

Responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Question 1

Topic: Catering arrangements for ADF personnel in Afghanistan
Hansard, 3 June 2009, pages 19-21

Senator Johnston asked:

- a) What is the cost and details of the measures implemented to improve the food situation at Tarin Kowt, including chefs and kitchens?
- b) How long until the catering facilities will be available in Tarin Kowt and the Forward Operating Bases?

Response

- a) All Patrol Bases from which the ADF operate, have been equipped and staffed with sufficient catering personnel and equipment to enable the incorporation of fresh meals in the weekly menus. This is usually 1-2 fresh meals per day dependent upon the patrolling program and ration deliveries. Further improvements are intended to enhance the facilities and increase the ration of fresh meals at the Forward Patrol Bases to at least two fresh meals per day.

Specifically at Tarin Kowt (Camp Holland), the following measures relating to catering arrangements have been taken:

- the Mentoring and Reconstruction Task Force (MRTF) can expend additional funds to purchase supplementary rations
- the Commanding Officer of the MRTF is to work with the CO Task Force-Uruzgan, to ensure that food quality meets agreed standards.

The current estimated costs for such measures at Patrol Bases are as follows:

- Equipment for Patrol Bases – \$0.1m.
- Fresh rations for Patrol Bases – \$0.15m.
- Additional catering staff of three personnel to prepare fresh meals at Patrol Bases – \$0.5m for six months.
- Enduring cost of \$1.3m to maintain these support arrangements.

The current estimated costs to complete transition of catering responsibilities from the Netherlands to Australia within Camp Holland at Tarin Kowt is as follows:

- Kitchen refit and supporting services – \$1.1m.
- Kitchen maintenance and repairs – \$0.22m (per annum).
- Additional ration costs for extra catering staff of ten personnel at Tarin Kowt to supervise and assist food service – \$0.343m (per annum).
- Increased cost of food service (fresh rations) compared to current arrangements – \$2.252m.
- Contract administration – \$0.5m (per annum).

- b) The ten extra cooks for Tarin Kowt have been deployed. However, the longer term transition to an Australian contracted and run kitchen will take time. It is planned that Initial Operating Capability (a limited capacity to meet requirements until full contract arrangements are in place and tested) for an Australian kitchen in Tarin Kowt will be

able to be achieved by December 2009 and will reach Full Operational Capability (full capacity, delivering all meals, meeting contract obligations and utilising all catering staff) by January 2010. The measures listed above for the Forward Operating Bases have been implemented.

Question 2

Topic: Defence White Paper
Hansard, 3 June 2009, page 52

Senator Johnston asked:

When was the Defence White Paper completed and submitted to Government?

Response

The Defence White Paper was developed systematically and considered by the Government at relevant stages of the development process. The final draft text of the Defence White Paper was provided to the Government for consideration in April 2009.

Question 3

Topic: Obesity in the ADF
Hansard, 3 June 2009, pages 91 and 94

Senator Barnett asked:

- a) What rehabilitation or exercise programs are currently in place to address obesity?
- b) What is the name of the obesity study conducted in the United States?

Response

- a) A variety of rehabilitation and exercise programs are currently in place in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) to address obesity. Individuals are assessed during routine health examinations or on an opportunistic basis with respect to their overall health status, which includes weight assessment. Those identified as needing intervention for obesity are managed using a tailored program that could include measures such as dietician support, exercise prescription by Physical Training Instructors, ongoing monitoring by health staff and referral for a formal rehabilitation assessment and entry into the ADF Rehabilitation Program.
- b) The name of the obesity study conducted in the United States is “Diagnoses of Overweight/Obesity, Active Component, U.S. Armed Forces, 1998–2008”, published in the Medical Surveillance Monthly Report, Volume 16, Number 1, January 2009, available at http://afhsc.army.mil/msmr_pdfs/2009/v16_n01.pdf

Question 4

Topic: Afghan National Army Trust Fund
Hansard, 3 June 2009, page 96

Senator Barnett asked:

- a) What contributions have been made by other countries?
- b) What is the proportion of the contributions made by other countries?
- c) Over what time frame will other countries make their contributions?

Response

- a) No countries have made contributions to the Afghan National Army Trust Fund since its mandate was expanded in March 2009. However, five countries, including Australia, have announced intended contributions.
- b) A total of €221 million has been pledged by Australia, Germany, Norway, Spain and Italy. Australia has pledged US\$200 million to the Afghan National Army Trust Fund over five years, which equates to approximately €50 million (allowing for exchange rate fluctuations) over five years. The other nations who have pledged to contribute are Germany – €50 million; Norway – €15 million; Spain – €4 million; and Italy – €2 million.

In addition, according to an April 2009 US Government Audit Office Report to Congressional Committees, the US has contributed approximately USD\$14.228 billion over fiscal years 2002-2009 in support of the development of the Afghan National Army

- c) Germany plans to contribute to the fund in 2009, and Norway in 2010. The other nations have yet to divulge the intended timeframes for their contributions.

Question 5

Topic: SASR Trust Fund
Hansard, 03 June 2009, p 97

Senator Barnett asked:

Aside from the SASR Trust Fund, what other trust funds exist in the ADF?

Response

The ADF has three other trust funds which are different from the SASR Trust Fund. These are the Royal Australian Navy Relief Trust Fund (RANRTF), the Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund (AMFRTF), and the RAAF Welfare Trust Fund (RWTF).

NAVY

The RANRTF was established in 1913 with the objective of providing welfare assistance to serving and ex-serving members of the Navy and their families. The RANRTF provides a range of financial products and services to serving and ex-serving members of the Navy and their families in the form of Home Management Services grants, Family Support Services loans, General Purpose loans and Special loans for reasons that may fall outside the guidelines for the above products such as medical and dental, legal, funeral and education expenses.

ARMY

The AMFRTF was established under the *Services Trust Funds Act of 1947* and is administered in the interests of serving and ex-serving members of the Army and their families. The Fund provides assistance to eligible persons by way of low cost loans and grants.

The AMFRTF provides assistance in the form of approved loans for payment for furniture and household expenses, payment of debts, medical, dental, legal and educational expenses, emergency travel and funeral expenses loans.

The Fund also provides relief grants to ex-members of the Army, and the Army Reserve (who have completed 12 months continuous full time service) and the dependants of both categories who are suffering financial hardship.

AIR FORCE

The RWTF was established under the *Services Trust Funds Act 1947* and is administered in the interests of serving and ex-serving members of the Air Force and their dependants. The RWTF currently provides assistance to eligible persons by way of low cost loans and grants.

The RAAF Central Welfare Trust Fund was established at the conclusion of World War II and is administered under the RAAF Welfare Recreational Company. The focus of the company is on the provision of affordable holiday facilities for serving Air Force personnel and other eligible persons and the provision of low cost loans and grants to approved Air Force sporting clubs and associations.

Question 6

Topic: Exercise Talisman Sabre 2009
Hansard 3-4 June 2009

Senator Ludlam asked:

- a) What is the estimated total tonnage of munitions fired in the Shoal Water Bay region?
- b) What is the breakdown, by service, of personnel participating in Exercise Talisman Sabre?
- c) What is the proportion of civilian to military personnel participating in Exercise Talisman Sabre?

Response

- a) The quantity of ordnance used during the exercise is not disclosed as it has the potential to reveal valuable intelligence information about the preparedness of the participating forces.
- b) The breakdown of ADF personnel participating in Exercise Talisman Sabre is: Navy – 1,632; Army – 3,906; and Air Force – 250. These figures do not include the support staff in many areas, such as the Air Force base personnel, who are essential for operating the base but are not assigned specifically to Exercise Talisman Sabre duties.
- c) There are 250 civilians directly supporting Exercise Talisman Sabre as either participants or in support. This represents approximately four per cent of the total assigned personnel.

Question 7

Topic: Mental Health in the ADF
Hansard, 3 June 2009, page 104

Senator Back asked:

What percentage of ADF personnel are discharged on the grounds of psychological and mental health issues?

Response

The attached table displays the total number of ADF personnel discharged on medical grounds from 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2008.

