

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 241

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Airborne Delays

**Proof Hansard Page:** 152 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Smith, Dean asked:**

**Senator SMITH:** My final question goes to airborne delays, and specifically delays of 15 minutes or more.

**Ms Staib:** Specifically relating to the Perth area?

**Senator SMITH:** Yes.

**Mr Hood:** I have got it, but we may need to take it on notice.

**Senator SMITH:** My understanding is that we saw a reduction in airborne delays of 15 minutes or more from 3.1 per cent in October 2013 to 1.3 per cent in December 2013. If that is true, that is great. Can you verify those figures and, again, provide them to me for the period December 2013 to present.

**Mr Hood:** Certainly, we can table that.

**Answer:**

Month	% of flights with an airborne delay greater than 15 minutes
October 2013	3.0
November 2013	1.7
December 2013	1.3
January 2014	1.5
February 2014	1.0
March 2014	1.6
April 2014	1.0
May 2014	3.6

May 2014 saw an increased percentage of flights with an airborne delay due to one day of low cloud and storms which necessitated single runway operations. In collaboration with the airport and airlines, Airservices has implemented a number of strategic and tactical air traffic management initiatives to minimise delays, however there are sometimes still delays due to forces beyond our control such as weather.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 242

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Instrument Approach Procedures at Rockhampton

**Proof Hansard Page:** 153 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Fawcett, David asked:**

**Senator FAWCETT:** Ms Staib, do you have an officer here who deals with instrument approach procedures, particularly the NDB-A or VOR-A at Rockhampton?

**Ms Staib:** We will probably have to take the details of that question on notice. But we can try.

**Senator FAWCETT:** I am concerned by the lack of consultation with industry about the restriction placed on that approach, which is costing them a fair bit of money. It is the only approach available for operators in that region who do not have TSO-compliant distance measuring equipment in their aircraft. It is still valid outside of tower hours but it is not available during tower hours, which means that operators who are away on charters sometimes cannot return and they lose charters because of it, and the flying school cannot teach their students instrument flying—they have to fly a 132 nautical miles round-trip, which is about an extra \$700 per sortie. That is having a huge impact on a small GA sector, and they were never consulted when that change was made. I would like to understand why the change was made and why this approach cannot be reinstated to be available during tower operating hours.

**Ms Staib:** I do not have that detail at hand. I will take it on notice and we will investigate it for you and find out what happened.

**Answer:**

The change to the procedure came into effect in May 2013 as part of a broader package of changes to Rockhampton airspace. The procedure is used around once per month because there are several other terminal instrument flight procedures (TIFPs) available for use at Rockhampton for suitably equipped aircraft. Reliance on Non-Directional Beacon (NDB) approaches is declining over time as more aircraft transition to Global Navigation Surveillance System (GNSS) technology.

As part of the airspace redesign Airservices identified that the tolerances of the procedure were not wholly contained within the new controlled airspace as required by Civil Aviation Safety Regulations and therefore the procedure did not comply with the Regulations. Due to local terrain limitations the procedure could not be redesigned so that it was wholly contained. As a result, the procedure was amended to make it unavailable during tower hours, (the period during which the procedure was non-compliant with the Regulations). The alternative was to remove the procedure from use altogether.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 243

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** INTAS - Software

**Proof Hansard Page:** 153 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... Since the introduction into operational service, how many Integrated Tower Automation Suite, INTAS, software versions have been installed at Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers respectively?...

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... but what has happened to the software? How many software versions have been installed at Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers?

**Ms Staib:** The detail of that I will have to take on notice. There have been updates to the software versions since we started implementing INTAS, but the exact number I will have to take on notice.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Further to that: have any of these software versions required reversion to a previous software version due to unsatisfactory performance?

**Ms Staib:** I will have to take that on notice.

**Senator XENOPHON:** And further to that: if so, how many at each tower?

**Answer:**

Since the introduction into operational service, INTAS software has been upgraded:

- 17 times at Broome (since commissioning in July 2012)
- 16 times at Rockhampton (since commissioning in October 2012)
- 10 times at Adelaide (since commissioning in May 2013)
- 11 times at Melbourne (since commissioning in November 2013)

These include routine upgrades by the software manufacturer. Four of these software releases required reversion to a previous software version due to unsatisfactory performance. This occurred once at Rockhampton and 3 times at Melbourne. The ability to revert to a previous version of software during or after a software upgrade is a key measure that Airservices employs to ensure the safety and integrity of the system is maintained at all times.

