-40 % greater than US benchmarks to build naval ships in Australia, and even greater against some other naval ship building nations. That price premium is simply too high to make good economic sense. As it currently stands, it is too high to enable a continuous build strategy to be adopted.</i></p> <p>I have two questions on this section of Mr Andrews' speech.</p> <p>(1) (To Defence) In an answer to a question on notice from Senator Conroy in February (QON 59 - 5), Defence said that no decisions had been made on whether the Future Frigates (SEA5000) would be built overseas. Doesn't this contradict the statement by the Defence Minister in his speech of March 31, among other statements by the Government?</p> <p>(2) (To the Defence Minister) the issue of a local premium for ship building was covered in the RAND Corporation report into naval shipbuilding in Australia, recently released, cited in the media release from the Defence Minister on the day the report was released (April 16, see attached):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The cost of building naval ships in Australia is 30-40 per cent greater than United States benchmarks, and even greater against some other naval ship building nations. Australia is currently one the most expensive places to build naval vessels. This premium can be reduced by improved productivity through:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Establishing a consistent production and build demand.</i> ○ <i>Selecting a mature design at the start of the build and limiting the amount of changes once production begins.</i> ○ <i>The necessity of ensuring a well-integrated designer, builder and supplier team.</i> ○ <i>Matching the industrial base structure to demand.</i> ○ <i>Ensuring there is visionary leadership provided by company management.</i> <p>(a) Given the top three reasons RAND found responsible for a local naval ship building cost premium lie at the feet of Government and Defence, on what basis does the Defence Minister justify what he said in that March speech, which isolates naval shipbuilding industry as primarily responsible and "uncompetitive", "unsustainable" and not worthy of a continuous build strategy?</p> <p>(b) Does the Defence Minister acknowledge, given the RAND report, that the lack of a continuous build strategy is one of the chief reasons for the cost premium?</p>	Written	17/09/15	15/10/15
-----	---------	----------	--	--	---------	----------	----------

76.	Defence	Xenophon	Military superannuation	<p>It's understood that Defence adopted a change in the way it accounted for the cost of to its military superannuation scheme since the 2014 budget. According to information received, the discount rate (interest rate) used to project expected earnings from superannuation funds has been reduced from 6 per cent (based on the Long Term Cost Report interest rate) to 4.1 per cent (based on a spot interest rate approach in accordance with the Australian Accounting Standards)</p> <p>(1) What was, or is expected to be, the net effect on government finances of this change in the current financial year?</p> <p>(2) Looking at the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements – why has the cost of military superannuation grown from about \$500 million in 2013-14 to estimated \$4.08 billion in this financial year?</p>	Written	30/07/15	13/08/15
77.	Defence	Xenophon	Discussions with US – B1 bombers	<p>What discussions between Australia and the United States have occurred in relation to the placement of B1 bombers in Australia and its states and territories?</p>	Written	30/07/15	13/08/15
78.	Defence	Xenophon	DART – administrative and disciplinary action	<p>During the Budget Estimates hearing for the L&CA committee on Wednesday the 27th of May, Mr Matthew Hall of the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce revealed there has been a startling increase in the number of abuse cases concerning still serving ADF members that have been reported to the Chief of Defence for administrative or disciplinary action.</p> <p>As at 27 October 2014 the Taskforce had referred 40 abuse cases which included 64 still serving alleged abusers to CDF. On the 27th of May 2015 Mr Hall advised that this number had increased to 110 cases involving 151 alleged abusers who are still serving in the ADF.</p> <p>(1) Can you provide examples of the type of administrative and disciplinary action that may be applied in cases where a still serving member is found to have abused another member of the ADF?</p> <p>(2) Can you advise how many of these referrals have resulted in administrative action? In disciplinary action?</p> <p>(3) Without revealing information that could identify the alleged abusers, can you please advise what specific administrative and/or disciplinary action Defence has taken against them in respect of the abuse allegations?</p>	Written	07/08/15	13/08/15

79.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program - Competitive Evaluation Process	<p>REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, p.31:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Thank you. We are now all familiar with the question asked? My question is, to be clear: had the department been formally consulted about the use of a competitive evaluation process prior to the Prime Minister's announcement on 8 February?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I was aware of it.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Had the government sought formal advice from the department in relation to a competitive evaluation process for Australia's Future Submarine project prior to the Prime Minister's announcement on 8 February?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We had been discussing for some time what process might be pursued, and different options had been discussed from time to time.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So there had been a formal consultation with you, Mr Richardson, on that competitive evaluation process prior to the 8th?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: There was. I was certainly aware that an announcement would be made.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: That is very carefully worded. Who else fell into the category of being 'aware'?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I am not sure.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Would you like to phone a friend?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I left the dog at home.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So you are not aware of anybody else having been consulted?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not know.</p> <p>(1) How did the Secretary become 'aware' of the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(a) Please provide all relevant correspondence and meeting or discussion details including dates, times, attendees and agendas.</p> <p>(b) Were any documents prepared prior to 8 February in relation to the Competitive Evaluation Process? Please provide copies of any such documents.</p> <p>(c) Please detail the 'different options' that had been 'discussed from time to time' including analysis of their respective merits.</p> <p>(2) How did the Secretary become 'aware' of the Competitive Evaluation Process announcement on 8 February?</p> <p>(a) Please provide all relevant correspondence and meeting or discussion details including dates, times, attendees and agendas.</p> <p>(b) Were any documents prepared prior to 8 February in relation to the Competitive Evaluation Process announcement? Please provide copies of any such documents.</p> <p>(3) Who else was 'aware' of the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(4) Who else was 'aware' of the Competitive Evaluation Process announcement?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	---	--	---------	----------	----------