Number of ADF personnel discharged on medical grounds

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL
Officer	48	87	85	79	82	381
Enlisted	674	668	655	563	516	3076
Total	722	755	740	642	598	3457

Joint Health Command is unable to determine what percentage of these medical discharges was for psychological or mental health reasons, without an e-Health system or database that is integrated with the personnel management systems. Further data analysis would involve reviewing the 3457 case files individually, which represents a significant logistic and staffing commitment. Defence is currently developing a single comprehensive e-health system or the Joint Electronic Defence Health Information system (JEDHI) that will enable easy retrieval of clinical information, de-identified aggregated reporting to allow commanders to assess the readiness of individuals and units, and aggregated data on governance issues such as the number of Service personnel who have mental health or medical conditions resulting from operations in a specific theatre. The project for procurement of this system has commenced.

Some data around discharges from the ADF as a result of mental health issues was presented to Senator Back and is recorded in the Hansard (3 Jun 09, p105). This information relates to the number of medical discharges due to mental health reasons following operational deployment to the Middle East Area of Operations and East Timor. From the start of Middle East operations in 2003 to 31 Dec 2008, 373 people have been medically discharged. This represents 1.6% of the personnel who have served in this region. Of the 373, 146 personnel were discharged with mental health conditions. Of those discharged with a mental health condition 96 were directly or possibly attributable to their Middle East service.

During 2008, 127 personnel were discharged following service in East Timor, with mental health conditions totalling 47. Of this 47, 31 were directly or possibly attributable to their service in East Timor. This data provides a "snap shot" but references different time periods and cannot be compared to, or extrapolated to relate to, the figures provided in the table above.

Question 8

Topic: Submarine manning
Hansard, 03 June 2009, page 107

Senator Johnston asked:

What level of submariner manning was identified by an ANAO audit?

Response

The current demand for submariners is 667 officers and sailors. The current supply is 423 personnel at June 2008—a shortfall of 244 personnel or 37 per cent across all categories of submariners. This shortfall has more than doubled over the previous four years. The shortfall is even greater if the numbers of submariners unable to be deployed include those not deployed due to medical, compassionate or other reasons. As at June 2008, an additional 38 submariners could not be deployed for reasons such as medical and compassionate grounds, which would bring the total shortfall of submariners to 43 per cent.

Question 9

Topic: Attack on a sailor on Thursday Island
Hansard, 03 June 2009, pages 115-117

Senator Johnston asked:

What support is the Chief of Navy now prepared to provide the sailor, to give him every opportunity to make a full recovery?

Response

The Navy Divisional system is organised to care for the wellbeing of Navy members by providing structured personnel support, encouragement and assistance as required. I am advised that Navy is ensuring the ongoing care of the sailor with particular focus on supporting his rehabilitation and/or transition.

The sailor in question is on home care with his parents support and receives routine medical assistance through Defence and local area health services and has regular contact with his Divisional Staff, all with the aim to rehabilitate the sailor fit for meaningful employment. He has recently expressed desire to continue serving in the Royal Australian Navy and this has been forwarded to the Directorate Sailors Career Management for consideration.

The case is currently before the Medical Classification Review Board and it would be inappropriate to make further comment prior to the outcome of the review.

Question 10

Topic: Marangaroo

Hansard, 4 June 2009, pages 61-62

Senator Nash asked:

- a) Is Marangaroo a restricted site?
- b) Is Marangaroo fully fenced to keep the public out?
- c) How much of the land at Marangaroo is contaminated?
- d) When was the site last used?
- e) What will Marangaroo be used for in the future?
- f) What activities are undertaken by specialist personnel at the site?

Response

- a) The range area is restricted. The cantonment area is not restricted.
- b) Marangaroo does not have a man-proof fence around its entire perimeter. In areas of general access, there is a human-proof fence. In less accessible areas of the range, there is an appropriately signed cattle fence. Other areas that are inaccessible due to the ruggedness of the terrain are not fenced.
- c) Marangaroo has been a demolition range since World War II. Records from that period are not comprehensive and it is not possible, in the absence of invasive (and expensive) clean up assessments, to identify specific areas that are risk free of the existence of unexploded ordnance. As a precaution it is assumed that the entire range is potentially contaminated with unexploded ordnance.
- d) Marangaroo is used 48 weeks of the year. As at 30 June 2009, it is in use for training by the Navy and the Army. The Air Force last used both the internal and external Demolition Ranges at the site during 11-15 August 2008.
- e) In the future, Marangaroo will be used for the following activities:
 - i) The Navy will continue to use the site for tri-service delivery of explosive ordnance training; underwater weapons demonstration; and basic clearance diver explosive ordnance training.
 - .ii) The Army will continue to use the site for demolition and explosive ordnance disposal purposes.
 - iii) The Air Force will continue to use the site for demolition activities and explosive ordnance disposal continuation training.
- f) The Australian Defence Force uses Marangaroo for the following activities:
 - demolition
 - explosive ordnance disposal training scenarios involving the use of explosively powered tools to remove or render inoperable fuses on inert training aids. The training is conducted to maintain currency and competency in Explosive Ordnance Disposal skills
 - disposal of explosive ordnance up to 155mm projectiles via sympathetic detonation of a donor charge

- improvised Explosive Device training scenarios based on operations incidents. This may involve the use of explosive charges to disrupt simulated improvised explosive devices in proximity to explosive ordnance.

Question 11

Topic: SIEV 36

Finance and Public Administration Hansard, 26 May 2009, pages 68-69

Senator Ronaldson asked:

Note: These questions were taken on notice by Senator Faulkner for Defence.

- a) Why has the Government denied requests to release all available still photography and video footage of the incident?
- b) What advice has been given by the Coroner or anyone else investigating this matter, on why still photographs or video footage has not been released?
- c) Has Defence been asked by the Northern Territory Coroner or anyone else not to release still photographs or video footage?

Response

- a) All images taken by officials have been collected as evidence as part of the Northern Territory Police Investigation and will not be released to the public until they have been fully assessed.
- b) The Northern Territory Police, as part of their investigation, have collected all still photography and video footage. The Northern Territory Police advise that they will not release photographs or video footage until all authorities can complete their assessment.
- c) Yes. The Northern Territory Police are responsible for the approval to release any photography or imagery.

Written question on notice

Written question on notice to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and subsequently transferred to the Department of Defence for response.

Written question 1, referred from DFAT

Topic: West Papua

Senator Bob Brown asked:

- a) Please outline any assistance the Australian Defence Forces or other Australian personnel have given to the PNG government to secure the border area in Marind province against illegal incursion.
- b) Please detail any strategic concerns the department has about the build-up of Indonesian military and militia personnel on the PNG–West Papua border.

Response

- a) Through the Defence Cooperation Program, the Australian Government supports the development of a professional PNG Defence Force (PNGDF) with improved capabilities in core areas such as border and maritime security. This includes funding bilateral exercises, training, infrastructure projects, the sustainment of Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), and PNGDF border patrols (rations and allowances) out of FOBs Vanimu and Kiunga. The specific deployment of PNGDF personnel within PNG is a matter for the PNG Government.
- b) The deployment of security forces within Indonesia is a matter for the Indonesian Government.

Written questions on notice

Defence written question 1

Topic: Paragon Project in South Australia (surface coating technologies for the JSF project)

Senator Kroger asked:

- a) Could the Department please explain its involvement in the establishment of the proposed commercial capability in South Australia.
 - i) How many meetings has DMO attended?
 - ii) When and where did the meetings take place?
 - iii) Who attended these meetings?
 - iv) What is the current status of the joint venture?
 - v) What is the timeline for the business plan?
- b) What is the proposed completion date for the Paragon South Australia plant?
- c) What is the timeframe for accreditation from Lockheed Martin?
- d) The Department explained in the June Estimates Hearings, that it conducted a study that found that no Australian companies were available to provide designated surface coating technology for the JSF project.
 - i) When was this study conducted?
 - ii) Who is the author of this study?
 - iii) Is this study published for public access? Could you please provide a copy?
- e) Could the Department please provide the following details regarding the Paragon joint venture in Australia.
 - i) How many people would be employed?
 - ii) How many Australians would be employed?
 - iii) What is the size of the capital investment?
 - iv) What is the size of the South Australian Government's financial contribution?
 - v) What is the size of the Federal Government's financial contribution?
 - vi) What exactly would be the 'line of production'?
 - vii) In addition to Lockheed Martin, what type of industries and customers will be targeted?
 - viii) What will happen to the facility following the completion of the JSF project?

