

# Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

**Budget Estimates Hearing, 31 May – 1 June 2010**

## Questions Taken on Notice

**Q1**

**HMAS Success Commission of Inquiry, Hansard 31 May p 107**

**Senator Johnston**

- (a) Who are the staff attending within the inquiry?**
- (b) What is the Commissioner's daily fee?**
- (c) Please detail daily rates for the Counsel, including the Counsel Assisting, and Junior Counsel Assisting.**
- (d) Are there any leasing costs for the premises?**
- (e) Please detail all other costs and associated expenses.**

**Response:**

(a) The staff attending within the inquiry include:

President:

- The Hon Roger Gyles AO QC

Counsel Assisting:

- Lead Counsel Assisting
- Counsel Assisting x2 (one of these is a Flight Lieutenant working in their ADF capacity and no costs will be attributable to that individual)
- Legal Research Assistants x2

Support Team:

- Clerk to the Commission (Major (Equivalent))
- Commission Orderly (Sergeant (Equivalent)) - only attends on hearing days
- President's Secretary (Civilian Contractor)
- Finance/travel/accounts (Corporal (Equivalent))
- Administrative support x2 (1x Able Seaman, 1x Private (Equivalent))
- Public Affairs, (currently a civilian, being replaced by Captain (Equivalent))
- Assistant Manager (Warrant Officer Class 2 (Equivalent))
- Manager (Colonel (Equivalent))

(b) In accordance with the *Legal Services Directions 2005* (Cth), a Commonwealth agency that proposes to brief counsel who does not have an approved rate for performing Commonwealth legal work is required to ask the Office of Legal Services Coordination (OLSC) in the Attorney-General's Department to approve an initial rate.

Earlier this year, Defence Legal approached the OLSC to determine whether the President required an approved rate given that his role would be that of President of a Commission of Inquiry. The OLSC advised that it did not consider such a role to constitute working as counsel and therefore there was no need to obtain an approved rate from the OLSC.

The parties subsequently agreed to a daily rate of \$7,700 (GST inclusive) after giving consideration to current commercial rates and approved rates for similar positions.

(c) *Counsel Assisting and Assistant Counsel Assisting*

In accordance with the *Legal Services Directions 2005* (Cth), a Commonwealth agency that proposes to brief counsel who does not have an approved rate for performing Commonwealth legal work is required to ask the OLSC to approve an initial rate.

In February this year, Defence Legal approached the OLSC and queried whether Lead Counsel Assisting and one of the non-ADF Counsel Assisting had approved rates. The OLSC provided the then current rates to Defence Legal. However, as the rates had been set by the OLSC in 2007, Defence Legal requested, on behalf of Lead Counsel Assisting and the non-ADF Counsel Assisting, that the OLSC give consideration to (a) revising their ongoing rates, and (b) setting a 'one-off' rate for both for the purposes of the Commission of Inquiry.

The OLSC subsequently approved the following 'one-off' rates:

- *Lead Counsel Assisting*

Daily: \$3,600 (GST inclusive)

Hourly: \$600 (GST inclusive)

It is anticipated that the Lead Counsel Assisting's services will be required for a period of 179 days. It is therefore estimated that the total expenditure, comprising professional legal services and some agreed incidental costs, will amount to approximately \$647,700 (GST inclusive).

- *Counsel Assisting*

Daily: \$2,400 (GST inclusive)

Hourly: \$400 (GST inclusive)

It is anticipated that the Counsel Assisting's services will be required for a period of 179 days. It is therefore estimated that the total expenditure, comprising professional legal services and some agreed incidental costs, will amount to approximately \$432,738 (GST inclusive).

The total amount expended, as at 1 June 2010, in relation to services provided by the Lead Counsel and Counsel Assisting is \$280,727.36.

*Counsel Representing*

Where an individual is identified as a potentially affected person, that is a person the President of a Commission of Inquiry considers may be adversely affected by the inquiry being conducted by the Commission, that individual is given access to Counsel who are Reserve Legal Officers. This is done through the office of Defence Counsel Services. A potentially affected person is able to choose who will represent them from a list of eligible Reserve Legal Officers. To be eligible, a Reserve Legal Officer must have provided Defence Counsel Services with a biography, hold the requisite security clearance for the matter, not have a conflict of interest in the matter and normally be located in close geographic proximity to where the matter is being conducted.

Before contacting Defence Counsel Services, a potentially affected person may have already contacted a particular Reserve Legal Officer and may wish that person to be engaged as their legal representative. This is a matter for the potentially affected person.

The rate for Reserve Legal Officers is set out in Defence Determination 2008/45, with the relevant base Sessional Fee Rate for the first five days' work being \$1,215 per day for junior counsel and \$1,823 per day for Senior Counsel/Queen's Counsel, or \$202.50 per hour for junior counsel and \$303.75 for Senior Counsel/Queen's Counsel for less than three hours.

Where it is likely that a matter will exceed five days' work, the Director General Australian Defence Force Legal Services (as delegate of the Chief of the Defence Force) makes a determination as to the Sessional Fee Rate for the individual Reserve Legal Officer. This is done taking into account advice from the OLSC about what a reasonable Sessional Fee Rate for the individual Reserve Legal Officer would be, based on its assessment of the individual's circumstances, including their seniority and the location of their practice.

The daily rates for Counsel Representing potentially affected persons in the HMAS *Success* Commission of Inquiry range from \$1,000 to \$2,200 for Counsel ranging in rank from Lieutenant to Colonel (or equivalents). The total amount paid to date for Counsel Representing is \$230,980.68.

(d) The Commission of Inquiry is being conducted at the Defence Plaza, 270 Pitt Street, Sydney. This is a building that is already leased by Defence on an ongoing basis and the Commission is using the auditorium and a number of training rooms on the 11th floor of the Defence Plaza. There is no charge to the Commission of Inquiry to use this space and there are no other leasing costs associated with the conduct of the inquiry.

(e) There are a number of other costs and expenses associated with the Commission of Inquiry. Given the ongoing nature of the inquiry, it is not possible to provide an estimation of the total costs and expenses that may be incurred. As of 1 June 2010, such costs and expenses have amounted to \$140,951.20, which includes the following:

- Office Related Expenses - \$32,345.72
- Travel - \$45,427.72
- Accommodation - \$30,411.78
- Meals and Incidentals - \$19,289.53
- Miscellaneous - \$13,476.45

## **Q2**

### **Combat Clothing, Hansard 1 June p 9**

**Senator Johnston**

**What percentage of Disruptive Pattern Camouflage Uniform (DPCU) does not have the application of near IR applied to it?**

#### **Response:**

All current version DPCU has Near IR (NIR) applied to it. However, there are superseded version DPCU stocks in the ADF inventory which are considered suitable for training activities within Australia, which are not NIR treated. 70% of stockholdings are NIR treated and 30% are non-NIR.

## **Q3**

### **Australian Defence Apparel (ADA) Tender, Hansard 1 June p 11**

**Senator Johnston**

**Regarding the tender with Australian Defence Apparel (ADA) that included the option to purchase fabric from China:**

- (a) What were the terms of the contract?**
- (b) What was the value of the contract?**
- (c) Does the contract include the details of the Chinese manufacturer in question?**
- (d) When was the contract first awarded and signed?**
- (e) Which Commonwealth representative signed the contract?**

**In relation to the fabric samples provided by the Chinese manufacturer:**

- (f) Were the samples fully tested as compliant with the specifications for near IR and fire retardant and matched precisely to the Bruck fabric?**

**Response:**

(a) The contract required the delivery of a range of disruptive pattern garments in accordance with a functional and performance specification. The provision of additional garments through the activation of an option for further quantities was at the Commonwealth's discretion. A copy of the contract has been provided to the committee, subject to redaction of material that was officially listed as 'Commercial-in-Confidence' information for the benefit of the contractor and the names of individuals. However, the titles of those undertaking duties have been retained.

(b) The overall expected value of the contract, if the option was exercised, was \$13,549,026.57, with initial quantities valued at \$6,464,865.44.

(c) Yes.

(d) The contract was signed on 22 December 2009.

(e) The contract was signed by the (then) Acting Director of Clothing Systems Program Office.

(f) The Commonwealth had not made a decision to exercise the option for additional quantities using Chinese fabric, and consequently there was no formal requirement for samples prior to exercising the option. The supplier, while not having to provide the Chinese fabric or test results until this option was exercised, did undertake during negotiations to provide samples and test reports for review. The reason the supplier undertook to do this was to provide the Commonwealth with early confidence that the Chinese company could produce the fabric to specification. Following the decision to not exercise the option for additional quantities, the Commonwealth was not able to test the compliance of the Chinese fabric against the specification.

**Q4**

**Actions of the Defence Export Control Office (DECO), Hansard 1 June p 14**

**Senator Johnston**

**What did DECO do upon being availed of the information that there was a potential export contract of DPCU 8818, incorporating the near IR signature management technology? What action was taken, who was contacted as a result, what investigations were undertaken and what follow ups were undertaken by that office?**

**Response:**

These issues are being reviewed by DECO as part of the enquiry announced to the Committee by the Minister for Defence on 1 June 2010. That process has not at the time of this response been finished.

## **Q5**

### **Clothing Procurement Contract and Review, Hansard 1 June p 18**

**Senator Johnston**

**What are the terms of reference of the contract with Mr Lewincamp for the clothing procurement review?**

#### **Response:**

*Extract from Services Agreement with Frankadvice Pty Ltd dated 16 February 2010:*

DMO buys goods and associated services from suppliers in the textiles, clothing and footwear industry sector. The existing Commonwealth policy framework associated with the DMO's procurement of goods from this sector for the ADF has been subject to change and some uncertainty.

DMO has identified issues of overlap, uncertainty and conflict between policy objectives. Urgent advice is now required by the CEO DMO to precisely identify the areas of key policy concern and to recommend actions and strategies for the Commonwealth and DMO to take to reduce the policy uncertainty in this area and to ensure continuity of supply of products from this industry sector to the ADF.

The consultant shall provide, under the overall guidance and direction of the Chief of Staff to CEO DMO the following:

- a) an analysis of the current Commonwealth policy framework relating to the DMO procurement of textiles, clothing and footwear;
- b) from this analysis the identification of areas of policy overlap and conflict;
- c) the delivery of a draft report for CEO DMO's consideration by 26 February 2010; and
- d) a completed version of the report delivered prior to the expiry of the agreement.