INTAS continues to operate safely.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 244

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** INTAS – Database Entries

**Proof Hansard Page:** 154 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... The second set of questions with respect to this: since introduction into operational service, how many INTAS Airservices systems issues database entries have been raised at or for Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers respectively? On notice?

**Ms Staib:** Yes, thank you.

**Senator XENOPHON:** How many remain open? Also on notice?

**Answer:**

Refer to SEQoN 245

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 245

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** INTAS - Alarms

**Proof Hansard Page:** 154 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... The third set of questions: since the introduction to operational service, how many traffic triggered and/or equipment—that is, Airservices owned or otherwise—alarms and/or alerts or cautions and/or warnings have been presented to air traffic controllers at INTAS work positions at Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers respectively?

**Ms Staib:** I will take that on notice as well. In terms of the rating of severity of some issues, there are no outstanding severity 1 issues. We have introduced—

**Senator XENOPHON:** Perhaps on notice you could explain the difference between severity 1 and, presumably, severity 2 and 3—

**Ms Staib:** There are different characteristics.

**Senator XENOPHON:** If you could set out those characteristics, that would be very useful. What percentages of these alarms/alerts or cautions/warnings, if any, have been false?

**Answer:**

The Integrated Tower Automation Suite (INTAS) combines flight and operational data, surveillance and voice communications systems into a single integrated, tower specific layout. INTAS provides each tower controller with customisable touch screens displaying electronic flight strips, operational information, weather, terminal area and, where available surface surveillance (radar) data and other airport systems including ground lighting. The system contributes to improved safety of operations by enhancing controller situation awareness and reducing workload through the automation of previously manual tasks.

The system undergoes extensive testing prior to operational commissioning. Once commissioned, issues, defects and change requests are submitted by controllers and technical staff via the Airservices System Issue Database (ASID). This includes alarms, alerts, cautions and warnings presented to controllers.

All defects and faults are assessed and assigned a severity level based on definitions in the table below. There are currently no Severity 1 or Severity 2 system issues. Reported defects or faults are further broken down by impact on service and include; service delivery/safety, system impacts on ATC efficiency, maintenance efficiency impacts, documentation improvements and cosmetic/functions not in use.

**Severity Definition Airways System Issues**

<b>Severity 1:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any issue which may have contributed to an aircraft accident</li><li>• Major system issues causing wide spread disruption to industry</li></ul>
<b>Severity 2:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any issue which was known to cause or contribute to a significant reduction in safety levels such as a breakdown of separation, or an issue that could have real potential to lead to S1 if not resolved by technical or procedural fix</li><li>• Major system issues causing localised disruption to industry</li></ul>
<b>Severity 3:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The issue was known to cause or contribute to a significant increased workload for ATC which could have real potential to lead to S2</li><li>• System issues resulting in disruption to a small number of aircraft operations</li></ul>
<b>Severity 4:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The issue had an impact on efficiency but would not normally be expected to lead to S3,S2 or S1</li></ul>
<b>Severity 5:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The issue had a minor impact or was a minor variation from specification or is a minor documentation anomaly</li></ul>