Response

- a)
 - i) Representatives from DMO attended around six meetings from 2007 to 2009.
 - ii) Meetings involving DMO were held between 2007 and 2009 in Canberra, Melbourne, Adelaide and the US.
 - iii) Personnel from the New Air Combat Capability (NACC) Industry Team in DMO, as well as representatives from the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research and the companies involved attended the meetings.
 - iv) Defence SA supports the establishment of an in-country aerospace components processing facility. This is a critical capability required to position Australian industry to secure global supply contracts on the JSF and other military and civil aerospace

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

programs. Defence SA are in ongoing discussions with a project proponent regarding establishment of a processing facility in South Australia. These discussions are commercial-in-confidence at this time. Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.

- v) Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.
- b & c) Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.
- d)
- i) The initial study was conducted in 2007. However, the Government and Australian companies' assessment of Australia's processing capability and capacity did not cease with the study. The assessment of the capability of relevant industry is ongoing.
 - ii) The firm Worley Parsons was commissioned by the then Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources to conduct the study.
 - iii) The study was released to all relevant parties, including Paragon and Electromold, and is not for wider release as it contains in-confidence and competition sensitive information. However, DMO has provided the following summary of the study:
 - The aim of this study was to define the opportunities for local industry which are available via Australia's participation in the JSF Program and what in-country processing capabilities would be required to support that involvement.
 - Australia's processing industry appeared to be able to provide the bulk of those processes most commonly required for JSF production, but these are generally in a small batch context rather than a production-scale capability and unable to accommodate large components. Overall, the study found there was a significant capability gap.
 - The study concluded there was insufficient capacity to service JSF Program requirements beyond early Low Rate Initial Production stages. This capacity gap was generally considered to be most acute in relation to wet (i.e. tank-based) processing, however it was noted that other areas such as shot peening (specifically robotic shot peening) also appeared to be below requirements.
 - With regards to the certifications and approvals required by local industry, the study concluded there was a gap across all processing activities in terms of approvals; it will be necessary to have specific approvals and certifications in place in order to undertake JSF-related activities. Since the study was completed some processes have been certified, but these certifications do not meet the full range of processes required to support the JSF Program and, as noted above, even where certifications exist there is unlikely to be the capacity to satisfy the JSF Program demands.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- e) Could the Department please provide the following details regarding the Paragon joint venture in Australia.
- i) Defence SA are in ongoing discussions with a project proponent regarding establishment of a processing facility in South Australia. These discussions are commercial-in-confidence at this time. Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.
 - ii, iii, iv) Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.
 - v) The Federal Government has to date, made no financial contribution to the proposed joint venture. Defence would consider providing funding; for example, for up-skilling through the Skilling Australia's Defence Industry (SADI) program if an eligible application were to be received from the proponents. SADI funding has already been provided to, for example, Electromold to up-skill its personnel.
 - vi) Questions concerning this venture should be referred to the Premier of South Australia.
 - vii) Australian machining companies are pursuing component manufacture work on a broad range of defence and commercial aerospace programs. It is important to note that the customer for the proposed processing capability would be Australian machining companies, not Lockheed Martin or any other aircraft manufacturer.
 - viii) Based on current production rates the JSF production program will not finish until 2034. The proposed processing facility would be set up to undertake work in addition to the JSF.

Written question 2

Topic: Post deployment management of active service personnel

Senator Back asked:

- a) Can you advise what processes or protocols are in place for the management of Australian troops during transition from active engagement (e.g. Iraq or Afghanistan)?
- b) Are service officers trained in psychological analysis of troops under their command?
- c) Is a psychological debrief undertaken having left the area of engagement?
- d) By whom and when? Do soldiers know the person interviewing them?
- e) What is the fate of the data collected?
- f) What is the reaction of soldiers to this debrief?
- g) Of what value is this information to the ADF?
- h) Have surveys been undertaken of soldiers to assess the value of this process?
- i) What other debriefing takes place, when and by whom?

Response

- a) All ADF members returning from deployed operations are involved in comprehensive support processes, which include psycho-education and an individual screen by a Mental Health Professional or Provider, referred to as the Return to Australia Psychological Screen (RtAPS). Members who are identified from the RtAPS as requiring immediate mental health support are referred to see a Mental Health Professional upon their return to Australia. All members who were deployed also receive a Post-Operation Psychological Screen (POPS) three to six months post deployment. This process is one of the most comprehensive of any military in the world and was developed in collaboration with the Australian Centre for Posttraumatic Mental Health, Macquarie University and internationally recognized experts in military mental health. This process is robust, however, it will be further enhanced by the implementation of recommendations from the Dunt Review into Mental Health Care in the ADF and Transition to Discharge. These include an improved model of screening that will better utilise Defence mental health resources and more effectively engage with families in the process.
- b) Commanders are provided with mental health awareness briefs at various stages throughout their careers. These briefings generally include the support/advice services at a commander's disposal, including support/advice from psychologists and psychological examiners who conduct interviews and briefings, both on deployment (as an embedded or a fly-in team) and in Australia.
Commanders also receive training in basic counselling/interviewing skills during officer training that assists them in identifying members with mental health concerns.
- c) All ADF members returning from deployed operations are involved in comprehensive support processes, which include psycho-education and an individual screen at time of return to Australia (RtAPS) and then receive a POPS three to six months post deployment.
- d) The RtAPS is generally provided by Psychologists or Psychological Examiners who have either deployed as an embedded Psychology Support Team or who fly in to the country for the sole purpose of providing RtAPS. POPS are provided by Defence Psychologists and Psychological Examiners who belong to regional Defence psychology units. ADF members who are being screened may or may not know the person conducting the screen.
- e) Individuals assessed as "at risk" are referred for immediate clinical follow up.
In the Middle East Area of Operations (MEAO), the screening questionnaires are scanned and entered into databases maintained by the deployed Psychologists and Psychological Examiners. The screening team provides a written and verbal brief to individual Commanders based on data from the screens and information gathered during interview. The briefs contain aggregate data only. The briefs provide information on levels of exposure to potentially traumatic events, overview of the mental health of the contingent, the number of referrals for additional assistance that were generated by the RtAPS process, perceived stressors of the contingent on deployment, organisational concerns (including morale and career intentions), as well as deployment experience both previous and current. The data is utilised by the First Psychology Unit to enhance and improve the

content of the pre-deployment psychological briefs. This ensures a continuous feedback loop and improvement process.

The data is also forwarded to the ADF's Directorate of Mental Health where it is combined with previous data to create surveillance reports. This data is distributed to the senior personnel agencies so that issues identified can be addressed; it is also used to improve training and policy in relation to operational deployment.

- f) A recent survey of personnel showed that over half either agreed or strongly agreed that the RtAPS questionnaire was worthwhile (53.5%), with 39.5% reporting they neither agreed nor disagreed, and 6.9% disagreed. The content of the RtAPS questionnaire was deemed appropriate by 62.9% of personnel. Very few disagreed (5.5%) and 31.6% neither agreed nor disagreed. When asked if the RtAPS questionnaire covered the main issues of their deployment, 65.2% agreed, 27.2% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7.5% disagreed.
- g) The briefs that are generated by the data contain information for senior commanders on levels of exposure to potentially traumatic events, overview of mental health of the contingent, the number of referrals for additional assistance that were generated by the RtAPS process, perceived stressors of the contingent on deployment, organisational concerns (including morale and career intentions), as well as deployment experience both previous and current.

The data is utilised by the First Psychology Unit to enhance and improve the content of the pre-deployment psychological briefs. This ensures a continuous feedback loop and improvement process. Furthermore the data is utilised by the Directorate of Mental Health to produce surveillance reports. This data is distributed to the senior personnel agencies so that issues identified can be addressed; it is also used to improve training and policy in relation to operational deployment.