*Following the completion of the initial 'ten plus three' days of services provided for under the original agreement, a second agreement was signed on 18 June 2010 to complete further analysis stemming from the first report, as follows:*

- i) identify practical methods by which DMO can obtain quality assurance on its overseas suppliers, particularly those from Asia;
- ii) identify processes and procedures through which DMO can be assured that its overseas suppliers abide by the laws of their countries and relevant international obligations, such as those of the International Labour Organisation;
- iii) consider how an Australian company acting as a prime contractor to DMO can enforce quality obligations on its suppliers, and ensure that subcontractors abide by the laws of their countries and relevant international obligations;
- iv) consider further the relevance and impact of broader government industry and procurement policies on Defence; and
- v) investigate further intellectual property issues associated with combat clothing.

## **Q6**

### **Defence ADF Apparel, Hansard 1 June p 25-27**

**Senator Johnston**

- (a) What is the percentage of Australian combat uniforms manufactured in Australia and overseas for FY 2008-09 and July 2009 to date.**
- (b) Which countries are they manufactured in and what are we getting from these countries?**
- (c) Where is the fabric acquired from for equipment such as webbing ensembles?**
- (d) How long has Defence been acquiring combat uniforms manufactured out of country?**

**(e) What are the costs associated with these?**

**For all Defence ADF apparel:**

**(f) What is the total annual value?**

**(g) What is the percentage produced/manufactured in Australia and the value of this?**

**(h) Provide value and percentage of what goes offshore.**

**Response:**

NOTE - Please note that the following data against this Question on Notice has been primarily sourced from responses provided by the top 20 Clothing Systems Program Office (CLOSPO) suppliers in June 2010.

(a) Combat Uniforms manufactured in Australia July 2008 to June 2010 = 81%. Combat Uniforms manufactured Overseas July 2008 to June 2010 = 19%. This is approximately the case for each financial year (FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10).

(b) Taking an expansive view of Australian combat uniforms, the following countries provide the following clothing items:

- China: Cold Weather Coats, Cold Weather Gloves, Cold Weather Drawers, Cold Weather Shirts, Extreme Cold Weather Drawers, Extreme Cold Weather Gloves, Extreme Cold Weather Mittens, Fasteners, Mens and Womens Gloves, Narrow Brim Hats, Tarmac Jackets and Overtrousers, Raincoats, Fire Retardant Jackets and Trousers, Wet Weather Jackets and Trousers.
- Italy: Cold Weather Boots.
- Laos: Kumul Pattern Shirts and Trousers, Jacket Cold Weather.
- Sri-Lanka : Broad Brim Hats.
- UK: Extreme Cold Weather Jackets, Cold Weather Overalls.
- US: Extreme Cold Weather Mittens, Extreme Cold Weather Socks, Cold Weather Gloves, Combat Boots, Hot Weather Boots.
- Vietnam: Coveralls.

(c) For load carriage equipment, the fabric is acquired through the Australian supplier, Wax Converters Textiles Pty Ltd.

(d) Respective dates associated with Defence acquiring combat uniforms manufactured out of country are as follows:

- China: Cold Weather Coats (2008), Cold Weather Gloves (2009), Cold Weather Drawers (2010), Cold Weather Shirts (2010), Extreme Cold Weather Drawers (2010), Extreme Cold Weather Gloves (2009), Extreme Cold Weather Mittens (2006), Fasteners (2010), Mens and Womens Gloves (2003), Narrow Brim Hats (2009), Tarmac Jackets and Overtrousers (2009), Raincoats (2005), Fire Retardant Jackets and Trousers (2009), Wet Weather Jackets (2009) and Trousers (2005).
- Italy: Cold Weather Boots (2003).
- Laos: Kumul Pattern Shirts and Trousers (2008), Jacket Cold Weather (2009), noting some quantities were also manufactured in Australia.
- Sri-Lanka: Broad Brim Hats (2009).
- UK: Cold Weather Jackets (2002), Cold Weather Overalls (2002).
- US: Extreme Cold Weather Mittens (2006) and Socks (2005). Cold Weather Gloves (2006), Combat Boots (2004), Hot Weather Boots (2007).
- Vietnam: Coveralls (2010).

It should be noted that Australia has historically sourced a variety of clothing and personal equipment from overseas suppliers to meet the specific challenges of different operating environments. The combat uniform items listed above were largely procured for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, in some cases as operationally urgent requirements. Prior to these

operations, the ADF was not equipped for extreme heat or cold as experienced in these theatres of operation. Equipping our troops appropriately for extreme or specialty conditions must be the primary consideration, and the expertise to produce many of these products lies overseas.

- (e) Respective costs for combat uniforms (from Jul 08 – Jun 10):
- China: Cold Weather Coats (\$0.030m), Cold Weather Gloves (\$0.010m), Cold Weather Drawers (\$0.481m), Cold Weather Shirts (\$0.549m), Extreme Cold Weather Drawers (\$0.342m), Extreme Cold Weather Gloves (\$0.189m), Extreme Cold Weather Mittens (\$0.004m), Fasteners (\$0.026m), Mens and Womens Gloves (\$0.083m), Narrow Brim Hats (\$0.148m), Tarmac Jackets (\$0.500m) and Overtrousers (\$0.300m), Raincoats (\$7.079m), Fire Retardant Jackets (\$0.107m) & Trousers (\$0.041m), Wet Weather Jackets (\$0.239m) and Trousers (\$3.498m).
  - Italy: Cold Weather Boots (\$2.068m).
  - Laos: Kumul Pattern Shirts (\$0.066m) and Trousers (\$0.073m), Jacket Cold Weather (\$0.411m).
  - Sri-Lanka : Broad Brim Hats (\$0.147m).
  - UK: Extreme Cold Weather Jackets (\$0.739m), Cold Weather Overalls (\$0.402m).
  - US: Extreme Cold Weather Mittens (\$2.488m) and Socks (\$0.131m). Cold Weather Gloves (\$0.280m), Combat Boots (\$0.304m), Hot Weather Boots (\$0.020m).
  - Vietnam: Coveralls (\$0.073m).
- (f) The figures below only cover ADF apparel as provided by the DMO.  
Apparel - Value FY 2008-09: \$95.6m;  
Apparel - Value FY 2009-10: \$72.2m.
- (g) 83% for Clothing SPO Apparel for the aggregated July 2008 to June 2010 period.
- (h) 17% for Clothing SPO Apparel for the aggregated July 2008 to June 2010 period.

## **Q7**

### **Harding-Treloar Report 2006, Hansard 1 June p 27-32**

#### **Senator Johnston**

#### **Regarding the 2006 Harding-Treloar Report:**

- (a) **What were the terms of reference for the Harding-Treloar report?**
- (b) **What was the cost of this report?**
- (c) **Who are Mr Harding and Mr Treloar?**
- Recommendation 11 requires the IG to conduct a review.**
- (d) **What was the finding of this IG review?**
- (e) **Please confirm who was IG at the time.**
- (f) **What were the IG's qualifications?**
- (g) **Please provide report for tabling.**

#### **Response:**

(a) The Terms of Reference are available at  
[http://www.defence.gov.au/publications/Clothing\\_Review\\_Report.pdf](http://www.defence.gov.au/publications/Clothing_Review_Report.pdf)

(b) Total paid was \$176,117.78 (GST inclusive).

Breakdown by vendor was:

Mr Harding was paid a total of \$51,076.04 (GST exclusive), comprising:

- Services \$49,875.00 (GST exclusive as he earned less than \$50,000.00), and
- Travel \$1,201.04 (GST exclusive).

Mr Treloar was paid a total of \$56,682.22 (GST inclusive), comprising:

- Services \$51,012.50 (GST inclusive), and
- Travel \$5,669.72 (GST exclusive).

Mr Allan Kallir, employed under Insight Partners Pty Ltd, was paid a total of \$68,359.52 (GST inclusive), comprising:

- Services \$63,525.00 (GST inclusive), and
- Travel \$4,834.52 (GST inclusive).

(c) The Review Team comprised Air Vice-Marshal Bob Treloar AO (R'td), Mr Mike Harding and Dr Alan Kallir.

Air Vice-Marshal Treloar was the Commander Australian Theatre, 1999-2001 and his experience and background in the field of military operations were highly relevant to a review of this nature.

Mr Harding has extensive experience in the private sector. He is a Non-Executive Director and member of the Audit Committee of Santos; Non-Executive Director, Deputy Chairman and Chairman of the Remuneration Committee of ARC Energy; and Chairman of the Project Governance Board - Land Systems Division (Army), for the Department of Defence.

Dr Kallir has advised senior management in service and manufacturing industries around the globe for more than a decade. He has extensive and significant experience working with Boards, Chief Executive Officers and Senior Management on issues of strategy, organisation, growth and profit management.

(d) and (g) This report has been subject to an application under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (FOI Act). The document was released on 4 May 2009, with some deletions relating to section 41 [documents affecting personal privacy]. A copy of the redacted report has been provided to the Committee.

(e) and (f) Mr Claude Neumann was Inspector General when the investigation was conducted. However, the audit investigation was conducted by Mr John Wiseman who had been Director of the Melbourne office of Management Audit Branch for over a decade and was particularly experienced in the conduct of procurement reviews.

## **Q8**

### **Availability of reviews and reports, Hansard 1 June p 45, 65**

**Senator Johnston**

**Are the following publicly available, and if not, will the Minister review for public availability:**

- (a) the audit investigation into the combat fleece jacket by Mr Jason Woods in 2005;**
- (b) the Command ISF Timor Leste field survey of Land 125 load-bearing TLBG6 survey 2, by Major Ian Potts, Mr Phil Radosovich and Dr Heysham Mendis;**
- (c) the report "Pack frames and its effect on perceived weight of the pack and comfort: a preliminary report"; and**
- (d) the Booz Allen Hamilton report regarding boots.**

### **Response:**

(a) This audit investigation has been subject to an application under the FOI Act. The document was released on 19 March 2010, with some deletions relating to section 43 [documents concerning business affairs], section 45 [documents concerning material obtained in confidence] and section 41 [documents affecting personal privacy]. A copy of the redacted audit investigation has been provided to the Committee.



(b) The Field Survey of Land 125 Load Bearing Equipment – Timor Leste Report September 2009 will not be released at this stage as it will form part of the Whalan Review into RODUMS. Should the Committee wish to further discuss this report prior to the conclusion of the Whalan Review, the DMO is happy to offer the Committee a private briefing.

(c) This report has been subject to an application under the FOI Act. The document was released on 15 April 2010, with some deletions relating to section 43 [documents concerning business affairs, and section 41 [documents affecting personal privacy]. A copy of the redacted report has been provided to the Committee.