				<p>(5) REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, p. 32:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would be very surprised if you were not. I would be very surprised if you were not aware of it, Mr Richardson, so I am happy to take your word. We will hopefully, if there is anything, find out. Did Defence's formal advice to government ahead of the Prime Minister's announcement on 8 February included [sic] advice on the structure, terms and/or details of a competitive evaluation?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I am not aware of that. I am not aware of it having gone into that detail.</p> <p>Please provide the exact detail of Defence's advice to the Government regarding the Competitive Evaluation Process prior to 8 February.</p>			
80.	Defence	Conroy	<p>Future Submarine Program – International Policy Division responsibilities and contribution</p>	<p>REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, p. 32:</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Well, there have been a variety of people working on submarines. The areas that have been involved have been DMO and, as I mentioned, General Manager Submarines. International Policy has been involved. Deputy Secretary Strategy has been involved and, self-evidently, Chief of Navy and Navy, very much involved. The VCDF has been involved, and the CDF has been involved.</p> <p>(1) Please provide specific details on the scope of the International Policy Division's responsibilities and contributions in regard to the Future Submarine Program.</p> <p>(2) Please include all documentation, details of meetings and discussions, and details of all interactions outside of the Australian Government in relation to the Future Submarine Project and the Competitive Evaluation Process.</p>	Written	08/09/15	17/09/15

81.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – Off the shelf solution	<p>REF: Response to sub-question 6 of Question on Notice 35 from the Department of Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 25 February 2015:</p> <p><i>“There is no ‘off-the-shelf’ solution for the Future Submarine.”</i></p> <p>REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, p. 46:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Defence's response to subquestion (6) of question on notice No. 35 to the Department of Defence at the additional estimates hearing on 25 February states: <i>There is no ‘off-the-shelf’ solution for the Future Submarine.</i> That is just a representation of what was said. That is a direct quote. Mr Richardson: That is inaccurate.</p> <p>(1) Was Defence’s response to sub-question 6 of Question on Notice 35 from the Department of Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 25 February 2015 accurate?</p> <p>(2) Does Defence continue to stand by this statement?</p>	Written	17/09/15	15/10/15
-----	---------	--------	---	--	---------	----------	----------

82.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – Expert Advisory Panel	<p>REF: Minister for Defence Press Release, 05/06/15, Expert Advisory Panel appointed to oversee Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process.</p> <p><i>The members of the Expert Advisory Panel are:</i></p> <p><i>Professor Donald Winter, a former Secretary of the United States Navy;</i></p> <p><i>The Honourable Julie Anne Dodds-Streeton, a former Justice of the Federal Court of Australia;</i></p> <p><i>Mr Ron Finlay, one of Australia’s leading infrastructure specialists with extensive legal experience; and</i></p> <p><i>Mr Jim McDowell, a member of the First Principles Review team with extensive Defence experience.</i></p> <p>(1) Did Defence recommend all four of these appointees to the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(2) Did the recommendation of all four of these appointees originate in Defence?</p> <p>(3) By what process were potential appointees evaluated by Defence in relation to their potential roles and contributions to the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(4) Who else was recommended by Defence for appointment to the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(5) On what basis were any potential appointees (as recommended by Defence) to the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process rejected by the Government?</p> <p>(6) On what date did Defence make formal recommendations to the Government regarding the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(7) By what practice was the formal recommendation made (e.g. Formal written advice from the Department Secretary)?</p> <p>(8) Who in Defence was responsible for making the recommendations?</p> <p>(9) On what date did the Department provide advice to the Government on the terms of reference for the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(10) Which areas and individuals in Defence were responsible for developing those terms of reference?</p> <p>(11) What are the contractual arrangements for the members of the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(a) What payments are being made to the members in the form of salaries, allowances, travel budgets and any other payments?</p> <p>(b) What are the start and end dates for the contracts?</p> <p>(c) What secretariat and/or administrative support is being provided to the Expert Advisory Panel for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process and what is the cost of this support?</p> <p>(12) What is the budget for the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process?</p>	Written	12/10/15	15/10/15
Defence Portfolio – Budget Estimates, 1-2 June 2015						58	

				<p>(a) What have been the costs to date?</p> <p>(b) What is the projected total cost of the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p>			
83.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – Conditions of tender	<p>REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, pp. 48:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Could you provide some examples of what the department would consider to be a conflict of interest in regard to the Future Submarine project, including the competitive evaluation process?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: It would be a conflict, for example, if Mr Gould decided tomorrow to go and work for one of the potential bidders. We would consider that to be a conflict of interest, and we would presumably put in place arrangements to—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: What sort of arrangements would you put in place in that situation?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: We would normally write to the relevant company and suggest to them that that appointment would not be appropriate at this stage, given the position that Mr Gould held immediately prior to that. We would normally have provisions in our documentation to cover off on that.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I noticed a case recently in New South Wales where someone in a similar type of position to Mr Gould moved to work for a bidder in a process. The New South Wales government wrote to them and said, 'You are no longer allowed to bid because that person has gone to work for you.' Is that the sort of thing, or is that outside your scope?</p> <p>Mr Dunstall: We are not normally that specific, but we would normally point to provisions in our conditions of tender along the lines that bids must not be prepared with the assistance of individuals who have previously or in recent times worked with the Commonwealth. We would then write to the tenderer and suggest to them, 'You have to meet that requirement, that condition of tender. We will be expecting you to provide evidence as to how you do that. We would be interested to understand how you can do that given that you are now proposing to employ the particular individual.'</p>	Written	17/09/15	15/10/15

				<p>(1) Is the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project subject to the same 'conditions of tender' regarding bids not being prepared with the 'assistance of individuals who have previously or in recent times worked with the Commonwealth' as described above?</p> <p>(2) Please provide the conditions of tender for the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project.</p> <p>(3) Has Defence identified any party involved with the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project that may be preparing a bid with the assistance of an individual recently employed by the Commonwealth?</p> <p>(4) Have any parties involved with the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project been written to with the suggestion that they must meet this condition of tender?</p> <p>(5) What steps would Defence consider appropriate for a bidder to take in order to meet its condition of tender?</p> <p>(6) What evidence does Defence consider sufficient to ensure a bidder meets this condition of tender?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