- h) Yes, surveys have been conducted of both the RtAPS (in 2008), and POPS (in 2005) process.
- i) Members can (and are routinely encouraged to) self refer to Mental Health Professionals and Providers within Defence at any stage if they wish to receive additional assistance. Members who have been deployed are also entitled to self-refer to the Veterans and Veterans Families Counselling Service (VVCS).

Written question 3

Topic: Decompression after deployment

Senator Back asked:

- a) How does the Australian policy compare/contrast with our partner countries?
- b) What happens once personnel return back to their own units in Australia?
- c) Are decompression briefings conducted immediately post deployment or in Australia?
- d) What is the number and percentage loss to the system of soldiers after deployment?

- e) Is a follow up psychological interview undertaken? If so, how long after deployment finishes?

Response

- a) Decompression in the ADF is currently conducted on the basis of a commander's decision and under unit or task group arrangements and resources. There is no set policy or procedure for decompression in the ADF. Some units utilise transit time between the Area of Operations and their Australian home locations for decompression; others conduct a staged return to work once they have returned to Australia, perhaps working half days and allowing family and personal administration time before personnel take leave or return to normal work (this latter process tends to be called "reintegration"). In many units and for many personnel there is no decompression. Similarly, the practice of when leave is taken varies at the unit commander's discretion.

The ADF has produced a Commander's Guide to Decompression for personnel returning to Australia. Decompression should provide personnel with the opportunity to gradually recover from higher levels of stress. Decompression should take place either in a safe area within the country of operation, or in a third country location away from the Area of Operation, or once personnel have returned to Australia. Ideally, decompression should be conducted over two to seven days. During this period, veterans are not required to undertake any military taskings such as piquets or duties. Tasks during decompression should typically involve the completion of the RtAPS screens and provision of the psycho-education brief; preparation of equipment/quarantine inspections; health briefs; and administration briefs and activities (such as the opportunity to buy gifts for family). Between activities, members should have time to wind down and talk amongst themselves, or engage in sporting activities and the like. The reinforcement or reestablishment of social bonds is considered the primary aim of the activity.

In regards to the United States (US), certain groups (eg US Marines) engage in decompression just before returning home (giving their people two days to unwind etc), but it is not a widespread approach.

The Canadian Forces conduct a "third-location decompression" (TLD) program, currently based in Cyprus, on an as required basis. The TLD consists of five days of structured group activities and individual free time to catch up on sleep and rest, relax with friends, enjoy peace, quiet and privacy, unwind and begin to feel safe again. Participants receive mental health sessions where they have the opportunity to choose two of the four offered sessions they wish to attend. The educational topics include Healthy Relationships, Anger, and Coping with Stress. The mental health teams on TLD can comprise social workers, psychologists, and chaplains.

The British approach is referred to as 'normalisation', and involves three to four days in the barracks with military activities, recreation and family contact structured into each day. In the UK, decompression is discretionary (although the requirement to consider its use is mandatory); the decision to implement decompression is made at the Brigade level. The decompression program is constructed and managed by personnel at a higher level who have experienced the same operational environment, and participation in the

decompression process is universal (involving all ranks and all personnel regardless of whether they are regular or reservist). The UK military use decompression either in a third location (eg Cyprus) or back in country (ie UK).

The Royal Netherlands Armed Forces have utilised decompression for over 10 years. Through their experience, they report that decompression should only be employed after high tempo missions such as in Cambodia or Afghanistan. The Royal Netherlands Armed Forces decompression involves personnel participating in a 72 hours 'third location decompression' at an Air Force Base in Belgium or third country location such as Greece. Social workers and officers with experience from other deployments conduct end of deployment debriefs for groups of up to 12 deployed personnel.

A recent review by Hughes et al (2008) addressed the history, policy and existing research on the efficacy of decompression in the military. The reviewers argued there was a lack of evidence to support claims that decompression works and until further knowledge is gained its use should be discretionary.

- b) Upon Return to Australia, members usually take leave for a period of time prior to returning to work. The ADF is trialling a Coming Home Reintegration Package, which is a one-day programme that aims to assist members re-adjust to life in the garrison, in the family, and in the wider community. It focuses on psycho-education in areas such as sleep, substance use, communications with family, and dealing with anger.
- c) Decompression briefings are usually conducted at the end of or immediately post deployment. Upon return to Australia, psychology officers can also provide a psycho-education brief or a Coming Home Reintegration Package to units, as requested by unit commanders.
- d) A 2008 report investigating career intentions following deployment to Operation Catalyst between 2004 and 2007, found that 17.3 per cent of personnel reported an intention to leave the ADF post-deployment. Of those 17.3 per cent, just under half (45.6 per cent) followed through and discharged from the service within 12 months of returning to Australia. Among those who had indicated, prior to their deployment, that they intended to remain in service, 9.7 per cent changed their mind at the time of their RtAPS. In comparison, 12.6 per cent of those intending to leave prior to deployment changed their intentions to staying in service at the time of their RtAPS.
- e) Members who are identified from the RtAPS as requiring immediate mental health support are referred to a Mental Health Professional upon returning to Australia. All members who were deployed also receive a Post-Operation Psychological Screen (POPS) three to six months post deployment.

Members are routinely encouraged to self refer to Mental Health Professionals and Providers within Defence at any stage if they wish to receive additional assistance. As necessary, unit Commanders can also direct members to undergo psychological

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

assessment. Members who have been deployed are also entitled to self-refer to the Veterans and Veterans Families Counselling Service (VVCS).

Written question 4

Topic: Communication with families

Senator Back asked in writing:

- a) What communication is undertaken with families of serving personnel overseas?
- b) Are satisfaction surveys undertaken of families to determine value/adequacy of communications? If so, can results be made available?
- c) Does the ADF see any value in this process?
- d) Is this an outsourced process or undertaken within the ADF?

Response

- a) Defence undertakes a range of support activities for the families of ADF members, who are absent from home for service reasons. These activities can include regular phone calls, emails and other deployment support functions. The National Welfare Coordination Centre provides information packs and booklets to families when an ADF member is deployed. Families themselves may also initiate contact with the Defence Community Organisation, the National Welfare Coordination Centre, Unit Welfare Officers, Service Chaplains and other organisations separately from this process.
- b) No.
- c) Defence considers communication with families to be very important and sees significant value in families being informed about issues that affect them.
- d) Defence's communication activities in support of families are conducted internally by Defence and, where appropriate, in consultation with external bodies such as Defence Families Australia.

Written question 5

Topic: Loss of active service personnel from military service to civilian employment

Senator Back asked in writing:

- a) What percentage of soldiers/sailors/Air Force personnel leave the service after deployment—officers and other ranks
- b) Has this percentage changed over the last 5 years?
- c) If so, what is the trend?
- d) How many junior to middle ranking officers leave the ADF annually?
- e) Is there a difference between active service officers and desk bound officers?
- f) Are exit interviews conducted?
- g) Can you supply the list of reasons why these personnel are leaving the service?
- h) What percentage of those who leave will return to full time service in the ADF over time?
- i) What is the trend?

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
 Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
 Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

Response

- a) The table below details, to 19 June 2009, the percentage of permanent ADF Officer and Other Ranks that separated within 12 months of returning from an overseas operational deployment.

Service	Officers that separated in 2009 (%)	Other Ranks that separated in 2009 (%)
Navy	2	4
Army	8	20
Air Force	5	8

- b) Yes.

- c) Separation rates for Other Ranks in the Army have increased over the last five years. While Navy and Air Force separation rates have declined for Other Ranks in the Air Force there was an exception in 2006 where separation rates increased to 7 percent.

- d)

Financial Year	Number of junior or middle ranking officers that separated from the ADF
2006-07	1,005
2007-08	834
2008-09 (to 31 May 2009)	812

- e) All ADF members have an obligation to undertake 'active' service as well as perform administrative duties. The majority of officers in the ADF rotate between administrative and operational billets as a normal part of postings and career progression.

- f) Yes.