(d) This report has been subject to an application under the FOI Act. The document was released on 6 October 2009, with some deletions relating to section 43 [documents concerning business affairs], section 40 [documents concerning certain operations of agencies] and section 41 [documents affecting personal privacy]. A copy of the redacted report has been provided to the Committee.

## **Q9**

### **Modular Load Carriage (MLC) Tender, Hansard 1 June p 52-53, 58, 66, 68-69, 70-77**

**Senator Johnston**

**In relation to the Modular Load Carriage (MLC) tender/contracts:**

- (a) What project number was this given?**
- (b) How many shortlisted tenderers were there for MCBAS?**
- (c) Of the five tenderers, were they all Australian?**
- (d) Of the two tenderers shortlisted, when did this occur?**
- (e) At what point were the tenderers provided with a copy of the MCBAS specifications?  
At shortlisting or before?**
- (f) Were the two shortlisted tenderers provided with the specifications, particularly in relation to how pouches are attached to the body armour?**
- (g) Did the tender specify that DPCU fabric had to be used?**
- (h) Did the two shortlisted use DPCU as specified?**
- (i) Were the final two competitors treated the same?**
- (j) How much did it cost us to develop MCBAS?**
- (k) Did the two shortlisted tenderers each produce 30 sets of MLC integrated systems?**
- (l) Were either of the shortlisted tenderers given the opportunity to change their samples during the evaluation process?**
- (m) Did the successful tenderer meet the target timelines given on the preproduction samples?**
- (n) Provide comparative dates on the delivery of the pre production samples for the shortlisted tenderers.**
- (o) Provide the percentage of the difference in price between the tenderers.**
- (p) Regarding the allegation of fraud in relation to the MLC tender process, how was BRIG Horrocks advised of the allegation?**

**Regarding the cancelled MLC tender:**

- (q) Please provide a copy of the IG report into fraud and corruption in this matter; the**
- (r) IG report regarding perceived and actual bias;**
- (s) probity officers report on the bias matter;**
- (t) Given the tender has fallen over:**
  - i. Who provides all the various pouches, packs, backpacks and systems?**
  - ii. What exactly are they providing?**
  - iii. Where are they manufactured?**
  - iv. How many units have been acquired? and**

**v. Is there a follow on contract option or has there been a follow-on exercise of contract? and**

**(u) Where do we get the pouches for the Individual Load Carriage equipment from and how many have been purchased?**

**Response:**

- (a) The MLC capability sought to build on load carriage improvements initiated as part of the Land 125 Individual Combat Load Carriage Equipment (ICLCE) capability. It was not assigned a project number, however it was conducted by the staff involved in Land 125. It was not a capital acquisition project but was to secure a Prime Systems Integrator to deliver all aspects of the Modular Load Carriage capability.
- (b) There were 16 respondents to the invitation to register. Of these, five companies were shortlisted and subsequently issued with a 'Restricted' Request for Tender for MCBAS – MSA Australia Pty Ltd, X-tek/Tote Pty Ltd, Pacifica Safety Products, Australian Defence Apparel and Armor Holdings Aerospace Group. All shortlisted respondents were subject to trials.
- (c) No. There was one US based manufacturer.
- (d) The Screening and Shortlisting report was approved on 20 March 2008.
- (e) Photographs and measurements of Modular Combat Body Armour were provided to the tenderers on 7 January 2008. This information was sent before the MCBAS contract was signed on 8 February 2008 and before the Modular Load Carriage shortlisting was completed on 20 March 2008. The availability of the MCBAS specification was not a consideration for shortlisting.
- (f) Photographs and measurements of Modular Combat Body Armour were provided to the tenderers on 7 January 2008, one month prior to tender closure. Specifications of how pouches were to be attached to the body armour were not provided.
- (g) Yes.
- (h) Neither of the shortlisted tenderers supplied samples which fully complied with the specification, as it applied to DPCU.
- (i) Both shortlisted tenderers were provided equal opportunity and suffered no disadvantage with respect to the provision of samples.
- (j) MCBAS was developed to meet an Army requirement for personnel protection. The market was invited to develop and supply a body armour system to the Commonwealth. There was no separately identifiable development cost in the contract. The total acquisition cost to date is approximately \$78 million.
- (k) Both tenderers were required to provide 10 sets to be delivered within 10 days. Both tenderers satisfied the request. They were then requested to provide an additional 20 sets to support user trials, as directed by the capability manager, Chief of Army. Both tenderers fulfilled this additional requirement.
- (l) Neither of the shortlisted tenderers were provided an opportunity to change their samples.
- (m) Yes, the successful tenderer met the target timelines.
- (n) The tenderer subsequently assessed as being preferred met the requirement. The other shortlisted tenderer did not. Their pre-production samples were not received until 31 March 2008, 17 days late.
- (o) There was a price differential of 16% in favour of the preferred tenderer.
- (p) On 18 Jul 08, Brigadier Horrocks was verbally informed that a member of the public, in conversation with a Defence staff member, alleged that a DMO procurement officer had received

money from a potential tenderer and had inappropriately influenced the outcome of the Modular Load Carriage (MLC) Equipment investigation. On the same day, Brigadier Horrocks reported the allegations to the Inspector General for investigation.

(q) to (s) Defence will not provide copies of these reports to the Committee because of sensitive business and personal information contained within them, and the fact that they are subject to current actions in the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, under the FOI Act, as well as administrative action within Defence. Defence is prepared to discuss matters relating to the MLC tender process with the committee and, to that end, offers a private briefing by senior DMO officials.

(t) (i) and (ii) Modular Load Carriage (MLC) was to be the new capability which was to replace Individual Combat Load Carriage Equipment (ICLCE). Following the termination of the tender on 16 July 2009, the DMO continues to source equipment from ICLCE through a number of suppliers including:

- Adventure One Pty Ltd - Leg Patches, Patch Adapter, Comforter Assembly, Suspenders Shoulder Harness Left and Right (LFP), Sleeve Protection, Pouch for the Soldier Personal Radio;
- ROBCO Products Pty Ltd - Suspenders Shoulder Harness Left and Right (LFP), Pouch Slimline, Pouch Rifle Scope and Water, Pouch Utility and Water, Pouch Entrenching Tool, Compression Zip, Joining Zip, Pouch Double Magazine STEYR;
- Hunters Edge Pty Ltd - Vest, H-Harness, Drop Bag, Pouch Grenade, Pouch Double 9mm Magazine, Holster Pistol Left and Right Hand;
- Combat Clothing Pty Ltd - Pouch Utility Large, Pouch Utility Medium, Pouch Torch, Pouch Water Bottle, Pouch Double/Triple Magazine STEYR;
- CrossFire Pty Ltd - Pouch Torch, Pouch Utility Medium, Pouch Utility Large;
- SOS Marine Pty Ltd - Pouch Accessory Small Utility Horizontal, Pouch Accessory Small Utility Vertical;
- Page Furnishers - Suspenders Shoulder Harness Left and Right Frame;
- Wax Converters Textiles - DPCU and DPDU Duracord;
- Speedline - Cloth Warp Polyester Khaki (Vest and Drop Bag);
- Wesloft - Snap fasteners medium;
- ITW Fasteners - Buckles Surmount;
- Hydration Systems Australia - Bladder Drinking System, Camelbak Bite Valve Cover; and
- Keables Pty Ltd - 5/32 x 1/4 x 13/64" BSW Book Screw, Male & Female Brass Fluoro 20 Black-BZ (for components of Pistol Holsters).

(t) (iii) The various components of the ICLCE are manufactured in Australia, apart from the utility pouches provided by CrossFire which are produced in Vietnam.

(t) (iv) Since its introduction in October 2005, there have been approximately 28,000 sets of ICLCE provided to date.

(t) (v) The contracts resulted from a direct source acquisition in support of operations. There are no options for extending the period of any contract.

(u) There are two main types of magazine pouch - a two and a three magazine pouch. To ensure surety of supply, they are manufactured by two suppliers, both of which are Australian based - ROBCO Products and Combat Clothing Pty Ltd. The magazine pouches are further broken down by colour. Since 2005, in the Disruptive Pattern Desert Uniform (DPDU) colour approximately 22,000, 2-magazine pouches have been procured, whilst approximately 33,000, 3-magazine pouches have been procured. In terms of the Disruptive Pattern Camouflage Uniform

(DPCU) colour, approximately 26,000 2-magazine pouches have been procured, whilst approximately 39,000 3-magazine pouches have been procured.

**Q10**

**Lymington Group contract, Hansard 1 June p 61-62**

**Senator Johnston**

**Regarding the contract awarded to Lymington Group (for the manufacture of dress shoes and boots):**

- (a) What was the testing regime for the 60,000 pairs of parade boots and shoes that was undertaken to determine who won this tender?**  
**(b) What is the value of the contract?**

**Response:**

(a) Patent leather parade boots are provided via a standing offer which was competitively tendered in October 2002. Tenderers were requested to provide tender samples. These samples were evaluated against the requirements of the relevant specifications through desktop analysis, however testing was not carried out by an official testing authority. The solicitation documents stated that the supplier must provide a 'Certificate of Conformance' for all deliveries and that testing may be required, but was not mandatory.

Patent leather shoes are provided via a standing offer which was competitively tendered in 2003. Tenderers were requested to provide tender samples. These samples were evaluated against the requirements of the relevant specifications through desktop analysis, however testing was not carried out by an official testing authority. The solicitation documents stated that the supplier must provide a 'Certificate of Conformance' for all deliveries and that testing may be required, but was not mandatory.

(b) The estimated value of the patent leather parade boots is \$0.393m per year. The estimated value of the patent leather shoes is \$0.540m per year.

**Q11**

**Visits to offshore manufacturers, Hansard 1 June p 63**

**Senator Johnston**

**How many visits have been conducted to offshore manufacturers of Defence apparel in the past 5 years?**

**Response:**

Only one visit has been conducted to an offshore manufacturer of Defence apparel in the last five years. This was to Apex Ventures Private Limited, a sub-contracted manufacturer for Crossfire (AUST) Pty Ltd, located in Vietnam.

**Q12**

**RODUMs, Hansard 1 June p68**

**Senator Johnston**

**716 RODUMs regarding MCBAS were received in one year. Has there ever been so many RODUM responses for so many items of kit in one year?**

**Response:**

A single Report on Defective or Unsatisfactory Materiel (RODUM) may refer to one example of a single physical item or many examples of the same physical item. In the case of the subject MCBAS RODUM there were not 716 RODUMs but rather 31 RODUMs covering 716 sets of MCBAS. The 31 RODUMs raised concerns on design (4); operation of the quick release

capability (8); manufacturing (13) and other unrelated issues (6). The issues raised have all been addressed and the RODUMs have been closed.