## **Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

### **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

#### **Infrastructure and Regional Development**

- Since commissioning in July 2012, 904 issues have been raised in Broome. 831 have been closed as at 18 June 2014. A software release scheduled for deployment on 28 July will correct 7 defects, and the subsequent release in the development stage and scheduled for deployment in October will correct a further 12 defects. Remaining and any new issues will be prioritised for correction in the subsequent and ongoing quarterly delivery cycle. From the total number of open issues there are 2 key issues being managed. These issues contain an operational workaround or recovery and are assessed as not representing a significant safety or service delivery risk.
- Since commissioning in October 2012, 315 issues have been raised in Rockhampton. 273 have been closed as at 18 June 2014. A software release scheduled for deployment on 28 July will correct 4 defects, and the subsequent release in the development stage and scheduled for deployment in October will correct a further 5 defects. Remaining and any new issues will be prioritised for correction in the subsequent and ongoing quarterly delivery cycle. From the total number of open issues there are 2 key issues being managed. These issues contain an operational workaround or recovery and are assessed as not representing a significant safety or service delivery risk.
- Since commissioning in May 2013, 578 issues have been raised in Adelaide. 471 have been closed as at 18 June 2014. A software release scheduled for deployment on 30 July will correct 31 defects, and the subsequent release in the development stage and scheduled for deployment in October will correct further 23 defects. Remaining and any new issues will be prioritised for correction in the subsequent and ongoing quarterly delivery cycle. From the total number of open issues there are 8 key issues being managed. These issues contain an operational workaround or recovery and are assessed as not representing a significant safety or service delivery risk.
- Since commissioning in November 2013, 670 issues have been raised in Melbourne. 406 have been closed as at 18 June 2014. A software release scheduled for deployment on 30 July will correct 36 defects, and the subsequent release in the development stage and scheduled for deployment in October will correct further 50 defects. Remaining and any new issues will be prioritised for correction in the subsequent and ongoing quarterly delivery cycle. From the total number of open issues there are 8 key issues being managed. These issues contain an operational workaround or recovery and are assessed as not representing a significant safety or service delivery risk.

A recent workshop of senior controllers from towers fitted with INTAS, Airservices safety experts and engineering staff confirmed their support for the INTAS product and that the system continues to operate safely. Airservices continues to work with the supplier of INTAS to clear remaining defects in a timely manner and to complete agreed system enhancements requested by controllers.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 246

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** INTAS – Information Inaccuracies

**Proof Hansard Pages:** 153-154 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** If you could set out those characteristics, that would be very useful. What percentages of these alarms/alerts or cautions/warnings, if any, have been false? The fourth set of questions with respect to this: since the introduction to operational service, has INTAS ever displayed information to air traffic controllers that was late, incorrect, incomplete, corrupted or absent? Is that on notice?

**Ms Staib:** Yes, I will take that on notice.

**Senator XENOPHON:** If so, on how many occasions for Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers respectively? On notice?

**Ms Staib:** Yes, thank you.

**Answer:**

If a controller considers that there may be an issue with the system performance this is recorded via the Airservices System Issues Database (ASID) for investigation. All issues are investigated and rectification action completed as required. The issue is then closed. We do not separately classify false alarms.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 247

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** INTAS

**Proof Hansard Page:** 154 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** Have any accidents or incidents, within the meaning of the Transport Safety Investigation Regulations 2003 or the Airservices safety management system internal reporting requirements, occurred where late, incorrect, incomplete, corrupt or absent information provided by INTAS was contributory to an extent? Senator Sterle, I think they will take it on notice....

**Ms Staib:** Regarding the issue I think you are referring to, I do not have the specific details. We introduced new technology into those four towers, as you point out. With any new technology, there have been some minor teething problems, particularly around the voice switch. That has been the case. We have recorded all of those instances, as reported by the air traffic controllers or our field maintenance people, into our CIRRIS database, which tracks all these issues for us. We have reviewed all of those issues and continue to iron out these minor bugs. In terms of how many exactly, I will get that detail for you on notice....

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... Finally, with respect to that question: if so, how many for Rockhampton, Broome, Adelaide and Melbourne towers, respectively? And how much does the system cost taxpayers?

**Ms Staib:** I will get that detail for you in that report as well.

**Answer:**

There have been no accidents where INTAS has been found to be a contributing factor.

There has been one occurrence where INTAS was found to be a contributory factor to a reportable incident. A Loss of Separation Assurance (LOSA) was reported by Melbourne tower controllers when the INTAS system did not create a co-ordination prompt as expected. This resulted in the coordination requirement with Essendon tower being delayed.

The INTAS system continues to perform safely.

The INTAS system forms part of the Airservices capital works plan. Airservices capital works is funded through the ACCC endorsed long term pricing agreement with airlines. Airservices does not derive any funding from Government appropriations.