- g) The 2007 Defence Exit Survey lists the following top ten reasons for leaving the service:
- desire to stay in one place
 - to make a career change while still young enough
 - desire for less separation from family
 - better career prospects in civilian life
 - impact of job demands on family/personal life
 - lack of control over life
 - insufficient personnel in units to do the work
 - lack of job satisfaction
 - little appreciation of the personal sacrifices made during my time in the ADF
 - little financial reward for what would be considered over time in the civilian community.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- h) It is not possible to determine the overall percentage of re-enlistments across the ADF over time. The last three years has seen the following number of personnel resuming full-time service.

Financial Year	Number of personnel resuming full-time service
2006-07	923
2007-08	1,099
2008-09 (to 31 May 2009)	1,077

These numbers include re-enlistments (those members reenlisting who did not transfer to the Reserve following their initial Regular service), Reserve personnel transferring to Regular service (this may include some who have not had prior full-time Regular experience) and Service transfers (those leaving one Service and joining another).

- i) An upward trend is apparent.

Written question 6

Topic: Career guidance/Human resource management of service personnel

Senator Back asked:

- a) Please explain the process for processing career progression/guidance for officers.
- b) Are performance reviews undertaken within the officer's own regiment?
- c) Are the HR officers professionally qualified to conduct these reviews?
- d) What administrative system is used to track the status, performance, progress of officers?
- e) Are surveys undertaken of service officers of the satisfaction levels with this process?
- f) Are surveys undertaken of past officers of the satisfaction levels with this process?
- g) Can you provide a summary of the outcomes of these surveys (questions 32 and 33)?
- h) Is there improvement in the process over time?

Response

- a) Career progression/guidance for officers occurs on multiple levels. There is a tri-Service performance appraisal system which is used for reporting an officer's current performance and suitability for future employment, and promotion prospects. This is outlined in Defence Instruction (General) PERS 10-8 Performance Appraisal Reporting in the Australian Defence Force. This is further supported at the service level by:
 - In the Navy, the performance appraisal system is overlaid by a Performance Management and Assessment System (promotion process), which is outlined in ABR (The Australian Book of Reference) 6289 Royal Australian Navy Officers' Career Management Manual.
 - In the Army, the performance appraisal system is an essential component and diagnostic tool used by the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC), which determines suitability for promotions and non-promotional milestones. The PAC process is detailed in Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 47-11 Career Management for Australian Army Officers, and Defence Instruction (Army) PERS 47-11 Career Management of Soldiers in the Australian Regular Army and Army Reserve.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- In the Air Force, the performance appraisal system is complemented by Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 5-5 and Defence Instruction (Air Force) PERS 4-29. This is also supported at the working level:
 - In the Navy, the respective Desk Officers within the Directorate of Naval Officers' Postings act as career facilitators for individual career members. A member's chain of command being the initial point of contact for any career matter/guidance.
 - In the Army, Careers Advisers at the Directorate of Officer Career Management – Army (DOCM-A), the Soldier Career Management Agency (SCMA) and at the regional Army Personnel Agencies (for Army Reserves) provide career advice to Army members, as well as advice to a member's immediate chain of command on professional development and staffing issues. Ultimately, career management within the Army is a three-way process, between the member, their chain of command, and their career management agency
- b) Yes. The performance appraisal system requires immediate supervisors to undertake performance reviews/counselling throughout the reporting period.
- c) There is no requirement for professional qualifications in order to conduct performance reviews. Line managers undertake this role as a normal part of their duties and responsibilities. HR competencies are acquired by officers through normal career development training programs, such as the Leadership, Management and Development Program.
- d) There are multiple systems in place that track status, performance and progress of officers:
- PMKeys is an electronic Human Resource Information System for the whole of the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO)
 - an optical document records (including personnel records) management system
 - Promotion Boards and selection processes for specific appointments such as Command.
- e) Yes. In the annual Defence Attitude Survey (DAS) respondents are asked to answer a number of attitudinal questions. Within the DAS, there is a section dedicated to Career Management. Individual surveys are completed by officers on exit from Defence also cover satisfaction levels with the process.
- f) No. Surveys are not undertaken of past officers, however the ADF Exit Survey does capture those leaving the Service. The ADF Exit Survey is a voluntary survey distributed to all voluntarily discharging members. Within the Exit Survey is a section dedicated to Career Management Issues.
- g) Yes. The following results are from the 2008 Defence Attitude Survey.
- In relation to the performance appraisal system, a higher proportion of Army participants (50 per cent) considered the performance appraisal system in the Service fair, when compared with Navy and Air Force (both 44 per cent). Approximately half of Navy, Army and Air Force respondents believed their work was fairly assessed by the Services performance appraisal system, compared with approximately three

quarters of Defence Civilians. Approximately half of each of the ADF and Defence Civilian respondents were satisfied with their performance appraisal system.

- Overall, less than 42 percent of ADF respondents were satisfied with their Service's career management process. Army participants (42 per cent) were more likely to be satisfied than Navy and Air Force (both 36 per cent). Furthermore, ADF respondents were less likely to agree that they could access adequate information to manage their career (between 50 per cent for Army and 56 per cent for Navy), compared with Defence Civilians (63 per cent), while approximately 42 per cent of ADF respondents believed information on their career management had been adequate. Approximately half of ADF respondents agreed they had sufficient contact with their career management agency. Approximately one third of ADF respondents believed they had no personal control over their career.
 - Overall, more than 60 per cent of ADF respondents reported their career development has been good, compared with 54 per cent of Defence Civilians. Army respondents (45 per cent) were most likely to consider that the promotional process in the Service was fair, compared with Navy (39 per cent) and Air Force (36 per cent). Navy (55 per cent) and Army respondents (57 per cent) were more likely to believe that their promotion opportunities had been good in the past, when compared with Air Force (46 per cent) and Defence Civilians (43 per cent). Notably, Defence Civilians were much less likely to agree that their promotion prospects are good (21 per cent) compared with their ADF counterparts (from 38 per cent for Air Force to 52 per cent for Army).
- h) Data from the 2008 Defence Attitude Survey suggests that satisfaction levels regarding the performance appraisal system and career management have generally improved.
- i) Career management policies and processes are continually reviewed and changes implemented as required. The Defence Attitude Survey does measure, to some degree, satisfaction levels, however there are no other formalised performance measures in place to track career management process improvements.

Written question 7

Topic: Promotion process

Senator Back asked:

- a) Is there an accelerated promotion process for high achieving junior officers in the three services?
- b) If not, why not?
- c) If so, how is it structured?
- d) How long does it take a Captain, on average, to be eligible for promotion to Major? (and equivalent rank in the other services)
- e) Same from Major to Lt Colonel? (and other services)

- f) What action is being taken to reduce the loss to the ADF of young officers who leave as a result of a failed system for promotion opportunities? (For example: encourage alternative deployments overseas for training/exchanges/career development)

Response

- a) Yes.
- b) Not applicable.

c)

Navy

Officers accelerated promotion to Lieutenant is premised on them being qualified and having 12 months experience in their primary qualification (specialisation). For higher ranks accelerated promotion is based on assessed performance and potential at rank in comparison to peers

Army

The Army has an accelerated promotion process for junior officers, which is achieved through promotion zones. Promotion zones have been established within the last year 'minimum time in rank' (MTiR) at each rank. For example, a Captain can be substantively promoted to Major after five years and advance in seniority by 12 months. However, this is the exception and is only utilised for the Army's highest performing officers. Outside of promotion zones, the career management system has the flexibility to promote early if circumstances (either performance or Service need) dictate. This may see an officer promoted between 12 and 24 months early—however, this is very rare. To promote an officer earlier than 24 months before MTiR would place the Army in a position where it is unable to generate either the development or experience required for an officer to be promoted.

Air Force

There are two distinct promotion systems applicable to junior officers:

- Rates of promotion as a junior officer (Officer Cadet through to Flight Lieutenant [FLTLT]) are determined on appointment and are predicated on the minimum amount of experience (time) and proficiency attainment considered necessary for that individual. Consequently, the notion of superior performance does not accelerate the rate of promotion up to the rank of FLTLT. The officer's terms of appointment including promotion progression through to the rank of FLTLT are determined on the basis of the officer's resume with particular reference to relevant tertiary qualifications, military experience (reserves, permanent and foreign military) and previous civilian employment. Officer candidates are also assessed via a series of practical tests and via an interview panel.
- Upon attaining the rank of FLTLT (equivalent to the Army rank of Captain), an officer's subsequent promotion is wholly predicated on their reported performance. Subject to attaining two years seniority as a FLTLT, the officer competes for promotion in a merit-based promotion system against all other officers of the same rank and employment group. Officers who clearly exhibit superior performance and

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

promotion potential have been identified for promotion on their first presentation to a promotion board.

d) *Navy*

The average seniority for members identified for promotion to Squadron Leader from the Flight Lieutenant promotion pool in 2009 is 5.9 years.