84.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program - Probity	<p>During Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, the issue of conflicts of interest with respect to the Future Submarine Project was discussed. At the time, Mr Dunstall said:</p> <p><i>“As with most of our major programs, we have a probity framework that applies. We have an appointed probity adviser who advises, and the personnel involved in the process are subject to that framework, including in relation to dealings with conflict of interest and confidentiality.”</i></p> <p>When asked who the probity adviser was, Mr Dunstall responded:</p> <p><i>“The Australian Government Solicitor”.</i></p> <p>(1) When was the Australian Government Solicitor appointed as the probity adviser for the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>(2) What is the probity framework that applies to the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>(3) Which agency drafted the framework, when was it finalised and when did it come into effect?</p> <p>(4) Does this framework apply only to Government employees or are commercial entities involved in the project also subject to the framework?</p> <p>(5) How is compliance with the probity framework monitored and enforced?</p> <p>(6) Is Defence able to release a copy of this framework (redacted or otherwise)?</p> <p>(7) Was the Australian Government Solicitor, as the probity adviser for the Future Submarine Project, consulted on the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(a) If so, when was the Australian Government Solicitor consulted, who conducted the consultation, and what was the advice from the Australian Government Solicitor?</p> <p>(b) Is Defence able to release a copy of the advice from the Australian Government Solicitor (redacted or otherwise)?</p> <p>(c) Have any changes, updates or amendments been made to the probity framework as a result of the Government’s decision to utilise a Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(8) On 5 June 2015, the Minister for Defence announced the appointment of an Expert Advisory Panel to oversee the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process. At the time, Defence Minister Andrews stated:</p> <p><i>“The Expert Advisory Panel will assure the Government that the competitive evaluation process remains sound, is conducted in accordance with probity and accountability principles, and that participants have been treated fairly and equitably.”</i></p> <p>(a) Is the Australian Government Solicitor still the probity adviser for the Future Submarine Project following the formation of the Expert Advisory Panel?</p> <p>(b) Will the Probity Adviser still have ultimate responsibility for probity issues associated with the Future Submarine Project, including the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(c) What role will the Expert Advisory Panel have in ensuring probity and accountability principles are followed?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

				<p>(d) Will the Expert Advisory Panel have a monitoring and oversight function? If so, how will it perform this function?</p> <p>(e) How will the Expert Advisory Panel enforce probity and accountability principles?</p> <p>(f) How does the Expert Advisory Panel's role with respect to probity and accountability issues accord with the Probity Adviser's role and responsibilities?</p> <p>(g) Will the Expert Advisory Panel be bound by, and operate within the terms of, the existing Probity Framework for the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>(9) Mr Sean Costello, the Chief of Staff to the former Minister for Defence, was appointed as the CEO of DCNS Australia just four months after finishing as Chief of Staff to the then Defence Minister. DCNS Australia is a subsidiary of DCNS, one of the commercial entities involved in the Competitive Evaluation Process.</p> <p>When asked about this during Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, including whether the Australian Government Solicitor had been consulted on this matter, Mr Dunstall said:</p> <p><i>"Yes, I can confirm that. They provided us advice in relation to the matter."</i></p> <p>(a) When was the Australian Government Solicitor consulted about Mr Costello's involvement in the Future Submarine Project?</p> <p>(b) On what date did Defence request advice and on what date was advice received from the Australian Government Solicitor?</p> <p>(c) Who within Defence requested the advice?</p> <p>(d) What form or format did Defence's request for advice, and the subsequent response from the Australian Government Solicitor, take?</p> <p>(e) What, if any, concerns were raised or recommendations made by the Australian Government Solicitor with respect to Mr Costello's involvement in the Future Submarine Project, including the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p> <p>(f) Is Defence able to release a copy of its request and the subsequent advice from the Australian Government Solicitor with respect to Mr Costello's involvement in the Future Submarine Project, including the Competitive Evaluation Process (redacted or otherwise)?</p> <p>(g) Was Mr Costello exposed to commercially sensitive information regarding potential competitors of DCNS in the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project during his tenure as Chief of Staff to the then Defence Minister?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

85.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program - Japan	<p>REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, pp. 79:</p> <p>Senator CONROY: Which areas of Defence and of the Australian government have been involved in consultations with the Japanese competitor? This is going to be a much longer list, so take your time.</p> <p>Mr Gould: No—the difference with Japan is that we have been working on a government-to-government basis up till now, rather than a government-to-industry basis.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: You are now saying you are the government's representative in the discussions with the Japanese?</p> <p>Mr Gould: I am the government's representative in all of these discussions. But the government team with Japan is actually led by the Deputy Secretary for Strategy, because it has a greater political—</p> <p>Senator CONROY: I would have expected that to be the answer. So who is it who has the greater political—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Peter Baxter.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: So Mr Baxter is in charge of it. Why did you say, Mr Gould?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Well.</p> <p>Senator CONROY: No, let Mr Gould repeat what he has already said on the Hansard.</p> <p>Mr Gould: He is in charge of it because it is a government-to-government arrangement with Japan, rather than a government-to-industry arrangement, which is the case with France and Germany.</p> <p>(1) Why are consultations with Japan in relation to the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project being conducted on a government-to-government basis, rather than a government-to-industry basis?</p> <p>(2) What additional functions or capabilities does the Deputy Secretary for Strategy bring to these discussions (above and beyond the normal team)?</p> <p>(3) Please outline the day-to-day duties of the Deputy Secretary for Strategy outside of his involvement in this process (including the teams he oversees and their respective functions).</p> <p>(4) What are the 'greater political' aspects of the discussions with Japan as opposed to the other bidders?</p>	Written	28/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

86.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – Rough Order of Magnitude	<p>During Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, Mr Gould said that the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarine Project would result in a “rough order of magnitude” for cost and schedule for each of the options.</p> <p>(1) How does Defence define a Rough Order of Magnitude estimate?</p> <p>(2) What level of accuracy and variance is typical in the commercial sector when determining a Rough Order of Magnitude estimate for cost and/or schedule for an acquisition?</p> <p>(3) What level of accuracy and variance is normally utilised by Defence when determining a Rough Order of Magnitude estimate for cost and/or schedule for an acquisition project?</p> <p>(4) What level of accuracy and variance will be utilised when determining the Rough Order of Magnitude estimates for cost and schedule for the Competitive Evaluation Process?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
87.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – Exploratory Work	<p>In its response to Question on Notice 6 from the Department of Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 25 February 2015, Defence indicated that there has been:</p> <p><i>“...an exploration of a new design conducted in Australia”.</i></p> <p>(1) Can you please clarify which agencies and/or entities conducted this exploratory work?</p> <p>(2) Who requested this exploratory work be undertaken, when did the request occur, and when was the work completed?</p> <p>(3) What were the terms of reference for this exploratory work?</p> <p>(4) Which organisations and/or entities were consulted as part of this exploratory work?</p> <p>(5) Defence’s response to Question on Notice 6 from the Department of Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 25 February 2015 also states that this exploratory work found skills gaps, and as a result:</p> <p><i>“Australia would need to partner with an experienced international designer to develop the Future Submarine”.</i></p> <p>Against what criterion were Australia’s design capabilities assessed?</p> <p>(6) Was the scope of this exploratory work restricted to design of Australia’s Future Submarine or did it also include consideration of elements related to a build phase?</p> <p>(7) What criteria were used to assess Australia’s build capabilities?</p> <p>(8) Did the exploratory work consider an Australian build, an overseas build, or a hybrid build for Australia’s Future Submarines?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15