**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 248

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Garuda Airbus A330s

**Proof Hansard Page:** 155 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** I note that the ATSB released a report on 28 February into the loss and separation insurance involving two Garuda Airbus A330s in March 2012. Are you familiar with that?

**Ms Staib:** Yes.

**Senator XENOPHON:** I have read part of it out earlier this evening. The report from the ATSB stated that they are not satisfied that Airservices had adequately addressed the identified safety issues regarding processes for managing a temporary restricted area et cetera. You are familiar with the report, it is on the record, it is a public document. The ATSB has now investigated a significant number of similar events, and CASA has conducted an audit of Airservices. When can we expect an improvement in Airservices' operations?

**Ms Staib:** I will just say a few words, and then I will ask Mr Hood to go through some of the operational improvements that have been made. The first thing I would say is that that particular incident happened two years ago. In terms of the interruption to service, there has not been one of those incidences since October 2012. And, if you recall, we have discussed the CASA 172 report and in fact that was one of the areas of recommendation in terms of making sure that we are adequately resourced to man the stations that we are responsible for. That goes to that issue that I talked about before—the Nav Canada review into air traffic control numbers, which confirmed certainly the methodology for determining staff at each of our locations and provided me with assurance that we do have the right numbers in place. In terms of the operational improvements that have been implemented since that date some two years ago, I will just ask Mr Hood to give you a couple of examples—for example, the benefit of ADS-B and some other data exchange protocols we have with Indonesia.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Sorry—I have some other questions I need to get out very quickly. Would you mind answering that on notice?

**Answer:**

Airservices has implemented a number of systemic safety improvements in response to the referenced Loss of Separation Assurance (LOSA) incident, arising from our internal investigation as well as the ATSB's investigation and subsequent safety recommendations.

Airservices has responded to the ATSB's recommendations, providing detailed information on the safety actions to improve:

- management of Temporary Restricted Areas (TRAs) associated with an air traffic service (ATS) contingency situation to ensure all aircraft operating in the TRA are known to air traffic services; and
- review and testing of ATS contingency plans to ensure their currency and effective implementation.

Airservices has completed a review of the effectiveness of each of the safety actions taken and is confident that the identified actions will further strengthen our risk controls and reduce the likelihood of a similar occurrence in the future.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 249

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Renewal of Airservices

**Proof Hansard Page:** 155 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** CASA's audit only allowed renewal of Airservices' approval for a limited period. When does this period expire?

**Ms Staib:** It was for a period of three years, and that is consistent with the other certificates that we do have.

**Senator XENOPHON:** And that expires when?

**Ms Staib:** It was issued in 2013, so 2016.

**Senator XENOPHON:** On notice, what benchmarks does Airservices need to meet for further renewal, and is that process on track?

**Answer:**

Airservices current Air Traffic Services Provider Certificate (CASA 96/13) expires at the end of April 2016.

Airservices is required to formally apply for recertification at least 90 days before the expiry date. The process to assess Airservices suitability for recertification is determined by CASA. Based on Airservices past experience, the recertification process generally involves audit of relevant systems and processes as well as consideration of Airservices past regulatory and safety performance.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 250

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Omnidirectional Radio Range Link at Mildura

**Proof Hansard Page:** 155 (26 May 2014)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** ... Airservices undertook to provide on notice whether the link had been non-operational prior to the five days immediately before the incident. The response reads: 'The link at Mildura airport had been non-operational for five days prior to the incident, with advice provided to industry through a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM).' With respect, this does not answer my question. Prior to that five-day period, had there been any periods of time in the immediately preceding 12 months when some part of the automated weather service at Mildura had been non-operational?

**Ms Staib:** I apologise that we did not answer your question to your satisfaction. Perhaps we can go back and look at the previous 12 months.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Yes, if you could, and that leads to the question of what steps Airservices has taken to ensure that this incident is not repeated this winter.