Army

The Minimum Time in Rank for a Captain is six years before promotion to Major.

Air Force

The average time for a Flight Lieutenant is 5.9 years before promotion to a Squadron Leader.

e) *Navy*

The average time for a Squadron Leader is four years before promotion to a Wing Commander.

Army

Minimum time in rank for a Major is five years before promotion to a Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force

The average seniority for members identified for promotion to Wing Commander from the Squadron Leader promotion pool in 2009 is 5.8 years.

- f) Exit surveying indicates that a lack of promotion opportunities is not a statistically significant reason for leaving the ADF. However, officers seeking to leave the service are counselled regarding their career options as an alternative to separation such as alternative career pathways and flexible working arrangements.

Written question 8

Topic: Development of the 2009 Defence White Paper

Senator Ludlam asked:

- a) Can the Minister confirm whether or not surveys of public attitudes to defence spending informed Government decision making in preparation of the Defence White Paper and subsequent budget announcements?
- b) Is the Minister aware that the Urbis research cited in Looking over the Horizon: Australian's Consider Defence indicated that public support for increased defence spending had fallen from 75 per cent in 2000 to 30 per cent in June 2008?
- c) Is the Minister concerned that the funding announcements on Budget Night run directly counter to this major shift in public sentiment on defence spending?
- d) Was a formal decision made to set aside consideration of public opinion in the development of defence policy out to 2030, and if so, can the Minister outline the process by which this decision was made?

Response

a-d) In evidence to the committee on 3 June 2009, Mr Michael Pezzullo, then Deputy Secretary Strategy advised that:

“In the end, the decision to resource Defence at the level that is articulated in the White Paper and associated other documents such as the budget is made by the government. Obviously, all of the information that was gathered during course of the 2008 public consultation process, or indeed independently of that process—as you would be aware, a number of studies came out with quantitative details that go to these issues as well—was made available to ministers in the lead-up to their final deliberations and decision on the white paper. I have no doubt the government took into account the views of the Australian community as it saw fit. In the end, it was a matter for ministers to decide.”

Written question 9

Topic: Staff with a disability

Senator Boyce asked:

- a) How many people with a disability were employed full-time and how many part-time? What classifications were these staff employed under?
- b) What percentage of staff in the Department had a disability at March 30, 2008 and March 30, 2009?
- c) What programs does the Department have to encourage the employment of people with a disability?

Response

- a) Disclosure of a disability in Defence is voluntary. As at 22 June 2009, 538 APS employees, 171 permanent ADF members and 50 active reserve ADF members had self disclosed on PMKeyS that they had a disability.

All APS employees have access to flexible working arrangements as detailed in the Defence Collective Agreement 2006-2009. Of the 538 employees that have self disclosed having a disability, 402 were employed at the APS standard level (383 full-time and 19 part-time), 135 at the executive level (128 full-time and 7 part-time) and one full time senior executive.

Of the 221 permanent and active reserve ADF members who had self disclosed a disability, 66 were officers and 155 were other ranks.

- b) As at 30 March 2008, 2.6% of Defence APS employees and 0.3% of permanent ADF members self disclosed as having a disability. This percentage has remained unchanged over the twelve months to 30 March 2009.
- c) In response to the eight recommendations from the Australian Public Service Commission's Management Advisory Committee (MAC) 2006 report, Defence developed a Disability Action Plan. The Action Plan details measures to recruit, retain and develop people with disability.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

Recruitment initiatives include:

- a review of recruitment and selection practices to identify any barriers to people with disability;
- the provision of work-experience opportunities for final-year tertiary students with disability, in partnership with the Australian Employers Network on Disability and local tertiary institutions;
- the recruitment of a number of people with intellectual disability to designated APS 1 positions; and
- the renewal of a contract with Koomarri 'Jobmatch' for a further three years. Jobmatch is a long-standing, mutually beneficial arrangement whereby up to 15 people with intellectual disability and their two supervisors are employed in providing a range of shop-front services at Defence sites in Canberra.

Disability retention and development initiatives include:

- the establishment of an online network for employees with disability;
- the review of the accessibility of websites and internal staff training;
- central funding of assistive technology; and
- provision of training for managers of employees with disability.

The Disability Discrimination Act 1992 provides certain exemptions in connection with employment, engagement or appointment in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) for people with a disability.

Notwithstanding such legislation, the ADF Medical Employment Classification (MEC) System administers the employment of ADF personnel who sustain an injury or illness during the course of their employment. The MEC system incorporates several levels of classification that facilitate rehabilitation, retraining and/or reclassification in an alternative occupation or service within the ADF. The MEC system is currently being reviewed to potentially include new classification levels that will provide extended periods of rehabilitation and ongoing employment opportunities for seriously injured ADF personnel.

Written question 10

Topic: Portfolio Budget Statements 2009-10

Senator Johnston asked:

- a) Can you please explain why the Budget Portfolio Statements for Defence were not ready for perusal and analysis at the beginning of the Budget Lockdown period on May 12th?
- b) Why was this important document withheld from review and analysis for more than three hours?
- c) On page 5 of the Defence 2008-09 Budget Portfolio Statement under the heading of Strategic Direction it says: 'The government has announced an audit of Defence's budget to examine the funding and financial management of Defence. This audit will inform the Government's consideration of the White Paper.'
 - i) Has this audit been completed?

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- ii) If it has, when and where, in the interests of transparency and accountability, was it released for public scrutiny?
 - iii) If it hasn't, why not?
 - iv) Will the Minister for Defence provide a full and detailed briefing for the Opposition on this audit?
- d) On page 5 of the Defence 2008-09 Budget Portfolio Statement under the heading of Strategic Direction it says: 'The Government has asked Defence to deliver up to \$1 billion per annum, for the next 10 years, in savings and efficiencies, for reinvestment in priority areas of Defence.' Where exactly have the \$1 billion of efficiencies and savings in the current financial year been made, and where does this detail appear in the 2009-10 Budget?
- e) On page 35 of the Defence 2008-09 Budget Portfolio Statement, under the heading of Defence Reform it says 'The Minister for Defence has also commissioned a series of associated reviews. These Companion Reviews will include reviews of how we sustain our uniformed and civil workforce; the Defence Capability Plan that equips the ADF.' It is now more than 12 months since these statements were made. Where are the:
- i) Companion Reviews;
 - ii) Air Defence Capability and;
 - iii) Ten Year Defence Capability Plan?
 - iv) When are they being made public, in the interests of accountability and openness as they should be?
- f) How much funding has been taken from the first six years of the Defence budget through deferrals and the like?
- i) Why was it necessary to do this?
 - ii) How do you explain that the deferral of indexation funding is necessary as it's mainly the new indexation that provides the extra funding?
 - iii) Where is it clearly outlined in the budget that \$1 billion worth of capital investment was deferred in the current budget and what projects were they?
- g) How will Defence find additional savings of \$6 billion from 2012-13 to 2018-19 that they didn't have to meet in the years 2009-10 to 2012-13?
- h) Following the bringing down of the 2009-10 Defence Budget there was widespread criticism that it offered only the barest of details on how the government will fund its expansive wish list for the defence force. There is one quote from a respected journalist whose thoughts perhaps best describe on how the budget documents were universally received. This is what he said: Geoffrey Barker—*Australian Financial Review* 13th May 2009: 'This year's defence budget has retreated from transparency, accountability and reality with the speed of an Iraqi regiment fleeing into the desert. But here is the rub. There is no way of knowing how Fitzgibbon has calculated that the price of the weapons acquisitions will be covered by the additional funding. Nor is it possible to know how Defence will find \$20 billion in savings over the decade through the strategic reform program. In fact, the likely cost of the massive new sea, air, land and strategic strike capabilities seems certain to far exceed \$146 billion if the through life operating and sustainment costs are included. Is this estimation close to accurate? What will it cost to acquire these capabilities over the next:
- i) Four years;
 - ii) 10 years; and
 - iii) 20 years?