88.	Defence	Conroy	Future Submarine Program – DSTO involvement	<p>Could Defence please outline what work DSTO is undertaking in regard to SEA1000?</p> <p>(a) How many staff are currently working on this project?</p> <p>(b) How many of these staff are contractors?</p> <p>(c) How many of these staff are permanent Commonwealth employees?</p> <p>(d) What is the cost of the contract staff?</p> <p>(e) What is the rationale for the number of contracted staff?</p> <p>(f) Would it be more efficient to hire Commonwealth employees to do this work, and retain the skills and knowledge in-house?</p>	Written	28/07/15	13/08/15
89.	Defence	Conroy	Requests for increased contribution in Iraq	<p>In remarks during a press conference after the G7 Summit on 8 June 2015, US President Obama said:</p> <p><i>“So we want to get more Iraqi security forces trained, fresh, well-equipped and focused. And President Abadi wants the same thing ... So we’re reviewing a range of plans for how we might do that, essentially accelerating the number of Iraqi forces that are properly trained and equipped and have a focused strategy and good leadership.”</i></p> <p>(1) Has Australia been approached by the United States with respect to the options for Iraq that President Obama referred to in his 8 June 2015 remarks?</p> <p>(2) Has Australia been approached by the United States, Iraq or other countries to consider increasing its contribution to the international effort in Iraq?</p> <p>(a) If so, when did this occur, who made the approach and what was the nature of the increased contribution sought?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
90.	Defence	Conroy	Consultation with Australia - Iraq	<p>In an address to ‘Australia’s Regional Summit to Counter Violent Extremism’ on 11 June 2015, Prime Minister Abbott said</p> <p><i>“We are talking with our friends and partners about how the air strikes might be more effective and how the Iraqi forces might be better helped.”</i></p> <p>(1) Which friends and partners are being consulted by Australia?</p> <p>(a) When did these consultations occur?</p> <p>(b) Which agencies and individuals are leading these discussions?</p> <p>(2) What proposals are under consideration to make air strikes more effective?</p> <p>(3) What proposals are under consideration with respect to better helping Iraqi forces?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15

91.	Defence	Conroy	Building Partner Capacity Mission	<p>In the press conference after the G7 Summit on 8 June 2015, President Obama went on to say that:</p> <p><i>“I think what is fair to say is that all the countries in the international coalition are prepared to do more to train Iraqi security forces if they feel like that additional work is being taken advantage of.”</i></p> <p>(1) How many Iraqi security personnel are currently being trained by international partners?</p> <p>(a) How many of these personnel are being trained as part of the Building Partner Capacity mission?</p> <p>(2) What is Defence’s assessment of the total capacity of the Building Partner Capacity mission and the take-up rate by Iraqi security personnel?</p> <p>(3) Is there residual capacity within the current Building Partner Capacity mission to train additional Iraq personnel or are there capacity constraints evident (and, if so, in what areas)?</p> <p>(4) Is there residual capacity within Australia’s current contribution to the Building Partner Capacity mission to train additional Iraqi personnel?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	-----------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

92.	Defence	Conroy	Size of contribution to Iraq	<p>During Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, Vice Admiral Griggs responded to several questions about the future of Australia’s Special Forces contribution in Iraq. As part of his response, Vice Admiral Griggs said that:</p> <p><i>“The intention is to draw-down the number of Special Operation Task Group personnel in the advise-and-assist mission so that our overall contribution level remains in balance to offset the additional 300 personnel that have gone into Taji for the Building Partner Capacity mission. As I said, the government has not yet decided on what the final composition of the ongoing advise-and-assist mission will be, but there will be an ongoing advise-and-assist mission, but it will be much smaller than it is now.”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) What did Vice Admiral Griggs mean when he spoke of Australia’s contribution level being in “balance”? What factors are being balanced? (2) How does a reduction in Special Forces personnel “offset” an increase in conventional forces as part of the Building Partner Capacity mission? (3) Was this “offset” – i.e. the reduction in Special Forces numbers – recommended by the Department of Defence? If so, on what basis did Defence recommend this course of action? (4) Is Defence working within a force size ‘cap’ or authorised manning level in Iraq? If so, what is the maximum size presently authorised for each element of Australia’s contribution? (5) What roles might a reduced Australian Special Forces element play in Iraq? (6) Will any future role for the reduced Special Forces element be limited to the current ‘advise and assist’ mission within its existing mandate? (7) Are any other roles for the reduced Special Forces contribution under consideration? If so, please outline what those roles might entail. (8) What factors will be considered when determining options for the potential size and mission of this reduced Special Forces element? (9) When does Defence expect there will be a decision on the future for the reduced Special Forces contribution in Iraq? 	Written	10/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

93.	Defence	Conroy	Red card system - Iraq	<p>In response to Question on Notice 3 from the Department of Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 25 February 2015, Defence provided information regarding the 'red card system' used in Iraq.</p> <p>As part of its response, Defence stated that:</p> <p><i>“Accepting or refusing any target is part of the normal tasking request process. Since the Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 22 October 2014, Australian Target Engagement Authorities have refused requests for Australian aircraft to strike a dynamic target on 16 occasions from 122 direct requests; however, at no time has it been necessary to apply the ‘red card’ in order to halt an assigned task. A target is defined as ‘dynamic’ if it is not identified in time for pre-planned engagement.”</i></p> <p>(1) Could Defence please provide updated statistics on the number of requests for Australian aircraft to conduct a strike and the number of refusals? Please provide statistics for the intervening period since Defence provided its response under Question on Notice 3 as well as total numbers since the start of Australia’s involvement in the air campaign.</p> <p>(2) With respect to all occasions where Australian Target Engagement Authorities refused a request for Australian aircraft to strike a target, could Defence please provide details of the event, including:</p> <p>(a) the date and time of the request as well as the subsequent refusal; (b) the nature of the request, including a broad description of the target (e.g. complex, building, car, individual, etc.) and its general location (e.g. city, district, etc.); and (c) the reason for refusing the request.</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	------------------------	---	---------	----------	----------