An examination of the RODUM database for the period 1 July 2009 to 23 June 2010 shows that the highest number of RODUMs raised on any item of clothing and personal equipment was 73 RODUMs on black patent leather shoes out of a fleet of 24,000 shoes. All these RODUMs related to the soles falling off. This problem is being fixed by the manufacturer at no cost to Defence. By way of further examples, 10 RODUMS were raised on combat boots out of a fleet of 50,000 combat boots and 18 RODUMS on combat clothing, including wet weather gear, out of a fleet of 250,000 items. RODUMs are an important part of maintaining Army capability. Soldiers and units submit a RODUM based on the information available to them. In this case, the RODUM initiator found a fault with one set of MCBAS, there were 460 items in stock and therefore they reported that 460 items may be affected. The 31 RODUMs on MCBAS combined affected 716 sets. The RODUMs raised the issue which has been addressed and resolved.

### **Q13**

**Rush 72, Hansard 1 June p 77**

**Senator Johnston**

**(a) Does the Rush 72 have fire retardant in or on it?**

**(b) Is it correct that JL SQ put an NSN in to purchase an option other than the Rush 72 and was this intercepted and cancelled?**

#### **Response:**

(a) The RUSH 72 pack does not contain any fire retardant material.

(b) It is understood that Joint Logistics Unit - South Queensland released an unauthorised request for an alternative pack to the RUSH 72. An alternative pack was sent to Soldier Modernisation Systems Program Office (SPO) for evaluation. This pack was returned to the contractor with details of the Defence Unsolicited Proposals Gateway, which provides industry and individuals with a pathway to submit proposals to Defence for assessment, offering the potential for future rewards under a contractual arrangement with Defence. Subsequently, in response to a request from the supplier to Director Soldier Modernisation SPO, a meeting between the contractor and members of Army Headquarters was organised for consideration of the merits of this capability. Army, as the capability manager, determined a continued requirement for the RUSH 72 and declined the pack offered by the contractor.

### **Q14**

**Shark Shield, Hansard 1 June p 87**

**Senator Johnston**

**What did we do to evaluate the Shark Shield?**

#### **Response:**

After the shark attack on Able Seaman Mark de Gelder on 11 February 2009, Navy undertook an immediate review of shark hazards to its divers. A shark deterrent system was acquired within nine and a half months of this attack. Given the potential impact on the diver's health and safety due to the emission of an electrical pulse in the water by the device, it was essential that the suitability of the equipment in the military diving role be rigorously tested. The selection, trial, assessment and purchase of this equipment is an example of close work between the DMO and Navy. Each had critical roles to play in these processes over the nine and a half months from the shark attack incident to Defence's receipt of Shark Shield.

To ensure that the product was safe and suitable for service a number of reviews and tests were conducted. These included:

- a health risk assessment identifying health effects of electric current and electromagnetic fields on the human body;
- a review of available information concerning Shark Shield and issues surrounding its use;
- a user evaluation to determine reliability, validity and applicability in the military environment which varies considerably to normal recreational diving; and
- a number of design deficiencies were identified during the trial and potential improvements to design and construction were passed back to the manufacturer.

#### **Q15**

**Defence Off Base Housing at Point Cook** (Taken during DHA hearing on 1 June)

**Senator Kroger**

**(a) With regard to off base housing at Point Cook: Was there a discussion between agencies?**

**(b) If so, where are the discussions at and the whole process?**

**Response:**

(a) (b) To clarify, the housing being discussed is at RAAF Williams – Point Cook. The houses are owned by Defence, not the Defence Housing Authority. In addition, the houses are all on-base, there are no off-base houses.

There were 46 former married quarters on-base that were in a derelict condition and had been vacant for approximately 10 years as they were no longer required by Defence. 13 of these houses were demolished in early June 2010. Of the remaining 33 houses, Defence had early discussions with the Department of Immigration and Citizenship but no decision has been made regarding the future use or possible demolition.

## Written Questions

W1

### **Civilian casualties in Afghanistan**

**Senator Brown**

- (a) How many new incidences of civilian injury or casualty in Afghanistan involving ADF forces have been investigated since Senate Estimates in February 2010?**
- (b) Since July 2008, which incidence reports (redacted) have been released to the Australian public? How have these been released?**
- (c) What measures has the ADF put in place since July 2008 to minimise civilian casualties? How are these measures enforced?**

**Response:**

(a) Since Senate Estimates in February 2010 there have been no instances of civilian casualties involving ADF forces. However, the Chief of Joint Operations (CJOPS) directed an Inquiry Officer review of allegations surrounding an operational incident which occurred in April 2009 in Kakarak, Afghanistan. The inquiry found there were no civilian casualties associated with this incident and this was mentioned in the Minister for Defence's June Parliamentary Statement. In a separate incident, following a significant engagement in Uruzgan, allegations were raised at a shura in Gizab concerning possible casualties. Following the allegations, an ADF Quick Assessment was conducted and it was determined there were no civilian casualties and no requirement for further inquiry. On 5 August 2010 Insurgents launched an unsuccessful attack against an Afghan National Army patrol in the Mirabad Valley. Following the attack a local national brought a child into a nearby patrol base with a suspected gunshot wound. Although it could not be determined how the child was injured, the ADF arranged for the child was aero-medically evacuated for follow-on treatment. One other incident remains under investigation.

(b) Since July 2008, the ADF has publicly released four redacted reports and these reports are available at: [www.defence.gov.au/coi/index](http://www.defence.gov.au/coi/index). The details are below:

- i. On 28 May 2009, the ADF released the Inquiry Officer Report into allegations of civilian casualties of 6 January 2009.
- ii. On 18 December 2009, the ADF released the Inquiry Officer Reports into civilian casualty allegations of 2 April 2009 and 28 April 2009.
- iii. On 28 June 2010, Defence issued the Inquiry Officer Report into the Escalation of Force incident of 11 August 2009.

(c) The ADF takes the issue of civilian casualties very seriously. ADF personnel operate under strict Rules of Engagement designed to protect our troops on operations. The Rules of Engagement ensure that the actions of Australian forces are consistent with our obligations under Australian and international law in protecting the lives and property of civilian non-combatants. Australian soldiers will continue to exercise their right of self defence when attacked, in accordance with our Rules of Engagement. Moreover, the Commander International Security Assistance Force (COMISAF) Tactical Directive details procedures to be observed to avoid civilian casualties or damage to civilian property to the maximum extent possible. This Directive continues the long-standing International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) focus on protecting civilians and operating in a manner that is respectful of Afghan culture. ADF force elements comply with the COMISAF Tactical Directive.

Since July 2008, the ADF has reviewed 16 incidents. All except two incidents have been closed and publicly released. One relates to the 12 February 2009 incident, in relation to which the Director of Military Prosecutions has decided to charge three special forces members with service offences. Charges may be referred for trial by a general court martial with the trial processes not expected to commence before early 2011. There have been two incidents since 9 November 2009, one of which has not been formally closed and one which cannot be attributed to the ADF. This is a clear indication of the care taken by the ADF in planning and executing complex counter-insurgency operations in a hostile and dangerous environment.

Each incident has been extensively reviewed and the accepted recommendations raised during the Inquiry Officer reports have been instigated. Operational commanders have been given direction to instigate the recommendations and have confirmed that appropriate action is underway. In some cases this has involved changing training prior to deployment to enable ADF force elements to exercise changed tactics, techniques and procedures. In addition, orders issued to force elements have been refined to ensure that we comply with ISAF requirements. ISAF constantly reviews the way it conducts military operations in order to prevent civilian casualties and demonstrate respect for Afghan culture. The ADF continues to review its tactics, techniques and procedures to improve our ability to protect civilians whilst preserving our operational effectiveness and the right to self-defence.

**W2**

**Cape Peron marina/canal development in Western Australia**

**Senator Siewart**

- (a) Has Defence given any thought to the security issues of the increased boating traffic that the Cape Peron marina/canal development in Western Australia will bring past Garden Island and the safe passage of personnel and equipment on and off the causeway-especially if there is an emergency?**
- (b) Is Defence aware that currently when the shift changes on Garden Island significant traffic jams are caused in and around Point Peron without the added traffic resulting from the proposed marina and housing development?**
- (c) Will there be any compensation offered to the RSL who will have their caravan park and club rooms bulldozed to accommodate the proposed development?**

**Response:**

- (a) Defence has been working cooperatively with the State Government and the City of Rockingham on the Cape Peron Marina project. Defence supports the project and has been an active member in the Steering Committee for the Cape Peron Tourist Precinct Project since 2005. The Steering Committee is aware of Defence security requirements.
- (b) Defence is aware of traffic issues around the Point Peron area and subsequently implemented a number of measures to minimise disruptions. Meanwhile the Steering Committee is working with Defence to improve traffic access to the island and Point Peron area.
- (c) This is not a Defence related matter. Matters relating to compensation should be referred to the Western Australia State Government Rockingham / Kwinana Development Office who are the managing agency for this development.

**W3**

**Relationships with certain companies**

**Senator Macdonald**

- (a) Could the Department list how many contracts it currently has with a company named Serco, a company named Sodexho, a company named Sodexo and a company named Serco Sodexho Defence Services Pty Ltd?**



- (b) Could the Department supply the same information with any other company of which the Department is aware, is associated with any of those named companies?
- (c) In relation to each company, please list the nature of the contract, and the principal location of where the contract work is being carried out.
- (d) Is the Department aware of any business relationship between any or all of the four mentioned companies?
- (e) In relation to each of the four companies, is the headquarters and registered office of the companies in Australia? If not in what country is the registered office of the four mentioned companies?
- (f) In relation to each of the companies could the Department please indicate the value of the contracts entered into with all or any of those companies?

**Response:**

(a) The Department has one contract with Serco Australia, and six contracts with Serco Sodexo Defence Services Pty Ltd.

(b) Nil.