**Answer:**

Airservices is responsible for monitoring the availability of the VHF Omni Range (VOR) which is used to transmit the Automated Weather Information Service (AWIS) at Mildura airport. The VOR was unavailable on three separate occasions during the period 12 months prior to the June 2013 incident. This would have resulted in the AWIS being unavailable. The details include:

Date	Details	Outage period
20/09/2012	Low voltage and monitoring cable cut inadvertently by Council	5 days
13/10/2012	System power reset and returned to service, no fault found	4 days
4/2/2013	System power reset and returned to service, no fault found	1 day

The AWIS was replaced on 29 October 2013 with a new system which operates on a frequency separate to the VOR. This equipment is now maintained and operated by Mildura Airport Pty Ltd.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 251

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Salaries and Bonuses for CEO and Direct Reports

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

1. Ms Staib, can you advise the Committee of the percentage of the “at risk” component of your salary you were awarded last year?
2. Can you provide the Committee with an extract of the minutes of the Board Remuneration Committee and Board meeting that recommended and authorised that payment? I am not seeking the full minutes, just the relevant extracts.
3. Can you advise the Board of all bonuses and other performance related payments given to each member of the Executive team?
4. How many members of your Executive team have left in the last 12-18 months?
5. I notice you have recently announced the appointment of a new Executive General Manager Corporate Affairs. What is the salary of the new EGM? Are there any other costs associated with her appointment? Where will the EGM be home based?

**Answer:**

- 1-3. The Board of Airservices authorises the CEO’s remuneration including bonuses paid. Remuneration information for senior managers, including the CEO, is published in Airservices Annual Report which is available on Airservices website.
4. Since 1 January 2013, four members of the Executive team have left the organisation.
5. Remuneration information for senior managers, which includes the newly appointed Executive General Manager, will be available in Airservices Annual Report. Her home base will be Melbourne. Airservices is a national organisation with significant operations in all capital cities.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.: 252**

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** State of the Aviation Industry

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

1. Ms Staib, you would be aware of the pressures airlines are currently under. Can you outline for the Committee any steps you personally have initiated to ensure Air Services reduces the cost impact it has on the operation of airlines?
2. Is Air Services proposing any increase in its pricing to airlines in the coming year? If so, on what basis, given the number of jobs etc that are being shed by airlines in the current climate?

**Answer:**

1. Through Airservices Long Term Pricing Agreement with industry, which provides price certainty in the five years to 2016, Airservices has delivered real term price reductions of 11 per cent whilst supporting aviation activity growth of almost 20 per cent.  
Airservices has in place initiatives that target fuel savings, with key strategies focussing on increasing airport capacity, reducing airborne delays and introducing track shortening and constant descent approach procedures where it is safe to do so. For example Airservices has seen a reduction in the average maximum airborne holding delay by approximately 35 per cent since the introduction of Metron in Brisbane in mid-December 2011. This has seen average maximum airborne holding during the morning peak period fall from more than 20 minutes to less than 15 and from about 30 minutes to less than 20 in the evening peak.
2. Airservices Long Term Pricing Agreement (LTPA) was established in 2011 through the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC). The agreement runs for the period 2011- 2016 and sets prices over the five year period. Under this agreement, the net increase of prices from 1 July 2011 on average was 0.6% in line with the introduction of new services and a continuing commitment to new capital infrastructure.  
Outside this agreement, the Airservices Board has decided that there will be no price increases for three additional services at regional locations that were not included in 2011-2016 LTPA. The new LTPA is due to be introduced in 2016 and will incorporate the price increase from these new services.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 253

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Dividend to the Government

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

Can you advise the Committee of the amount of the dividend Air Services has most recently paid to the Government and how much it is forecast to pay in the coming financial year?

**Answer:**

In Financial Year 2013/14 Airservices will be paying a total dividend of \$16m (made up of a final dividend for 2012/13 of \$10m and an interim dividend for 2013/14 of \$6m).

The forecast dividend for 2014/15 is \$10.6m.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 254

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Capital Works

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

I notice the Commission of Audit recommended that an independent review be undertaken of Air Services capital expenditure.