94.	Defence	Conroy	Daesh – threat of chemical or nuclear weapons	<p>During an address to the Australia Group Plenary on 5 June 2015, Foreign Minister Bishop stated that: <i>“The use of chlorine by Da’esh, and its recruitment of highly technically trained professionals, including from the West, have revealed far more serious efforts in chemical weapons development ... Da’esh is likely to have amongst its tens of thousands of recruits the technical expertise necessary to further refine precursor materials and build chemical weapons.”</i></p> <p>In subsequent comments to The Australian newspaper (“Jihadis’ quest for dirty bomb”, 9 June 2015), Foreign Minister Bishop is reported as saying that her speech was based on reports from the Defence Department and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.</p> <p>(1) Is Defence able to confirm reports of the use of chlorine or other chemical agents by Da’esh in Syria and/or Iraq?</p> <p>(a) If so, on what dates and at what locations did this occur? If possible, please also outline the chemical agents thought to have been used.</p> <p>(b) Have any chemical agents been used in the vicinity of Australian Defence Force personnel in Iraq?</p> <p>(c) What training and equipment have Australian Defence Force personnel in Iraq received should chemical agents be used in their vicinity?</p> <p>(2) Is Defence able to confirm that Da’esh has recruited the technical expertise necessary to further refine precursor materials and build chemical weapons?</p> <p>(a) If so, how many such experts does Defence assess that Da’esh has recruited?</p> <p>(b) What is Defence’s assessment of Da’esh’s capacity to effectively build and deploy chemical weapons?</p> <p>(c) What is Defence’s overall assessment of the threat of Da’esh using chemical weapons?</p> <p>In the same article in The Australian, Foreign Minister Bishop is also reported to have said that Islamic State is believed to have collected radioactive material from hospitals and research centres in Iraq and Syria, raising fears it could build a ‘dirty’ bomb.</p> <p>(3) Is Defence able to confirm that Da’esh/Islamic State has successfully collected radioactive materials?</p> <p>(a) If so, where and when are radioactive materials understood to have been collected?</p> <p>(b) What is Defence’s assessment of the size and scope of any radioactive material collected by Da’esh?</p> <p>(c) Does Defence assess that this material could be used to construct a ‘dirty’ bomb?</p> <p>(d) Does Defence assess that Da’esh has the necessary skills to effectively weaponise and deploy radioactive material?</p> <p>(e) Does Defence have any evidence of Da’esh currently possessing a ‘dirty’ bomb or precursor elements for such a bomb?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
-----	---------	--------	---	---	---------	----------	----------

				<p>(f) What training and equipment have Australian Defence Force personnel received should radioactive material be used in their vicinity?</p> <p>(4) During Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, Defence Secretary Richardson was asked whether he was aware of media reports that Da'esh was working to acquire nuclear weapons. At the time, Mr Richardson responded: <i>"Yes. I simply make the general comment that every terrorist group of any significance over the last 20 years has had an interest in acquiring some form of nuclear capability, whether that be a dirty bomb or something more sophisticated. The US and others are very alert to that and I do not think there is any suggestion that Daesh is at this point able to do that. We would not see a risk in Iraq at this point in time in terms of Daesh and nuclear weaponry. We think that is a touch exaggerated"</i></p> <p>In light of the Foreign Minister's comments to The Australian newspaper, does Mr Richardson stand by his assessment during Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015, including that:</p> <p>(a) there is no suggestion that Da'esh is able to acquire some form of nuclear capability, including a dirty bomb?</p> <p>(b) Mr Richardson does not see a risk in Iraq at this point in time with respect to Da'esh and nuclear weaponry?</p> <p>(c) such reports are "a touch exaggerated"?</p>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

95.	Defence	Conroy	First Principles Review	<p>(1) In response to questions during Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015 concerning the disbanding and dispersal of Capability Development Group (CDG), Mr Richardson stated:</p> <p><i>“... The existing Capability Development Group will remain in existence until a new capability development process is developed. It is very possible that we will not have that new process in place before early next year. Either way, the Capability Development Group will continue to work as it currently operates until we put in place a new process ...”</i></p> <p>(a) Could Defence please confirm that this mean that Capability Development Group will continue ‘as is’ – that is, it will remain intact under its current leadership and utilising its existing structure and processes – until the new capability development process is finalised?</p> <p>(b) Has work commenced on the new capability development process?</p> <p>(i) If so, when did development of the new process commence?</p> <p>(ii) Which entities within Defence are leading and/or involved in developing the new process?</p> <p>(iii) Are any outside entities – Government or otherwise – involved in developing the new process?</p> <p>(iv) Is there are target date for implementation of the new process?</p> <p>(2) The Government has accepted recommendation 3.10 of the First Principles Review: <i>"geospatial information functions be consolidated into the Australian Geospatial-Intelligence Organisation following improved resourcing and connectivity"</i></p> <p>What is the complete list of functions and the organisations in which they are currently housed that will be affected by the acceptance of this recommendation?</p> <p>(3) Has there yet been any consideration within the Department on the way in which this recommendation will be implemented?</p> <p>(a) If so, what possibilities are being considered?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	-------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

96.	Defence	Conroy	Defence Budget	<p>REF: Table 2 on page 17 of Budget Related Paper No. 1.4A – Defence Portfolio.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Serial 14 is titled ‘Total Defence funding’. Are these the figures that the Government uses to define total Defence funding? (2) The updated 2015/16 budget estimate figure is about \$2.1 billion higher than was estimated previously. Can you please explain this discrepancy? (3) The notes suggest that the figures have been adjusted by over \$1.5 billion. This represents roughly 5% of the previously estimated budgetary figure. Can you please explain the causes of such a significant adjustment? (4) \$800 million has been transferred to the Department’s appropriations in 2015/16 as a result of their subsuming of DMO. However the Department’s adjusted appropriation figure is another \$1.1 billion beyond this. Can you please explain the cause of this additional \$1.1 billion in appropriation? (5) Total Defence funding decreases by over \$1 billion in the 2016/17 financial year. Can you please explain the rationale behind this 3.1% funding cut? (6) What are the relevant factors in 2016/17 that reduce Defence’s requirements for personnel, operations or capabilities by 3.1%? (7) Is there a risk that a funding reduction of such a magnitude could have detrimental effects upon our service people who may be serving overseas at the time? (8) What assurances do our service people have that these funding cuts won’t affect their safety, their pay and conditions, or the support for their families? (9) Will this \$1 billion cut to the Defence budget have an effect on any Defence procurement projects such as the Future Submarine Project or LAND400? (10) Please explain how Defence proposes to cut \$1 billion out of its budget without affecting personnel, operations or capabilities? (11) \$400 million of this reduction comes from Departmental appropriations. What are the relevant factors in 2016/17 that reduce the Department’s funding requirements by \$400 million? (12) Is it envisaged that this \$400 million reduction will be made through further job cuts within the Defence Department? (13) Does the Department currently have excess staff? (14) Would a reduction in staff below current FTE numbers reduce Departmental capabilities? (15) Has Defence provided advice to the Government confirming the strategic imperative underpinning such excessive budgetary cuts? 	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	----------------	--	---------	----------	----------