(c)

Contract	Nature of Contract*	Primary Services	Primary Location of Service delivery	FY08/09 approximate annual contract expenditure (million)
Garrison Support Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	Catering, Accommodation, Access Control, Cleaning, Grounds Maintenance, Logistics, Range Management, Firefighting and other support services	A range of Defence sites within the ACT and Southern NSW	\$48.3m
Garrison Support Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	As per GSS-ACT above	A range of Defence sites within the Central & Northern NSW area	\$22m
Garrison Support Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	As per GSS-ACT above	A range of Defence sites within the Northern Territory & Kimberley area	\$40.8m
Garrison Support Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	As per GSS-ACT	A range of Defence sites within the Sydney West and Southern NSW area	\$54.2m
Base Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	As per GSS-ACT And also Comprehensive Maintenance Services such as the	A range of Defence sites within the Northern Queensland area	\$44.7m

		provision of a Call Centre, Fixed Plant & Equipment Maintenance, General Estate Works Management and Engineering Operations etc.		
Medical and Dental Logistics Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	Medical and Dental Logistics Services	Randwick NSW	\$5.1m
National Clothing Store Services	Prime Contractor with supporting subcontractors	Provision of clothing store services	A range of 32 locations around Australia	\$11.6m

- \* Each contract is let for a five year term with four one-year performance based extension options.
- \* Medical and Dental Contract is let for seven years with five one-year extension options.
- \* Clothing Store Services is let for four years with two one-year extension options.

(d) Serco Sodexo Defence Services Pty Ltd is a 50/50 joint venture between two global entities - Serco and Sodexo - and was formed in 1993. It is an organisation which was created to service the Australian Defence Organisation. Serco and Sodexo are providers of facilities management support services to a range of Defence, public and private sector organisations in Australia and overseas.

- (e) (i) **Serco's** Headquarters is located in London UK, **Serco Australia** is an Australian Registered company with its Headquarters in Sydney, NSW.
- (ii) **Sodexo's (Sodexho)** Headquarters is in France and **Sodexo Australia** is an Australian Registered company with its Headquarters in Melbourne, Victoria.
- (iii) **Serco Sodexho Defence Services Pty Ltd** is an Australian Registered company with its Headquarters in Milton, Queensland.

(f) Refer to the response in relation to Question (c) above.

#### W4

#### Defence Health

Senator Johnston

Mid last year, Defence announced that it was moving away from ISO 900 and ACHS and developing a new system based on the RACGP accreditation.

- (a) What progress has been made in the implementation of this new accreditation system?
- (b) How does this system suit dental care, inpatient care and allied health, including physiotherapy?
- (c) If quality healthcare for our troops is so important why has it become necessary to remove a system that is internationally recognised and replace it with no system at all?
- (d) Why was it necessary to issue a notice stating that Defence was transferring contractor positions to Public Service positions without any consultation with the companies or their staff, creating great uncertainty for both the companies and their staff?
- (e) Is it realised that many of the health professionals now see their jobs as insecure and as a result are looking elsewhere for employment?
- (f) How will this process be managed to ensure it does not drive up rates for health professionals, surely a more expensive option than the current system?
- (g) Isn't this new system just seeing the wheel turning a full circle with Defence Health taking back positions and creating further uncertainty for all concerned?

Response:

(a) Joint Health Command (JHC) began implementation of its Governance Audit System (GAS) in March 2010. To date, two trial audits have been performed using the Governance Audit Tool (GAT) with a complete series of audits of Australian Defence Force health facilities planned over the next three years. The Institute of Internal Auditors, Australia (IIAA) is validating the GAS/GAT, with part one of the validation completed and part two commenced on 14 May 2010. Validation of the GAS/GAT requires system implementation and review of actual audit results and testing and adjusting of the GAS/GAT is an important component of the validation process. Assessment by the IIAA to date has found overall general compliance with auditing standards, with seven areas of improvement that are currently being worked upon.

(b) The GAS is designed to take into account all facets of healthcare delivery in the ADF, including dental care, inpatient care, allied health, rehabilitation, mental health care and physiotherapy. Other areas encompassed by the GAS include radiography, radiation safety, pharmacy, emergency control, occupational health and safety, contract and financial management, logistic/materiel management and infection control. The GAT assesses against a range of Australian/New Zealand standards, Defence policy, civilian standards and guidelines. The full range of standards against which the GAS is based is available on the Joint Health Command intranet site for reference.

The GAT provides a risk assessment of processes, procedures and systems. There are still modules of the GAT which are under development, but the main components of the tool that underpin quality and safety have been developed to allow for the initial implementation, with ongoing refinement with the progressive roll-out of the system.

(c) JHC is committed to the delivery of safe, quality, effective and efficient health care to ADF members. The model being implemented is based on that of the National Audit and Governance Group of the British National Health Service, where clinical audit is a key and essential component of clinical governance, which demonstrates that quality healthcare can be delivered without external accreditation.

The GAS is not specifically based on one standard, such as the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards (ACHS) which is designed for hospitals, or the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP) standards for primary care. The unique nature and range of healthcare delivery in the Australian Defence Force requires assessment against a broad range of standards, and external accreditation does not guarantee safe and quality healthcare. For example, the ISO 9001:2000 auditing system previously used did not provide a sufficient clinical focus to ensure safety and quality in the Defence healthcare environment. Additionally, the external audit process did not provide enough flexibility to review key risks and to conduct audits according to risk. As a consequence JHC was seeing significant risks in the accredited health facilities, implying that the accreditation provided little value to Defence. The Governance Audit System is a complete system of targeted risk assessment, reporting, action taken and monitoring, consisted with a quality framework of Plan, Do, Study, Act.

The Joint Health Command Governance Audit System is an innovative and effective way for JHC to monitor and remediate risks associated with healthcare delivery in the Australian Defence Force.

(d), (e), (f) and (g) In the 2008 Audit of the Defence Budget, George Pappas and McKinsey and Co. recommended converting 1086 Defence contractor positions to APS employees, to allow Defence to achieve savings of approximately \$40m annually. In line with the audit and to achieve savings identified within the Strategic Reform Program (SRP) which primarily consists of conversions, the health contribution to these conversions from contractors to APS is 154.

JHC have approximately 900 contracted health professionals working within Garrison Health Facilities. The contractor positions proposed to be converted to APS are spread across all Regions and encompass a variety of health professions. Defence has proposed 154 positions to be converted over a 3 year period equating to a total of 17% of the contracted health workforce.

To ensure Defence has sufficient health professionals to deliver health care to the ADF it is important to have an integrated and balanced workforce consisting of APS, ADF, Contractors and Reserves. The current contracts with Prime Contractors end in December 2011 and as a consequence, ongoing employment for these contractors within the Defence environment is not guaranteed. Additionally, most health contractors are employed by the Prime Contractors on a casual or subcontracted basis. Importantly, Defence is not reducing the number of positions, but changing the way these positions are engaged.

JHC has formally advised the seven Prime Contractors on 3 occasions of the Defence proposal to convert contractor positions to APS: at the Annual Prime Contractor meetings held between August 2009 and November 2009, a breakfast for key Prime Contractor staff held 22 April 2010 and via email to the Prime Contractors on 18 May 2010. The Prime Contractors, as the employer, are responsible for notifying their staff of any possible changes to their employment.

Over the past year Commander Joint Health has been visiting all regions to advise staff of our Strategic Plan and the future of Health within Defence. All staff (including contractors) have been invited to these briefings where the subject of conversions was discussed. In addition, JHC has a regular newsletter that is distributed to all health facilities; with regular HR and SRP updates.

Defence is keen to employ the best person for the position and acknowledges many of our existing contractors are highly suitable, although, under the *Public Service Act* Defence is required to appoint employees based on merit. On 18 May 2010 a notice was distributed to all staff explaining where vacant positions would be advertised and invited all staff, APS, ADF, Contractors and Reserves to apply.

**W5**

**Defence recruiting**

**Senator Johnston**

- (a) **What was the performance of Defence Force Recruiting in terms of target achievement during the 12 months that Chandler Macleod was the contractor?**
- (b) **Was their performance better or worse than the previous contractor (Manpower), which has now been reinstated to the role?**

**Response:**

(a) In the 12 months from 1 February 2009 to 31 Jan 2010, Defence Force Recruiting achieved 86.4 per cent of its recruiting target.

(b) Chandler Macleod Group was engaged under a substantially different contract, designed around a different service delivery model, to that of the previous contractor, Manpower Services (Australia). These substantial differences do not permit direct comparison of contractor performance.

Recruiting target achievement has increased over the past two and one half years as follows:

- 1 February 2008 – 31 January 2009: 80.8 per cent;
- 1 February 2009 – 31 January 2010: 86.4 per cent; and
- 1 February 2010 – 31 May 2010: 88.0 per cent.

Both Defence and the contractor contribute to overall recruitment performance, and recruiting target achievement is influenced by a range of internal and external factors. Consequently, recruiting target achievement alone does not provide a sound basis for assessing overall contractor performance.

## **W6**

### **Nature of service issue – Australian Women's Land Army**

**Senator Colbeck**

**On the 22nd December 2008, the Minister for Defence Science & Personnel responded to me regarding the Australian Women's Land Army and recognition of their service.**

**The Minister stated that the Department of Defence has identified an external candidate to undertake the research effort and expected to have a policy response developed by the end of March 2009 and that a final response on this matter should be available before the end of June 2009'. No advice has been provided directly by the Minister or other official since that letter.**

**(a) Who is the external candidate?**

**(b) Are they still engaged?**

**In answer to a question on notice at Supplementary Estimates, the Department stated: *"Determining whether the Australian Women's Land Army should be recognised as a fourth official women's auxiliary service is a complex matter that remains under close examination by Government. The re-classification of Australian Defence Force operations is subject to a whole-of-government decision-making process. That process includes: seeking advice from Defence, the Department of Veterans' Affairs and central agencies, consideration of any proposals in the context of the Budget; and legislative amendment if required. The classification of the Australian Women's Land Army is being examined according to the process outlined above."***

**(c) What is now the status of this nature of service issue?**

**(d) What work has occurred since this question was asked in October?**

**(e) Which members of the Women's Land Army or their representatives have been consulted since I wrote to the Minister in December 2008 until October 2009, and since October 2009?**

**(f) Has the Department received correspondence from other organisations on this issue?**

**(i) If so, who? When?**

**(g) Does the Department have figures on how many women served in the Land Army?**

**(i) If so, how many?**

**(h) Does the Department have figures on how many women who served in the Land Army remain alive?**

### **Response:**

**(a) Dr Craig Stockings, Senior Lecturer in History, School Research Coordinator, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy.**

**(b) No.**

**(c) Research in relation to the Australian Women's Land Army has been completed. The submission is in its final stages and Defence is now in a position to place recommendations before Government once cleared within Defence.**

**(d) Completion of the research and cross-agency consultation with the Department of Veterans' Affairs.**

**(e) Since October 2009:**

Maxine McKew's Office – Dr Elizabeth Wulff June 2009  
Office of the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support March 2010  
Office of the Minister for Defence June 2010  
Maxine McKew's Office – Dr Elizabeth Wulff June 2010.