1. Ms Staib, can you outline for the Committee what your understanding is of Air Services' obligations to the Public Works Committee?
2. When was the last time Air Services referred proposed capital projects to the Committee?
3. Can you advise this Committee of the total cost of capital works for the current financial year and what you forecast it to be for the coming year?
4. How are these works financed? Does the cost come from additional levies on the airlines (and therefore the travelling public) or from the proposed dividend paid to the government?
5. Is it true that Air Services intends to build/develop its own data centre? How much will this cost?
6. How will this be financed?
7. Given the budget for this project, I presume you will be referring it to the Public Works Committee?
8. Why has Air Services decided to go down this path and not to rent space in other high security data centres like parts of Defence, ASIO, Health and the airlines do, just to name a few?
9. Can you give the Committee an update on the building of the new fire stations, starting with cost (both cumulative and by station)?
10. How are these being financed? By the airlines, or from revenue that would have gone to the government?
11. Have these projects been referred to the Capital Works Committee? If not, given the cumulative cost, why not?

**Answer:**

1. Although a statutory authority, as a Government agency Airservices is subject to the Public Works Committee process.
2. The last project referred to the PWC was in January 2012.
3. Airservices Corporate Plan capital expenditure projection for 2013/14 was \$254.9m. The forecast for 2014/15 is \$275.3m
4. Airservices capital works projects are financed through a pricing agreement with airlines which is endorsed by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) and tracked and monitored by stakeholders through a Pricing Consultative Committee.
5. No. Airservices already maintains centres in Brisbane and Melbourne.
6. N/A.
7. N/A.
8. Airservices has commenced the relocation of business systems to a third party commercial data centre but will retain safety critical operational systems on site. The decision was taken by the Airservices Board following a detailed independent assessment of Airservices systems. This took into account the current and future technical performance requirements necessary to provide uninterrupted air traffic control system service provision which is directly influenced by the proximity of control tower infrastructure and associated communications systems and networks.
9. Costs to build new fire stations in accordance with Airservices regulatory obligations are set out below:

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

Location	Total Project Cost	Construction Costs	Cumulative cost
Port Hedland ARFF Interim Facility	\$5.7m	\$5m	\$5.7m
Port Hedland ARFF Permanent Facility	\$13.7m	\$12m	\$19.4m
Newman ARFF Station	\$13.1m	\$9.03m	\$32.5m
Gladstone ARFF Station	\$10.1m	\$6.81m	\$42.6m
Ballina ARFF Station	\$12.7m	\$9.44m	\$55.3m
Coffs Harbour ARFF Station	\$11.4m	\$7.97m	\$66.7m
Hamilton Island ARFF Station	To be determined	To be determined	To be determined

10. Refer to (4)

11. No. The requirement to introduce a fire service is site specific and triggered by a regulatory requirement based on passenger movements. Accordingly, the roll out of new fire stations to support the provision of services is not delivered as a program of works. Each project is considered separately and the individual cost is not over the \$15 million threshold.



**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.: 255**

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Outside Appointments

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

I notice Ms Staib that you have recently been appointed to the Board of Directors of the Commonwealth Superannuation Corporation, representing the CDF.

1. How did that appointment come about? Were you approached by the CDF for example, or did someone approach him on your behalf?
2. What are your responsibilities on that board?
3. From the CSC's website it says you are an active member of the Air Force Reserve – how much of your time does this take up and who are you answerable/accountable to?
4. Can you outline for the Committee what your understanding of a conflict of interest is?
5. What arrangements have you put in place to deal with the obvious conflicts of interest? Have you removed yourself from all matters to do with One Sky for example? Surely Ms Staib you cannot represent Defence on one body, be a member of the active reserve of the Air Force and then claim to represent only the interests of Air Services when dealing with Air Force on One Sky surely?
6. Have you removed yourself from any involvement and decision making relating to the appointment of directors and other matters regarding Av Super – given the potential of Av Super either being rolled into CSC or for it to act as a competitor? If not, why not?
7. Have you taken the appropriate steps to ensure you no longer receive any information relating to Av Super's performance or operation? Who at Air Services now handles matters relating to the operation of superannuation funds? If not, why not?
8. Can you provide for the Committee an extract of the Air Services Board minutes granting approval for you to take up this appointment?
9. How much time do you expect to spend on CSC business?
10. Can you assure the Committee that it will have no impact on you being able to undertake your full-time job as CEO of Air Services?
11. Lastly, on this issue, I notice from the CSC website they refer to you as Air Vice Marshall Staib? That's not the correct form of address is it? This keeps happening doesn't it? Have you taken any steps to ensure that they refer to you as AVM Retired at all times?