97.	Defence	Conroy	Defence Budget – Mark Thomson’s analysis	<p>REF: Mark Thomson’s budget analysis in The Strategist from 13 May 2015.</p> <p>(1) Despite the Government’s claims of a budget increase, Mr Thomson asserts that: <i>“No new funding was actually provided for additional equipment or capability in 2015–16.”</i> Is this assertion accurate?</p> <p>(2) Does this failure to deliver new equipment and capabilities have the potential to impede our Defence people from conducting their jobs safely and effectively?</p> <p>(3) Taking into account the \$1 billion funding cut in 2016/17, Mr Thomson claims that in order to reach the 2023/24 target of 2% of GDP, the Government will: <i>“... require seven straight years of 4.6% compounding real annual growth...”</i> These are extraordinary numbers in terms of budgetary growth – is this trajectory realistic?</p> <p>(4) Mr Thomson points out the fact that: <i>“... defence spending can’t be turned on and off like a tap.”</i> Given the peaks and troughs in Defence funding projections, is Defence concerned that this budget does not provide the funding stability required to generate capability gains for our Defence force?</p> <p>(5) In his Media Release of 12 May 2015, Defence Minister Kevin Andrews reiterates the Abbott Government’s promise – and I QUOTE: <i>“...to provide Defence with a stable and sustainable funding growth path.”</i> Can you please explain how a \$1 billion cut to the Defence budget represents a ‘stable and sustainable funding growth path’?</p> <p>(6) Mr Thomson writes: <i>“On past experience, Defence and defence industry will find the expansion required to absorb sustained growth of 4.6% difficult to manage.”</i> Does Defence acknowledge that the unstable and unsustainable budgetary approach of the Abbott Government makes things ‘difficult to manage’ for Defence and Defence industry?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
-----	---------	--------	--	---	---------	----------	----------

98.	Defence	Conroy	ASLAV	<p>(1) What is the Life of Type ceiling for the ASLAV?</p> <p>(a) Does this involve an extension of the original Life of Type?</p> <p>(i) If so, what was the original Life of Type?</p> <p>(ii) What costs and modifications have been involved in extending the ASLAV Life of Type?</p> <p>(2) What air and sea assets in the ADF inventory can be used to move the ASLAV and how many can be moved by each asset?</p> <p>(a) Please provide examples of when the ASLAV has been moved by a particular air or sea asset for operational duties.</p>	Written	03/08/15	13/08/15
99.	Defence	Conroy	M113	<p>(1) What is the Life of Type ceiling for the M113?</p> <p>(a) Does this involve an extension of the original Life of Type?</p> <p>(i) If so, what was the original Life of Type?</p> <p>(ii) What costs and modifications have been involved in extending the M113 Life of Type?</p> <p>(2) What air and sea assets in the ADF inventory can be used to move the M113 and how many can be moved by each asset?</p> <p>(a) Please provide examples of when the M113 has been moved by a particular air or sea asset for operational duties.</p>	Written	03/08/15	13/08/15

100.	Defence	Conroy	LAND 121 Ph 4	<p>With respect to Land 121 Ph 4, the following exchange occurred during Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015: (REF: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee, Estimates, 1 June 2015, Proof Committee Hansard, p. 35): <i>Senator CONROY: Yes. So, do you agree that, of the three examples cited by Defence of previous acquisitions using a so-called competitive evaluation process, in all cases the options considered could be characterised as off the shelf?</i> <i>Mr Dunstall: Existing capabilities in three out of those four that were quoted in response to the question on notice.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) On what date was it decided that the Land 121 Ph 4 Light Protected Vehicle selection would be conducted using a Competitive Evaluation Process? (2) Who made this decision? (3) On what basis was this decision made? (4) What other options were considered in regard to appropriate processes? (5) Will the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Land 121 Ph 4 Light Protected Vehicle result in contract options for comparison? (6) Please provide all relevant documentation related to the Land 121 Ph 4 Light Protected Vehicle Competitive Evaluation Process, including dated advice from the Department recommending a Competitive Evaluation Process for the Land 121 Ph 4 Light Protected Vehicle selection. 	Written	28/07/15	13/08/15
------	---------	--------	---------------	--	---------	----------	----------

101.	Defence	Conroy	Landing Helicopter Dock Ships (LHDs)	<p>With respect to Navy's Landing Helicopter Dock Ships (LHDs), could Defence please provide answers to the following:</p> <p>(1) What ship-to-shore connector will be used in conjunction with the LHDs?</p> <p>(a) Are there any other ship-to-shore connectors planned besides the LCM-1E?</p> <p>(b) How many LCM-1Es can fit on each LHD?</p> <p>(2) What is the current status of the project to acquire the LCM-1E?</p> <p>(a) How many LCM-1Es will be acquired and at what cost?</p> <p>(b) How many LCM-1Es have been delivered thus far and are they currently in service?</p> <p>(c) When will the remaining LCM-1Es be delivered and introduced into service?</p> <p>(3) What is the maximum distance and duration of the LCM-1Es?</p> <p>(4) In what sea-states can the LCM-1E operate?</p> <p>(5) What force protection does the LCM-1E afford – does it have any armour or armaments?</p> <p>(6) What is the maximum load weight for the LCM-1Es?</p> <p>(a) What is the maximum number of vehicles and personnel the LCM-1Es can safely transport on a single trip – for example, how many M1 tanks, ASLAVs or M113 can fit?</p> <p>(b) What is the maximum load weight for the stern gate of the LCM-1Es?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
------	---------	--------	--------------------------------------	---	---------	----------	----------