- (f) Yes.  
(i) Maxine McKew's Office – Dr Elizabeth Wulff June 2009  
Department of Veterans' Affairs September 2009  
Department of Veterans' Affairs November 2009  
Department of Veterans' Affairs March 2010  
Department of Veterans' Affairs May 2010  
Maxine McKew's Office – Dr Elizabeth Wulff June 2010  
Office of the Minister for Defence June 2010.
- (g) Partial.  
(i) The AWLA was established for a maximum of 6,000 members. Enlistment peaked at 31 December 1943 with 3,421 Permanent and Auxiliary members. In September 1945, on the eve of its disbandment the AWLS totalled 1937 Permanent and Auxiliary members.
- (h) Advice from Maxine McKew's Office is that there are approximately 350 AWLA surviving members.

**W7**

**Fraud control and investigation**

**Senator Xenophon**

- (a) What is the fraud control process within the department in terms of items such as travel allowances?**
- (b) How has this changed since the 2000-2001 Audit Report no. 22, Fraud Control in Defence?**
- (c) When will the department next review this process?**
- (d) What is the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for initiating an Inspector-General investigation?**
- (e) What is the numbering system attached to an Inspector-General investigation?**
- (f) How many fraud investigations were initiated by the Inspector-General each year from 1994-2000?**  
(i) How many were successfully prosecuted? To what value? What amounts were recovered?  
(ii) How many investigations undertaken by the Inspector-General during this time were "abandoned"?
- (g) How many fraud investigations were initiated by the Inspector-General by year from 2000-2008**  
(i) How many were successfully prosecuted? To what value? What amounts were recovered?  
(ii) How many investigations undertaken by the Inspector-General during this time were "abandoned"?
- (h) Is the \$5000 benchmark still the current measure demarcating who handles a fraud investigation?**
- (i) What is the oversight and probity applied to the Department's administrative statement in para 3.60 of the 2000-2001 Audit Report no. 22: "The Inspector-General investigates the more serious cases involving \$5000 or more, and/or more sensitive cases, such as those involving senior officers"?**

- (j) Has the Inspector-General's investigative structure been changed or enhanced since the Department's response to the Service Police Audit in 2004?**
- (k) What was the investigative structure pre-2004?**
- (l) What is the relationship and protocol between the Inspector-General's investigative unit and ADFIS (including Military Police) from 2005 to the present?**
- (m) What percentage of the Inspector-General's investigators comply with the minimum standards outlined in Australian Government Investigation Standards (AGIS) 2003 and Australian Federal Police (AFP) investigation standards? Are these numbers published publicly?**

**Response:**

(a) The *Commonwealth Fraud Control Guidelines 2002* require agencies, including Defence, to have in place appropriate fraud prevention, detection, investigation, reporting and data collection procedures and processes. As part of these obligations, Defence conducts a biennial fraud risk assessment across all aspects of Defence business, including activities such as travel allowances, and develops treatment actions for any risks assessed as being unacceptably high. These risk assessments and treatment actions are incorporated into a biennial corporate fraud control plan that is now in its eighth iteration. Defence also utilises a range of ongoing strategies to identify and review potentially fraudulent transactions.

(b) Defence implemented all of the agreed recommendations arising from the Australian National Audit Office Audit Report 2000-2001 No. 22. Revised Commonwealth fraud control arrangements were subsequently introduced in 2002 and Defence adjusted its fraud control processes accordingly. Fraud control planning processes have remained essentially the same since 2002, although Defence has adopted an approach of continuous improvement and refinement with each iteration of its corporate fraud control plan.

(c) Defence is not contemplating any formal review of its fraud control system at this time. However, Defence is actively participating in a review of the *Commonwealth Fraud Control Guidelines* by the Attorney-General's Department. Defence also observes that the Australian National Audit Office recently released its 2009-10 Audit Report No.42, being a cross-agency audit of Fraud Control in Australian Government Agencies. The Australian National Audit Office has also nominated fraud control in Defence as a possible topic in its 2010-11 audit work program for Defence.

(d) Defence policy imposes a mandatory obligation on Defence personnel to report suspected fraud to either the Inspector General of Defence or Service Police, as appropriate. Defence has in place policies to guide whether allegations of fraud involving military members are dealt with under the military disciplinary system or under the civil criminal justice system. Allegations of fraud are also received by the Inspector General of Defence via (i) the Defence Whistleblower Scheme, (ii) internal detection systems and audits, and (iii) referrals from external agencies. Reports are assessed by Inspector General staff against a range of internal and external considerations, including Defence policy and instructions and Commonwealth policy documents such as the *Commonwealth Fraud Control Guidelines* and the Prosecution Policy of the Commonwealth. Following assessment, a recommendation is made to the Inspector General, who is the approving authority for the commencement of any investigation by Inspector General staff.

(e) Inspector General investigation case numbers are automatically allocated when investigation records are raised in the Defence Policing and Security Management System, which is the corporate case management software application used by Defence investigators. An Inspector General investigation number is made up of several components, comprising a prefix of INV followed by IGD01 (or DWS01 for whistleblower reports) and then DI for the

Directorate of Investigations and Recovery. This is then followed by the calendar year the investigation was registered and a unique sequence number for that year. An example of a case number is INV-IGD01-DI-2010-1.

(f) and (g)

Period <sup>1</sup> F/Y Ending	No. of IG Investigations <sup>2</sup>	No. Successfully Prosecuted <sup>3</sup>	Value <sup>4</sup> \$m	Amount <sup>5</sup> Recovered \$m	No. of IG Investigations Abandoned <sup>6</sup>
1994-2000	275	101	1.992	1.157	58
2001-2009	424	217	3.969	1.367	64

Note 1: Periods span 1 Jul 1994 - 30 Jun 2000 and 1 Jul 2000 - 30 Jun 2009.

Note 2: The number of investigations initiated by the Inspector General (IG).

Note 3: The number of Inspector General investigations that resulted in successful action being taken against a suspect, including criminal prosecution, action under the Public Service Act Code of Conduct or other adverse administrative action.

Note 4: The estimated value of the loss due to fraud of matters investigated by the Inspector General.

Note 5: Where large recovery amounts are involved, recovery action can continue for many years beyond the active investigation phase.

Note 6: Investigations are usually abandoned due to a lack of evidence, including where a credible suspect cannot be readily identified. A small number of investigations are abandoned on cost-effectiveness grounds. Data does not include investigations where (i) prosecution action against a suspect is unsuccessful (ii) the matter is determined to be unfounded or (iii) the matter is transferred to another jurisdiction.

(h) A number of considerations are taken into account for determining whether an alleged fraud involving a military member will be investigated for prosecution in the civil criminal courts or as a service offence under the Defence Force Discipline Act 1982. These considerations include monetary value, complexity, sensitivity and whether civilian co-offenders are involved. Since 2005, a monetary value of \$20,000 has been applied as one of the considerations in determining jurisdiction.

(i) The quote referred to in the question does not appear in ANAO Audit Report 2000-2001 no. 22. Nevertheless, Defence policy vests the Inspector General with responsibility for receiving allegations of serious, sensitive or complex fraud involving military personnel and all allegations concerning star rank officers. The Inspector General has visibility of all fraud incidents, including those under investigation by Service Police, via the Defence Policing and Security Management System.

(j) No. The Service Police Audit in 2004 related only to Service Police.

(k) The staffing level in the Inspector General's investigations area was increased from six to eleven positions in 2002 in support of the introduction of the Defence Whistleblower Scheme. The Inspector General's investigative structure has remained effectively unchanged since that time.

(l) The Australian Defence Force Investigative Service (ADFIS) and the Inspector General are separate organisations with different reporting lines and functional responsibilities. While the Inspector General is the lead authority for investigating fraud in Defence, ADFIS and the Inspector General have a shared responsibility for investigating fraud involving military personnel. There are a range of policy instruments that set out how this shared responsibility operates. Contact between the Inspector General and ADFIS occurs through formal quarterly meetings to discuss matters of common interest and regular consultation about the jurisdiction for particular cases.



(m) The Commonwealth Fraud Control Guidelines mandate the requirements for Commonwealth fraud investigators to hold a Certificate IV in Government (Investigation) or its equivalent. All Inspector General investigators hold qualifications equal to or above the minimum standard. While figures on this topic are not reported publicly, they are provided to agencies external to Defence as required, such as the Australian Institute of Criminology that conducts an annual fraud survey of Commonwealth agencies.

**W8**

**Staffing**

**Senator Barnett**

- (a) How many permanent staff recruited since additional estimates (Feb 2010)?  
 (b) What level are these staff?  
 (c) How many temporary positions exist or have been created since additional estimates?  
 (d) Since additional estimates, how many employees have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?

**Response:**

- (a) As at 13 September 2010, there were 786 permanent staff employed since 1 March 2010.  
 (b) The table below shows the staff by Classification.

Classification Level	No. of Staff
APS Level 1	2
APS Level 2	38
APS Level 3	67
APS Level 3 - 4	4
APS Level 4	93
APS Level 4 - 5	16
APS Level 5	104
APS Level 4 - 6	1
APS Level 6	192
Science &Tech. Level 1 (APS Level 2)	4
Science &Tech. Level 2 (APS Level 3 – 4)	3
Science &Tech. Level 3 (APS Level 4 – 5)	32
Science &Tech. Level 4 (APS Level 6)	32
Science &Tech. Level 5 (Executive Level 1)	9
Science &Tech. Level 6 (Executive Level 2)	4
Science &Tech. Level 7 (Executive Level 2)	1
Executive Level 1	146
Executive Level 2	34
Medical Officer Level 6	1
SES Band 1	1

SES Band 3	2
TOTAL	786

(c) As at 13 September 2010, 213 temporary positions exist and out of those, 114 positions have been created since 1 March 2010.

(d) As at 13 September 2010, a total of 309 non-ongoing employees have been employed since 1 March 2010. The average length of employment is approximately 26 weeks.

## W9

### Staffing – efficiency dividend/budget cuts

#### Senator Barnett

- (a) **Have staffing numbers been reduced as a result of the efficiency dividend and/or other budget cuts?**
- (i) **Since the efficiency dividend was introduced?**
  - (ii) **Since additional estimates?**
  - (iii) **If so, where and at what level?**
- (b) **Are there any plans for staff reduction? If so, please advise details ie. reduction target, how this will be achieved, services/programs to be cut etc.**
- (c) **If your Department/agency has been identified in the budget as delivering further efficiencies (savings), how will these be delivered? (for example, if the budget papers say ‘improvement to strategic work practices’ or similar, what are these and how will they be delivered?**
- (d) **What changes are underway or planned for graduate recruitment, cadetships or similar programs? If reductions or increases are envisaged please explain including reasons, target numbers etc.**

#### **Response:**

(a) The Defence White Paper 2009, *Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century: Force 2030*, foreshadowed that as part of the Strategic Reform Program enhanced productivity would be achieved through the introduction of an improved, integrated workforce management system underpinned by standardised support services, simplified business processes and ensuring that the right people are doing the right jobs, particularly in relation to the appropriateness of more expensive contractors and ADF members undertaking jobs that could be performed more cost-effectively by APS staff.