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- i) How are savings going to be generated, especially in the years 2012-13 to 2018-19, and how are the unexplained \$5.9 billion of savings from equipment procurement to be found?
- j) Consistently through the Budget papers is a phrase that is assigned to a large number of Expense Measures. It says: 'The cost of this measure will be met from within the existing resourcing of the Department of Defence.' A similar comment appears against a large number of proposals in the White Paper—page 137, para 18.4: 'shortfalls against the White Paper funding plan will be offset by Defence'.
 - i) How will the ADF Health Care Trial, which was a commitment made in the 2007 election campaign, be funded unless the savings can be made within the existing resources of the Department?
 - ii) If the funding can't be found within the existing resources does this mean that this initiative won't proceed?
- k) It is accepted that Funding for Defence from Government amounts to \$25.54 billion. However, the assertion that \$1.1 billion is Funding From Other Sources needs further explanation. How did Defence arrive at that figure when there was Funding From Other Sources of \$286 million; a DMO appropriation of \$851 million and a DMO drawdown of \$115 million making a total of \$26.793 billion?

Response

- a) The Department of Defence, in accordance with past practice, provided hard copies of the 2009-10 Portfolio Budget Statements (PBS) to Parliament House on 11 May 2009.
- b) The Defence 2009-10 PBS was not withheld from review and analysis. The Department of Finance and Deregulation advised Departments, via e-mail on the afternoon of 11 May 2009, that agencies were to include an electronic copy in addition to the hard copy. Defence officials were unaware of this e-mail and provided the PBS hardcopy to Parliament House on 11 May 2009 as initially requested. The decision to not have these hard copies available at the start of the lock-up was not made by Defence. Once Defence officials became aware that the hard copy was not in the Budget lock-up, every effort was made to distribute the hard copy immediately.
- c)
 - i) Yes.
 - ii) The Defence Budget Audit has not been released.
- iii & iv) The Government has not made a decision on the release of the Defence Budget Audit Report.
- d) In 2008-09 as identified in Table 1.2.9 on pages 22-3 of the 2008-09 PBS, the savings have been made in areas such as: efficiencies in the sustainment procurement cycle; reduction in administrative travel; reduction in scientific research; efficiencies in telecommunications projects; reduction in project definition costs for major capital equipment projects. In 2009-10, the \$1 billion in savings and efficiencies are incorporated in the savings in Table 3 on page 16 of the 2009-10 PBS.
- e)
 - i) The reviews were not undertaken with the intention of public release—in some cases they contain highly classified information. The reviews were developed as

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- internal working documents to be used to inform the White Paper and Strategic Reform Program.
- ii) The outcome of this review has been incorporated into the White Paper which was released to the public on 2 May 2009.
 - iii) A four year Defence Capability Plan (DCP) was released to the public on 1 July 2009.
 - iv) The outcome of these reviews has been incorporated into the White Paper which was released to the public on 2 May 2009.
- f) As detailed in Budget Paper No 2, pages 134-6, savings of \$2 billion over three years from 2010-11 will be drawn from the Defence budget and returned in the period beyond 2015-16. Defence funding will transition to the new long term path over 2013-14 and 2014-15. Defence funding will be \$1 billion below the new long term funding path in 2013-14, and \$0.5 billion lower in 2014-15 as higher funding levels are phased in.
- i) This will allow Defence to deliver acquisitions set out under Force 2030, the 2009 Defence White Paper.
 - ii) The Government has introduced a new long term funding model for Defence, consistent with a new strategic assessment and the capability plan set out in the 2009 Defence White Paper. This will provide greater certainty and stability for the Defence budget in the long term.
 - iii) Page 129 of the 2009-10 PBS identifies \$749.4m principally for reprogramming of approved projects and re-scheduling of unapproved projects. Individual projects are not identified in the PBS and project information is contained in the DCP.
- g) The Strategic Reform Program will comprehensively and fundamentally improve the management of Defence, making the organisation more efficient and effective, and creating significant savings to reinvest. The Strategic Reform Program booklet identifies how savings by stream will be achieved.
- h) As detailed on page 136 of the Budget Paper No 2, over the period to 2029-30, the Government will provide additional new funding of \$146.1 billion to Defence (against funding projections for Defence at the time of the Updated Economic and Fiscal Outlook).
- i) Planned expenditure on major capital equipment over the next four years is \$23.8 billion as detailed in Table 16, page 30 of the 2009-10 PBS.
 - ii) The Government has not released a 10 year capital investment program.
 - iii) Defence stated to the committee 3 June 2009, the estimated overall cost of acquiring the capabilities outlined in the White paper will be between \$245-\$275 billion out to 2030.
- i) The Strategic Reform Program booklet identifies how savings by stream will be achieved. The \$5.9 billion in Table 3 on page 16 of the 2009-10 PBS associated with the Defence Capability Plan, relates to increased investment, not savings.
- j)
- i) As outlined in Table 4 on page 17 of the 2009-10 PBS, the ADF Health Care Trial Expansion will be funded from within existing resources.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- ii) Table 4 on page 17 of the 2009-10 PBS indicates that the initiative is proceeding from within existing resources.
- k) Table 5, serials 9, 10 and 11 on page 19 of the 2009-10 PBS, indicate that Defence is budgeting to receive \$1,100.760m in funding from other sources. This is made up of \$286.314m in capital receipts and \$814.446m in own source revenue. DMO is separately appropriated \$851 million. The consolidated resourcing for DMO and Defence is detailed in Table 2, page 5 of the 2009-10 PBS.

Written question 11

Topic: Staffing

Senator Johnston asked:

The Defence White Paper says that over the next decade it will be necessary to increase the military workforce from the last actual number of 53,167 (2007-2008) to 57,800, an increase of 4,633, or 8.7 per cent. It also says that the number of bureaucrats will increase from the last actual number (2007-08) of 15,707 to 21,900, an increase of 6,193 or a 39.4 per cent increase. Included in this number is the employment of an additional 1,009 staff in the next 12 months to find the \$20 billion worth of savings over the next decade. On top of this, the DMO staff jump from 7,724 in 2008-09 out to 8,470 in 2012-13. That is an increase of 746 or 9.6 per cent - just in four years.

- a) Is the planned increase of 6,193 staff over the next decade an accurate reflection of what is planned for this period?
- b) How specifically are the 1,009 additional staff employed to conduct the Strategic Review Program going to be deployed?
- c) What will be the total cost of employing these staff over the next four financial years?
- d) Will this staffing figure of 1,009 be applicable to only 2009-10, or will there be increases over the following three years?
- e) How much additional funding will be required to meet these staff increases over the next four and 10 years?

Response

- a) The White Paper workforce numbers reflect the total Defence Portfolio including the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) whereas 15,707 does not include the DMO. The last actual number (2007-08) including the DMO is 21,192. Thus, there is a projected increase of 708 staff or 3.3 per cent (21,192 compared to 21,900).
- b) The 1,009 additional staff is the adjustment to Defence's total workforce for both the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program, rather than the number of staff specifically employed for the conduct of the Strategic Reform Program. How these staff will be deployed in respect of the Strategic Reform Program is subject to further detailed planning over the next six months resulting in the production of an implementation schedule and detailed project plan.
- c) The total cost of employing these staff members can be provided once the workforce composition has been established.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- d) As detailed in Table 18 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2009-10, the 1,009 is applicable to 2009-10 with further adjustments of 1,252 for 2010-11, 621 for 2011-12 and 242 for 2012-13. These adjustments will affect both the military and civilian workforces.
- e) No additional funding is required over and above that already considered in the context of the White Paper and the Strategic Reform Program.

Written question 12

Topic: Base rationalisation

Senator Johnston asked:

What consideration has been given to the sale of bases to meet the \$20 billion savings target?