102.	Defence	Conroy	C-130 Hercules and C-17 Globemaster	<p>(1) What is the minimum take-off and landing distances for a C-130? Please include un-laden and laden figures.</p> <p>(a) What is the maximum cargo capacity of the ADF's C-130s?</p> <p>(b) What are the minimum runway specifications for a C-130?</p> <p>(c) Does the C-130 require a sealed and/or paved runway to operate?</p> <p>(d) Does it require a reinforced runway or particular tarmac specifications?</p> <p>(2) What is the minimum take-off and landing distances for a C-17? Please include un-laden and laden figures.</p> <p>(a) What is the maximum cargo capacity of the ADF's C-17s?</p> <p>(b) What are the minimum runway specifications for a C-17?</p> <p>(c) Does the C-17 require a sealed and/or paved runway to operate?</p> <p>(d) Does it require a reinforced runway or particular tarmac specifications?</p> <p>(e) How many countries in the South Pacific have a C-17 capable runway? Please provide a list of such C-17 capable runways.</p> <p>(f) How does the C-17's cargo and take-off/landing requirements compare to the C-130?</p> <p>(3) In broad terms, what is the operational concept for the ADF's C-130s and its C-17s – how do they differ in terms of their intended purposes and roles.</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
------	---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---	---------	----------	----------

103.	Defence	Conroy	Triton	<p>REF: Stewart, C.,12/06/2015, No land role for \$2.5bn drones, The Australian</p> <p>(1) Can Defence confirm Australia’s commitment to acquire up to 7 MQ-4C Triton UAS’?</p> <p>(2) Can Defence confirm that the cost estimate for this acquisition is \$2.5 billion?</p> <p>(3) Can Defence confirm that its recommendation to Government is to acquire the Tritons via a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program (as opposed to a co-operative joint development program) as reported?</p> <p>(a) If so, what is the justification for this recommendation?</p> <p>(b) Who in Defence was responsible for making this recommendation?</p> <p>(4) What is the timeline for the Government to make a decision on the acquisition program for the Tritons?</p> <p>(5) What is Defence’s estimate for Australia’s up-front investment if a co-operative joint development approach was pursued?</p> <p>(6) Would an FMS program allow for the incorporation of Australian industry content into the Triton development program?</p> <p>(7) Would a co-operative joint development approach allow for the incorporation of Australian industry content into the Triton development program?</p> <p>(8) Has Defence identified any Australian technologies that may be applicable to the Triton, or any other UAS program?</p> <p>(a) Please provide a detailed list of these technologies including company, production details, etc.</p> <p>(b) What would be the economic value of these technologies being incorporated into the Triton program?</p> <p>(9) What Ground Moving Target Indicator technology options have Defence identified as having potential for incorporation into the Triton development program?</p> <p>(10) What greater signals intelligence capabilities has Defence identified as being of value if incorporated into the Triton development program?</p>	Written	17/09/15	15/10/15
------	---------	--------	--------	--	---------	----------	----------

104.	Defence	Conroy	Defence Estate	<p>In Senate Estimates on 1 June 2015 the following discussion took place:</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Grzeskowiak. So we have got that, if that is the caveat. The seventeen bases identified in the 2012 future Defence estate report are no longer regarded as unnecessary as implied in the first principles review? So the caveat that you have described, does that negate the—?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Sorry, Senator, I did not catch that.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: For example, the only caveat is in the case of disposal of the estate mentioned—that is, waiting on the force structure review in Defence white paper—then assessing each proposal on a case-by-case basis. What does that mean about the seventeen bases? It is quite a complex process, is it?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It means that the government, as per its predecessors, rightly retain the prerogative to determine on a case-by-case basis what parts of the Defence estate will be sold at any given time.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What I am trying to understand is: where does that put the seventeen bases?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It means that—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: They are subject to that test.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Absolutely, and whether they are rationalised or sold and, if so, when, will be determined by the government of the day in the normal way that historically governments have so decided.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: With the announced intention of disposing of Bulimba Barracks, does that mean there are only sixteen left on the list?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would have to—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Bulimba Barracks was one of the bases on that original list and, as you so rightly point out, that was announced by the government for disposal a couple of months ago.</p> <p>The intention to sell Leeuwin Barracks and the Pontville Small Arms Rifle Range Complex site has now been announced: http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2015/06/04/parliamentary-secretary-to-the-minister-for-defence-defence-to-sell-leeuwin-barracks-in-fremantle/ http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2015/06/04/parliamentary-secretary-to-the-minister-for-defence-defence-to-sell-land-in-tasmania/</p> <p>(1) Were Leeuwin Barracks included in the seventeen bases identified in the 2012 future Defence estate report?</p> <p>(2) Was the Pontville site included in the seventeen bases identified in the 2012 future Defence estate report?</p>	Written	12/10/15	15/10/15
Defence Portfolio – Budget Estimates, 1-2 June 2015				79			

				<p>(3) With regard to Leeuwin Barracks, what arrangements will be made to ensure an orderly and minimally disruptive transfer to Irwin Barracks of individuals and families currently in residential units in the Barracks?</p> <p>(4) Do cadets and reservists make use of Leeuwin Barracks?</p> <p>(a) If so, what arrangements will be made to meet their requirements?</p>			
105.	Defence	Conroy	Defence Personnel	<p>The following discussion occurred during Senate Estimates of 2 June [page 76 Proof Hansard]:</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: How much money has the department saved by having delayed the negotiation of a new agreement beyond the expiry date of 30 June last year?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I do not know whether we have saved any money, so to speak. Quite obviously if there had been a salary increase from last year to this year of one per cent, for example, then that would have been one per cent of extra APS salary costs, or 1½ per cent for 1½ per cent and so on. The mathematics is fairly straightforward.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What is your wages bill?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: We can give you the wages bill. It is about \$10.6 billion—that includes ADF—from memory.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So those figures—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Sorry; the employees' wages bill totals—that includes ADF, APS, all sorts of things—\$11.7 billion. But that is not the wages bill that you would compare with another organisation. There are a lot of other things involved in that.</p> <p>(1) What were the wages bill totals in the financial years 2013-2014 and 2014-15 for:</p> <p>(a) ADF personnel</p> <p>(b) APS staff</p> <p>(2) What are the wages bill totals foreseen for 2015-16 for:</p> <p>(a) ADF personnel</p> <p>(b) APS staff</p> <p>(3) For each of the answers in (1) and (2) above, what are the components of the amounts given?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15