**Answer:**

1. Ms Staib was approached by the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF) to be his nominee to the Commonwealth Superannuation Corporation Board.
- 2-3. The responsibilities and time involved in the CSC Board role and as an member of the Reserve do not interfere with Ms Staib's responsibilities as CEO of Airservices.
- 4-7. There are no conflicts of interest. Any potential or perceived conflict of interest at Airservices is managed in accordance with Airservices Australia Board *Conflict of Interest Protocol*.
8. The Airservices Board decided at its meeting on 9 April 2014 to approve the request to accept the offer made by the CDF and expressed its full support of the appointment.
9. See Answer to Question 2.
10. Yes
11. Air Vice Marshall Staib is the correct form of address, as Ms Staib is not retired from the permanent Air Force but transferred to the Reserve.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 256

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** Merging of Safety and Environment

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

1. I notice from Air Services website that there is now one EGM covering both these roles, is that correct? Have the two branches or sections been merged as well?
2. What experience does the current EGM have in dealing with safety matters?
3. Was there any consultation with community, industry or the government prior to this decision?
4. Can you outline circumstances around the WARP development and consultation for the Committee?

I appreciate that you were not CEO of Air Services at the time, but for the benefit of newer members of the Committee the last redesign of the airspace around Perth (known as WARP) lacked any credible public consultation. Part of the actions taken to ensure that didn't happen again was the creation of a separate environment department within Air Services, at the instigation of the then board and minister.

5. What do you believe has changed? Why do you and the board believe that a separate department is no longer needed? Have you had any industry or community feedback about this rearrangement? If so, what is it?
6. What arrangements are in place to ensure that the mistakes that occurred around WARP are not repeated with the runway redevelopment at Perth Airport?
7. There is a long history of the board also using an independent safety advisor. Is this still the case?
8. It is my understanding that the current independent advisor has now finished, or is about to finish her term – is that the case? Will she be replaced? And if so, who by? If not, why not? What has changed in the board's view that means they no longer need independent advice?

**Answer:**

1. Yes.
2. Safety is the number one priority for all Airservices business groups. The incumbent of the Executive General Manager Safety, Environment and Assurance role has a PhD in a safety discipline and has held senior safety and risk management related roles both with Airservices and previously the UK air traffic control organisation, NATS.
3. No. The changes are internal structural changes which will be transparent to stakeholders.
4. Following a 2003 audit of airspace use in WA by CASA, the Western Australia Route Review Project (WARRP) was a comprehensive review of airspace use, flight routes and aviation procedures across Western Australia. The review was undertaken by Airservices between 2006 and 2008 and changes were implemented in November 2008.
- 5-6. Airservices has made substantial changes over the past few years to improve community engagement and our approach to managing aircraft noise issues. This includes renewed communication and stakeholder engagement processes that are documented and transparent, the establishment of a dedicated Community Relations group and the implementation of a series of recommendations from the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman. In November 2013, Airservices published a document titled "Airservices commitment to aircraft noise management" which comprehensively outlines how we intend to collaboratively address aircraft noise issues. The document is available on our website. Safety and Environment both continue to be represented at Executive General Manager level.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

- 7-8. The term of the former independent safety advisor expired on 3 May 2014 and the Board is currently considering candidates for the role.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates May 2014  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Question no.:** 257

**Program:** n/a

**Division/Agency:** Airservices Australia

**Topic:** 80 Movement Cap

**Proof Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:**

1. Can you indicate what work Airservices Australia is undertaking with respect to Minister Truss' comment about change arrangements for calculating the 80 movement an hour cap at Sydney Airport?
2. What is the current status of this work?
3. What options are being considered?
4. Who will be consulted on any proposed changes?

**Answer:**

Airservices is not currently undertaking any work associated with a change of arrangements to the 80 movement cap.