- a) If such consideration has been given, what is the process associated in identifying those bases that may be closed and sold off?
- b) Has any scoping work been completed to determine the value of bases that will become surplus to requirements in the next decade?
- c) If it has, what value has been attached to each of these bases for a possible sale sometime in the future?

Response

a-c) Defence has not factored any savings from estate rationalisation into the \$20 billion savings program.

Written question 13

Topic: Bandwidth/Network Centric Warfare

Senator Johnston asked in writing:

As video communications is integrated into robots, soldiers, and UAVs, and network-centric warfare becomes the organising principle of war-fighting, front-line demands for bandwidth are rising at a rapid rate. The US military is focussing on the Transformation Communications Satellite (TSAT) System as part of a larger effort to address that need, and close the gap.

- a) What has the ADF done, and spent, in the period July 2008 to December 2008 to address the issue of increased bandwidth?
- b) What has the ADF done, and spent, in the period July 2008 to December 2008 in establishing a network centric warfare capability?

Response

a) During the period Defence undertook activities to provide access to the Wideband Global SATCOM System in the short and longer terms. The Defence Science and Technology Organisation testing and evaluation Satellite Ground Station at Salisbury, South Australia, was linked to the Defence Wide Area Network, which enabled interim access to the Wideband Global SATCOM System 1. Defence initiated an Implementation Agreement with the US to install equipment at US satellite ground station sites, which enabled limited access to the worldwide Wideband Global SATCOM System capacity.

In addition, the Defence Materiel Organisation commenced the contracting activities to acquire the required ground station capabilities on the Australian west and east coasts.

Defence also undertook planning and capability development activity for the acquisition of an Ultra High Frequency payload on a commercial satellite over the Indian Ocean Region, which has subsequently resulted in Defence contracting for an Ultra High Frequency payload that will become operational in 2012. During the period Defence expended \$34m as its contribution to the Wideband Global SATCOM System. There were no costs during the period that were associated with contracting activities for the Ultra High Frequency satellite payload.

- b) During the period Defence achieved the following Network Centric Warfare milestones:
- i. Networked Special Operations Task Unit milestone of the initial delivery of vehicles to Special Forces through Defence Joint Project 2097 Phase 1A;
 - ii. Networked Air Combat Force milestone of the delivery of Link-16 (tactical data link) fighter to fighter data exchange. Twelve F/A-18 A/B Hornet aircraft were fitted out during the period July 2008 to December 2008, completing the 71 F/A-18 A/B Hornet fleet fit out. This was undertaken through Defence Project AIR 5376 Phase 2.2 (Hornet Upgrade). The Link-16 capability in the Mobile Regional Operations Centre was also completed during the period under a rapid acquisition;
 - iii. Networked Maritime Task Group milestone of the provision of broadband Satellite Communications to Major Fleet Units commenced under Defence Joint Project 2008 Phase 3E (Military Satellite Communications). Four Adelaide Class Frigates were fitted with Link-16 hardware through Defence Project SEA 1390 Phase 2 Adelaide Class Frigate Upgrade; and
 - iv. The Networked Deployable Joint Task Force Headquarters milestone first deliverable provided through Defence Joint Project 8001 is the Headquarters Joint Operations Command facility near Bungendore, New South Wales, which was opened in February 2009. Headquarters Joint Operations Command was designed, resourced, equipped and staffed to enable it to evolve and revolutionise how the Australian Defence Force supports deployed forces in the 21st century.

The network centric capability requires the establishment of an integrated network to link sensors, command and control and engagement systems across the ADF, effectively integrate and exchange information between these systems, and provide the underlying information and communications infrastructure upon which the networked force will be developed. Specific achievements during the period were:

- i. evolving strategic, operational and tactical networks to sustain the conduct of operations and management of Defence business. The core of the strategic communications network that links major Defence sites provides an effective capability to support current operations; and
- ii. establishment of important networking capabilities, primarily in the satellite communications area, to sustain vital operational and tactical links across each of the operational theatres where Australian forces are currently deployed.

The network centric capability has a human dimension, which involves the preparation of the ADF and its people for operating in a networked battlespace through changes to doctrine, organisation, training and education with an emphasis on a 'learn by doing' approach. A number of initiatives were progressed through the period July 2008 to December 2008, including through the Services' New Generation Navy, the Adaptive Army and the Air Force Adaptive Culture programs.

An important element of a network centric capability is accelerating the process of change and innovation to take advantage of advances in Information Age knowledge, processes and technology. This requires tapping into the broadest possible knowledge and ideas base across Defence and industry, and refining that knowledge through an increased use of experimentation. The Capability Development Group's Rapid Prototyping Development and Evaluation organisation is a significant initiative that is committed to accelerating networked capability. From July 2008 to December 2008 the Rapid Prototyping Development and Evaluation organisation undertook 17 activities contributing to the network centric capability.

Expenditure attributed to the development and implementation of a network centric capability is limited to expenditure for the Network Centric Warfare Development Directorate (\$0.6m) and the Rapid Prototyping Development and Evaluation organisation (\$6.1m), which equates to \$6.7m over the period. Expenditure on projects within the Defence Capability Plan is not included in the summation of expenditure attributed to the establishment of a Network Centric Warfare capability.

Written question 14

Topic: Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)

Senator Johnston asked in writing:

The Government has announced that it will acquire 100 F-35 JSF, along with supporting systems and weapons.

- a) What are the scheduling arrangements for the introduction of these aircraft into the ADF?
- b) What funding has been assigned to the procurement of these aircraft over the Forward Estimates period and beyond?
- c) What funding has been assigned to the through life support of these aircraft over the Forward Estimates period and beyond?
- d) What funding has been assigned to the procurement of 'the new maritime strike weapon', as outlined in the Defence White Paper, for these aircraft over the Forward Estimates period and beyond?
- e) When and where will the initial three squadrons of the F-35 JSF be based?

Response

- a) Scheduling arrangements for the introduction of 100 F-35 JSF aircraft are subject to Government second-pass approval, anticipated in late 2009. The 2009 second-pass approval will be for no fewer than 72 aircraft, which is sufficient to provide for three operational squadrons and a training squadron to replace the F/A-18A/B 'classic' Hornets (Phase 2A/B). A decision on the remaining JSF aircraft (to form a fourth operational squadron) will be made at a later date, in conjunction with a decision on the withdrawal date of the F/A-18F Super Hornet.
- b) Funding for costs associated with contributions to the System Development and Demonstration (SDD), and initial contributions to shared activities under Production Sustainment and Follow-on Development (PSFD) Memorandums of Understanding, were approved in 2002 and 2006 respectively. Approximately \$29m will be expended in the Forward Estimate Period. The acquisition funding requirement for the initial 72 aircraft and associated procurement items will be around \$15 billion but is subject to the

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget estimates 2009-2010; 3 and 4 June 2009
Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

Australia/US exchange rate. Final funding and the magnitude of the expenditure in the Forward Estimates period are dependent on details of the acquisition to be determined at Second Pass approval.

- c) Through life support funding for the JSF will be determined in conjunction with second-pass approval. Comprehensive estimates of through life support costs have been developed using official JSF Project Office data adjusted for Australian operations and environment. Funding for JSF through life support comprises guidance transferred from classic hornet (as these aircraft are progressively retired) plus additional provisioning to compensate for the additional costs associated with the increased JSF rate of effort, and the increased complexity of this weapon system. Considerable focus has been placed on reducing JSF through life support costs by pursuing economies of scale in global sustainment arrangements, efficiencies in performance based logistics contracts, smart design for reduced maintenance, and increased use of simulation. Funding of around \$35,000 per flying hour will be required to support mature JSF operations, representing an increase of around 10 per cent over classic Hornet costs. Funding for JSF through life support costs will thus grow as they are progressively introduced into service.
- d) Provision for a new maritime strike weapon, as identified in the 2009 White Paper, is not included in Defence Capability Plan 2009 but is expected to be programmed in subsequent Defence Capability Plans. This is likely to be an ACAT III project (\$100m-\$500m).
- e) Current Defence planning is premised on RAAF Williamtown being the main operating base, receiving the first, third and training squadrons. The second squadron will operate from RAAF Tindal.