Following the release of the Defence White Paper, Defence released *The Strategic Reform Program 2009, Delivering Force 2030*. Since then, further analysis and planning has been undertaken to identify opportunities within Defence’s support workforce where improved business processes could be implemented. The improved efficiency would provide savings for re-investment in the Department. Defence has subsequently released *The Strategic Reform Program, Making it Happen* which has identified that over the ten years 2009-19 there would be overall growth in the APS workforce of 1,494 and overall growth within the ADF of 3,798.

The main strategy to achieve productivity improvements would be the implementation of a number of shared services to undertake a range of support functions. It should be noted that critical design principles for shared services are that capability must not be detrimentally affected and that savings come through standardisation, removal of duplication and ICT enablement. In short, the objective is to not remove services or programs, but provide them in a more cost effective manner.

(b) Implementing shared services and other workforce reform under the Strategic Reform Program is expected to result in a reduction in the number of functional positions required within the shared services and other reform areas, while maintaining the existing level of services. As the Department is expected to grow as a result of White Paper increases, civilianisation of some military positions and contractor conversions, any reform-affected APS staff will be initially assessed for retraining and redeployment. Where it is not possible to reassign an employee they will have access to a range of measures to assist with their transition from Defence. The following table provides a view of the civilian position reductions associated with implementing shared services and other workforce reforms.

2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
313	271	169	108	266	32	19	18	18

A detailed workforce impacts table is available in the publication *The Strategic Reform Program, Making it Happen*.

(c) Same response as (a) and (b) above.

(d) As announced in May 2009, Defence is managing its workforce mix in an integrated way to obtain the skilled people it needs to meet capability requirements in the most cost-effective way. In keeping with this integrated workforce model, graduate recruitment is being further aligned with the Defence Career and Talent Management Framework in order to deliver a workforce capability that best meets organisational requirements within budget allocations. In the short term this will see an increase in graduate recruitment in areas such as ICT, cyber, geospatial and intelligence capabilities; balanced by maintenance of intakes within Science and Technology streams and reductions in other less-critical generalist streams. As these initiatives are still being realised through the Strategic Reform Program it is too early to predict graduate targets across the total workforce at this stage.

## W10

### Communications Programs

#### Senator Barnett

- (a) What communications programs has the Department/Agency undertaken since additional estimates and what communications programs are planned to be undertaken?
- (b) For each program, what is the total spend?
- (c) A breakdown of how much was spent/is planned to be spent on each program/initiative should be provided.

*(by 'communications program' it is meant communication of a government message to the public – possibly by advertising (print, television etc), possibly through the erection of signs, plaques etc, or through other mediums. The recent (current) Government TV advertising campaign on health reform and specific health initiatives are examples, BER signage is an example, advertising on the Government's proposed new tax system would be another example.)*

#### Response:

- (a) The following communications programs have been undertaken since Additional Estimates or are planned to be undertaken:
- Oceans 10 (24-27 May 2010) - Participation in exhibition and staffing of exhibition stand.
  - Science Meets Parliament (9-10 March 2010) - Sponsorship enabling scientists to brief Federal MPs on their research each year.
  - Defence Export Control Office Outreach Program - Delivery of workshops, attendance at relevant conferences and trade shows, and associated advertising, publications and flyers.

- ‘Reserve and Employer Support’ advertising campaign. The advertising campaign supports the Government’s ongoing ADF capability requirement - that Reservists are available for service as required. Funds have been allocated to continue this campaign through FY 2010-11 and the program is currently in the approval process including consideration by the Independent Communications Committee (ICC).
- The launch of the ADF Paralympic Sports Program by the Minister for Defence and CDF at Russell Offices on 12 May 2010.
- The launch of the Military Health Outcomes Program (MilHOP) by the Minister for Veterans’ Affairs and Minister for Defence Personnel, and VCDF on 15 June 2010. The campaign specifically built in a public communications component, so family, friends and other members of the public would actively encourage members of the ADF to participate in the MilHOP studies. A small number of brochures and banners to promote the program and studies internally have been manufactured within existing administrative budgets.
- Joint Health Command’s partnership and involvement with public health messages and initiatives associated with Men’s Health Week. This included public awareness campaigns with the Australian Football League Coaches’ Association (AFLCA) and MWC Media, to record a commercial for broadcast during Men’s Health Week (June 14-20 2010) and to engage with free to air media outlets.
- Navy brand and job specific advertising for Navy Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Army brand and job specific advertising for Army Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Air Force brand and job specific advertising for Air Force Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Advertising for ADF Gap Year, ADFA, Sponsored Undergraduate positions and Professional Graduate Health and Engineering positions.
- Advertising specifically directed at attracting Australians from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Planned for FY 2010-11 (currently unapproved and subject to funding availability):

- Land Warfare Conference (15-19 November 2010) – Participation in exhibition and staffing of exhibition stand.
- Australian International Airshow (1-6 March 2011) – Participation in exhibition and staffing of exhibition stand.
- Defence & Industry Conference (end June 2011) – Participation in exhibition and staffing of exhibition stand.

(b) and (c) The total spend for each program is as follows (including a breakdown of costs where available):

- Oceans 10 (24-27 May 2010) participation in exhibition - \$15,334.70.
- Science Meets Parliament (9-10 March 2010) sponsorship - \$6,000.00.
- The total spend on DECO Outreach Program for Calendar year 2010 is \$72,403.00. The breakdown is as follows:

<i><b>DECO Outreach Program 2010</b></i>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Workshops	\$26,800.00
In-house Tailored Training	\$ 7,000.00
Promotional Items	\$ 1,275.00
Advertising	\$37,328.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$72,403.00</b>

- The 'Reserve and Employer Support Campaign' will cost a total of \$738,382 including media placement, dispatch, resizing and production in the 2010/11 financial year. The breakdown is as follows:

<i>Reserve and Employer Support Campaign</i>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Media (Gross)</b>	
Television (In-Flight)	\$159,998
Digital	\$140,000
Magazines	\$364,276
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$664,274</b>
<b>Production</b>	
Television	\$55,037
Online	\$10,000
Print	\$20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$74,108</b>

- The Joint Health Command (JHC) campaigns are programs with no additional spend outside of allocated budgets on advertising and promotion, and have been designed to gain coverage through the media. The Men's Week campaign totalled \$60,000 from existing administrative budgets.
- Navy - \$3,223,160 covering Navy brand and job specific advertising for Navy Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Army (Australian Regular Army and Army Reserve) - \$6,808,139 covering Army brand and job specific advertising for Army Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Air Force - \$1,635,020 covering Air Force brand and job specific advertising for Air Force Officer and General Entry priority roles.
- Education - \$1,106,105 covering advertising for ADF Gap Year, ADFA, Sponsored Undergraduate positions and Professional Graduate Health and Engineering positions.
- Broadening the recruiting base - \$285,466 covering advertising specifically directed at attracting Australians from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

In FY 2010-11, Defence Force Recruiting plans the following expenditure to continue the recruitment advertising program:

- Navy - \$5,650,000.
- Army (ARA and Army Reserve) - \$9,100,000.
- Air Force - \$3,550,000.
- Education - \$1,150,000.
- Broadening the recruiting base - \$218,000.

2010-11 planned expenditure on exhibitions (currently unapproved and subject to funding availability):

- Land Warfare Conference (15-19 November 2010). Estimated budget \$75,000.
- Eureka Prize (17 August 2010). Organised by the Australian Museum. DSTO sponsored prize for outstanding science in support of defence or national security. Sponsorship of prize: \$28,000.
- Australian International Airshow (1-6 March 2011). Estimated budget \$75,000.
- Defence & Industry Conference (planned for end June 2011). Estimated budget \$75,000.

## W11

### Hospitality

#### Senator Barnett

- (a) What is the Department's hospitality spend FYTD?  
(b) Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.  
(c) For each Minister/Par Sec's office, please detail total hospitality spend FYTD.  
(d) Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.

#### Response:

(a) The Department of Defence's total actual expenditure on hospitality (excluding expenses relating to the Minister's Office) for the period 1 July 2009 to 31 May 2010 was \$1.889 million, GST inclusive comprising:

- (i) Defence total actual expenditure for this period on hospitality was \$1.750 million (GST inclusive). This total amount comprises:
- Representation Allowance paid to members stationed overseas \$0.732m; and
  - Official hospitality costs \$1.018m.
- (ii) The Defence Materiel Organisation's total expenditure for this period on hospitality was \$0.139 million (GST inclusive). This total amount comprises:
- Representation Allowance paid to members stationed overseas of \$0.055 million; and
  - Official hospitality costs of \$0.084 million.

(b) The precise detail requested in the question is not readily available and I am not prepared to authorise the commitment of resources required to provide a detailed response.

(c) For details on hospitality expenditure for the period 1 July 2009 to 10 February 2010, Defence has provided details in response to Senate Written Question on Notice No. W8 (February 2010). For the period 11 February to 31 August 2010 the following amounts were expended:

Minister for Defence: \$325.50 (inclusive of GST).

Minister for Defence Materiel and Science: \$1,142.46 (inclusive of GST).

Minister for Defence Personnel: Nil

Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support: \$36.60 (inclusive of GST).

(d) For the period 11 February 2010 to 1 June 2010 the following amounts were expended:

Minister for Defence:

- (i) 9 March 2010.  
(ii) Parliament House, Canberra.  
(iii) Meeting with the Australian Submarine Corporation.  
(iv) \$57.00.
- (i) 13 May 2010.  
(ii) Parliament House, Canberra.  
(iii) Meeting with General Guo Boxiong, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission.  
(iv) \$202.00 inclusive of GST.
- (i) 28 May 2010.  
(ii) Parliament House, Canberra.  
(iii) Meeting with the RSL National Executive Committee.  
(iv) \$66.50 inclusive of GST.

Minister for Defence Materiel and Science:

- (i) 28 May 2010.
- (ii) Commonwealth Parliamentary Offices, Sydney.
- (iii) Meeting with Defence Industry representatives.
- (iv) \$152.46.