106.	Defence	Conroy	Maternity Leave – ADF personnel	<p>During Senate Estimates on 2 June [page 76 Proof Hansard], there was the following series of questions and answers:</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I am trying to be really objective about this. We had a situation where you could have two apples and then a month later you could only have one apple. From a management perspective, does that constrain your ability to retain and attract families and parents?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: No.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That is your answer-no?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We have very generous leave provisions in the Australian Public Service.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Given that it is reasonably understood-well, I think it is reasonably well understood-that Defence has struggled to attract and retain women, don't you think this makes that challenge even more difficult?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: No, the-</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That is fine. If your answer is no, I do not need any explanation on no. It is N and O.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: The Australian Public Service broadly has a level of maternity leave that is consistent for all Commonwealth employees.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I might add, Senator, that certainly the percentage of women in Defence APS is significantly below the rest of the Public Service. There is a mix of reasons for that. I would however note that we have increased the percentage of women in the workforce quite a bit over the last 10 years, although we are well short of where we want to be.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: An independent observer, or even someone who believes that incentives work in the market, would probably say that your challenge might be slightly more difficult. I not putting words in your mouth, but I am just countering the 'no', because I do not think that was particularly well thought out as an answer.</p> <p>(1) Further to Mr Richardson's and Ms Skinner's answers, please provide the reasons why the change in Paid Parental Leave arrangements does not make the challenge of retaining and recruiting women in the ADF more difficult.</p> <p>(2) How many ADF personnel have accessed jointly the Government Paid Paternal Leave scheme and the ADF Scheme in the last three financial years?</p>	Written	14/09/15	17/09/15
------	---------	--------	---------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------

107.	Defence	Conroy	Valour Inquiry	<p>(1) How many of the publicly sought submissions to the ‘Unresolved Recognition for Past Acts of Naval and Military Valour’ concerning 140 individuals and groups have been replied to by the relevant service chief?</p> <p>(2) How many for Navy, Army and Air Force respectively?</p> <p>(3) For those not yet replied to, for each service respectively, how many have been resolved, and how many have not yet been resolved?</p> <p>(4) For those cases not yet resolved, for each service respectively, what is the action being undertaken by the services, Department or the Parliamentary Secretary?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
108.	Defence	Conroy	National Family Health Program	<p>(1) What is the current number of families registered for the National ADF Family Health Program?</p> <p>(2) How many individual ADF dependants are currently registered for the National ADF Family Health Program?</p> <p>(3) What is the estimated ADF dependant population?</p> <p>(4) How has the program grown, in terms of membership, since it started?</p> <p>(5) Has the Department received any feedback on the program?</p> <p>(6) Do you consider the uptake to date to be within expectations?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
109.	Defence	Conroy	ADF Uniforms	<p>West Footscray based manufacturer, the Workwear Group, had a contract to supply the Australian Multi-cam Combat Uniform (AMCU) to the ADF. In May there were reports that the Workwear Group had its orders cancelled and that the jobs of 80 textile workers were at risk, and that the company would have to close.</p> <p>(1) Can Defence please explain what changed in the Defence contracts and processes to procure the AMCU?</p> <p>(2) Why was the Workwear Group the loser from this reorganisation?</p> <p>(a) On what basis were they selected for exclusion for future work?</p> <p>(3) Where has this work been allocated to? Has any work been sent overseas?</p> <p>(4) What consideration has been given to the requirement to sustain capacity in Australian Defence Industries for AMCU production so that it could manage any sudden surge in Defence requirements?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15

110.	Defence	Conroy	Locally engaged staff - Afghanistan	<p>(1) Without revealing personal details associated with specific cases, could Defence please provide the following information with respect to the Locally Engaged Employee program for Afghans at threat due to their association with Australian forces. How many applications has Defence been asked to consider since the program began? Please break this figure down by year.</p> <p>(2) How many applications have been finalised? (a) How many were successful and how many were unsuccessful? Please break this down on a per annum basis. (b) What is the average time taken for Defence to process an application? Please provide an average time across all applications as well as an average time for applications processed within each calendar year. (c) What was the fastest processing time for an application and what was the longest processing time for an application?</p> <p>(3) Are there any applications that remain outstanding? If so, how many are outstanding and when was Defence asked to consider each of these applications?</p> <p>(4) Have any applicants or their families been harmed or killed while their application was under consideration?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
111.	Defence	Ludwig	Non-Australian Citizens Employed by the Department/Agency	<p>(1) What is the Department/Agency's policy with regard to hiring non-Australian citizens?</p> <p>(2) Does the agency have a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) policy? If yes, please provide a summary.</p> <p>(3) How does the Department/Agency determine whether a person is a non-Australian citizen?</p> <p>(4) How many staff who were not Australian Citizens have been hired by the Department/Agency since the Federal Election in September, 2013? Please break the numbers down by: (a) Levels at which they are employed (b) Immigration Status (Visa) (c) Cultural Background (d) Linguistic Background (e) How many were hired to satisfy CALD targets?</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15

112.	Defence	Ludwig	Departmental Dispute Resolution	<p>(1) How are disputes between departmental and/or agency staff mediated?</p> <p>(2) Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include:</p> <p>(a) The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc).</p> <p>(b) Amount paid to each firm since the last budget.</p> <p>(c) When the contract with the firm commenced.</p> <p>(d) When the contract with the firm will expire.</p> <p>(e) Why the firm was selected to provide the service.</p> <p>(f) Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute.</p> <p>(3) How are code of conduct violations by departmental and/or agency staff mediated?</p> <p>(4) Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include:</p> <p>(a) The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc).</p> <p>(b) Amount paid to each firm since the last budget.</p> <p>(c) When the contract with the firm commenced.</p> <p>(d) When the contract with the firm will expire.</p> <p>(e) Why the firm was selected to provide the service.</p> <p>(f) Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute.</p>	Written	15/07/15	13/08/15
------	---------	--------	------------------------------------	--	---------	----------	----------