

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TRAINING

SENATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 2003-2004 BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING

Outcome: CSIRO
Output Group: CSIRO

DEST Question No. E253_04

Senator Carr asked on 4 June 2003, EWRE Hansard page 328

Question:

The suppressed report that we are referring to is the Arculus one. I ask you to take on notice:

- (a) Was this information provided to Professor Arculus?
- (b) Was a decision taken to exclude the critical comments regarding the *Southern Surveyor* from the cruise summary? If so, by whom?

Answer:

CSIRO has provided the following response.

Southern Surveyor – Professor Arculus

- (a) From the Hansard record, Senator Carr refers to a list of suggested ships improvements (tabled at the hearing) which was received by CSIRO from Professor Arculus and a letter to Andrew Reeves from Dr de Ronde in an interchangeable manner without qualifying which “report” is being referred to.

If the “suppressed report that we are referring to is the Arculus one”, then Professor Arculus authored that report and would be aware of the content.

- (b) There was no decision made to exclude critical comments regarding the *Southern Surveyor* from the cruise summary.
After voyage SS02/2003, Professor Arculus provided CSIRO with two documents. One was titled “cruise summary” and the other a list of suggested ships improvements.
The “cruise summary” was re-submitted to CSIRO by Professor Arculus in the correct format to become the National Facility Voyage Summary which is public record. Although the primary purpose of the Voyage Summary is to provide a scientific report on the voyage, it does contain other information considered appropriate for inclusion by Professor Arculus, including relevant technical issues and the injury to the boatswain.
The list of suggested ships improvements was compiled by Professor Arculus from comments received from scientists onboard during SS02/2003 and was never intended to be part of the cruise summary. That is why it was forwarded to CSIRO as a separate document.
It is important to note that the list of suggested ships improvements does not contain some allegations later made in Dr de Ronde’s letter to Andrew Reeves. If Senator Carr’s question about excluding “critical comments” refers to comments made only in Dr deRonde’s letter, then the question should be directed to him.