- (i) 5 July 2010.
- (ii) Cairns Colonial Club Resort, Cairns.
- (iii) Meeting with key stakeholders/suppliers to HMAS CAIRNS.
- (iv) \$990.00 inclusive of GST.

Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support:

- (i) 16 June 2010.
- (ii) Parliament House, Canberra.
- (iii) Meeting with the New Zealand Associate Minister for Defence.
- (iv) \$36.60 inclusive of GST.

## W12

### Board appointments

#### Senator Barnett

- (a) What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?
- (b) What is the gender ratio of appointments made to boards since the Government came to office in November 2007?

#### Response:

(a) In total there are 83 people currently appointed to boards across the Defence portfolio. Males account for 70 of these appointments, with females occupying 13 positions. Specific details of the gender balance for each board in the Defence portfolio are available below.

Entity	Male	Female	Total
Defence Housing Australia	6	2	8
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	6	2	8
Army and Air Force Canteen Service	5	1	6
AAF Company	8	0	8
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Recreation Company	4	2	6
Royal Australian Navy Central Canteens Board	6	2	8
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	4	2	6
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	3	1	4
Royal Australian Air Force Veterans' Residences Trust Fund	4	0	4
Royal Australian Navy Relief Trust Fund	5	0	5
Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits Authority	5	0	5
Military Superannuation and Benefits Board of Trustees No. 1	5	0	5
Defence Strategic Reform Advisory Board	9	1	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>83</b>

(b) There have been 44 appointments to boards across the Defence portfolio since the Government came to office in November 2007. Of these 44 appointments, 36 have been male and eight have been female. A detailed breakdown of appointments and the gender balance for each board is included below.

<b>Entity</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Defence Housing Australia	2	2	4
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	4	2	6
Army and Air Force Canteen Service	2	1	3
AAF Company	4	0	4
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Recreation Company	2	0	2
Royal Australian Navy Central Canteens Board	2	1	3
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	4	1	5
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	2	0	2
Royal Australian Air Force Veterans' Residences Trust Fund	1	0	1
Royal Australian Navy Relief Trust Fund	2	0	2
Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits Authority	2	0	2
Military Superannuation and Benefits Board of Trustees No. 1	0	0	0
Defence Strategic Reform Advisory Board	9	1	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>44</b>

### **W13**

#### **Grants**

#### **Senator Barnett**

**Has the Department complied with interim requirements relating to the publication of discretionary grants?**

#### **Response:**

*Commonwealth Grant Guidelines July 2009* requires Defence to publish details of all grants announced within seven days of date of effect. Defence has complied with these requirements with the exception of the following:

- a. Special Air Service Resources Trust had a date of effect of 24 March 2009 and was published on 8 October 2009. This was previously advised to the SSC Secretariat in April 2010.
- b. Family Support Funding Program had a date of effect of 27 Jan 2010 and listed 26 Feb 2010:
  - i. Baranduda Community Centre;
  - ii. East Sale Family Group;
  - iii. Karrakata Community House Inc;
  - iv. Larrakeyah Neighbourhood House;
  - v. Mactier Community Centre;
  - vi. Tindal Community Times; and
  - vii. Williams Defence Community House
- c. Feinstein International Centre: Afghanistan Civil-Military Conference date of effect 11 Mar 10 and listed 30 Apr 10;
- d. Family Support Funding Program: Woodside Defence Families Association funding agreement had a date of effect of 29 Mar 10 and listed 10 May 2010.
- e. Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) had two grants; the Australia's Defence Industry program and the Industry Skilling Program Enhancement program which were not published on the respective DMO website within the required seven days following approval of the funding agreement due to the time required to develop the reporting framework and the website, these are now reported on the DMO, Defence Industry Website.

The Department has experienced some delays in the publishing of grants online due to processing delays. Action has been taken to address the delayed reporting.



**W14**

**Freedom of Information**

**Senator Barnett**

- (a) Has the Department/agency received any advice from the Government or any other source on how to respond to FOI requests?
- (b) How many FOI requests has the Department received since November 2007?
- (c) How many have been granted or denied since November 2007?
- (d) How many conclusive certificates have been issued in relation to FOI requests since November 2007?

**Response:**

(a) During the period 1 November 2007 to 31 Aug 2010, Defence did not receive any advice from the Government on how to respond to FOI requests. However, during this period, Defence did seek and receive advice from a number of external legal agencies on Defence's 'Government and Administrative, including Privacy and Freedom of Information, Legal Panel'.

(b) During the period 1 November 2007 to 31 Aug 2010, Defence received 552 FOI requests, 526 were requested under Section 15 (access to documents) and 26 under Section 48 (amendment or annotation of personal records) of the FOI Act.

(c) 566 FOI requests were finalised between 1 November 2007 and 31 Aug 2010. The following table provides a breakdown of these requests:

**Section 15 requests Completed**

Granted in full	Partial disclosure	Denied <sup>1</sup>	Refused <sup>2</sup>	Withdrawn	Transferred	Total
140	195	16	40	145	4	540

**Section 48 requests Completed**

Granted in full – alter record	Granted in part – alter record	Granted – annotate record	Refused	Total
5	2	6	13	26

(d) None.

**Notes**

1. Where an *exempt document* is identified, access to the document can be **denied**, with reference to the relevant exemption provisions of the FOI Act.
2. Section 24A of the FOI Act provides for requests for access to documents to be **refused** if the documents cannot be found or do not exist. Access may also be **refused** if the work involved in processing the request would substantially and unreasonably divert resources of an agency.

**W15**

**Community Cabinet**

**Senator Barnett**

- (a) What was the cost of Ministers travel and expenses for the Community Cabinet meetings held since additional estimates?
- (b) How many Ministerial Staff and Departmental officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meeting?
- (c) What was the total cost of this travel?
- (d) What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office?

**Response:**

(a) Minister for Defence: \$1,300.06.

Minister for Defence Materiel and Science: Nil.  
 Minister for Defence Personnel: \$7,164.46.<sup>1</sup>  
 Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support: Nil.

Advice from the Department of Finance and Deregulation is that the above figures include airfares and Travelling Allowance (including Motor Vehicle Allowance) claims. They do not include travel by taxis (due to difficulties determining exact destinations using the electronic information as provided by Cabcharge) or travel on Special Purpose Aircraft.

(b) The Department of Finance and Deregulation advises that the Minister for Defence and the Minister for Defence Materiel and Science both attended the Community Cabinet meeting in Ballarat. The table below provides details of the number of ministerial staff and departmental officers that accompanied the Ministers to this meeting:

<b>Community Cabinet Meeting</b>	<b>No. of Ministerial Staff</b>	<b>No. of Departmental Staff</b>
Ballarat, Victoria	2	2

The Department of Finance and Deregulation advises that the Minister for Defence Personnel attended three Community Cabinet meetings. The table below provides details of the number of ministerial staff and departmental officers that accompanied the Minister to these meetings:

<b>Community Cabinet Meeting</b>	<b>No. of Ministerial Staff</b>	<b>No. of Departmental Staff</b>
Epping, New South Wales	1	1
Burnie, Tasmania	Nil	1
Perth, Western Australia	1	Nil

(c) The Department of Finance and Deregulation advises that the cost of travel for ministerial staff was \$4,038.46.

The cost of travel for the departmental officers was \$3,498.47.

(d) Total cost to the Department and the Ministers' offices is as follows:

Department of Defence: \$3,498.47.  
 Minister for Defence: \$2,407.26.  
 Minister for Defence Materiel and Science: \$624.10.  
 Minister for Defence Personnel: \$9,306.43.  
 Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support: Nil.

## **W16**

### **Reviews**

#### **Senator Barnett**

- (a) **What is the total number of Reviews both completed and ongoing in the portfolio/agency or affecting the portfolio agency since November 2007?**
- (b) **Please provide a breakdown of reviews completed since the government came to office (only those commenced after the current government came to office) including:**
- (i) **when those reviews were provided to Government,**
  - (ii) **estimated cost of producing each review (and total cost) and**

<sup>1</sup> The financial information provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation includes additional destinations not relevant to the Community Cabinet meeting. Given the nature of the flight bookings, the cost of the additional destinations is not able to be disaggregated from the cost of travel to attend Community Cabinet meetings.

(iii) if the Government has responded to the review or information about when the Government has indicated it will/will not respond to the review.

(c) How many reviews are ongoing?

(d) How many reviews have been completed since additional estimates?

(e) What further reviews are planned in the portfolio/agency?

**Response:**

(a) 19

(b – i-iii)

## **1. REVIEW INTO PROTECTIVE SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS**

**Commissioned:** Classified

**Submission to Government:** Classified

**Concluded:** 17 August 2009

**Cost:** \$91,128

**Government response:** N/A

## **2. REVIEW OF THE ARMY RESERVE APPROVED FUTURE FORCE**

**Commissioned:** May 2009

**Submission to Government:** Submitted to Chief of Army August 2009. Currently being considered by senior Defence personnel as part of the Rebalancing Army Review Implementation Plan. The Rebalancing Army Review Implementation Plan has not yet been submitted to Government.

**Current Status:** To be incorporated into the Rebalancing Army Implementation Plan

**Cost:** As the Review of the Army Reserve Approved Future Force was conducted by serving (Regular and Reserve) personnel and utilising current Army processes and budgets, there was no extra cost for the review.

**Government Response:** N/A

## **3. STRATEGIC REVIEW OF NAVAL ENGINEERING**

**Submission to Government:** The report was presented to the Chief of Navy Senior Advisory Committee on 15 December 2009.

**Cost:** Total cost expected of review (some transactions from December yet to be reconciled) \$144, 189.20

**Government response:** As this was an internal review, a Government response is not required.

## **4. DEFENCE WHITE PAPER**

**Commissioned:** 22 February 2008

**Submission to Government:** April 2009

**Date released to public:** 2 May 2009

**Cost:** The White Paper cost was \$4,965,325. The combined cost of the White Paper Associated Reviews was \$11,353,315

**Government Response:** 2 May 2009

## **5. REVIEW OF AUSTRALIA'S AIR COMBAT CAPABILITY**

**Commissioned:** February 2008

**Submission to Government:** April 2008

**Cost:** \$101,384

**Government Response:** 2 May 2009

## **6. DEFENCE PROCUREMENT AND SUSTAINMENT REVIEW**

**Commissioned:** 7 May 2008

**Submission to Government:** 18 September 2008

**Released to Public:** 23 September 2008

**Cost:** The total cost of the Review was approximately \$334,000, including external costs of around \$127,300.

**Government Response:** 2 May 2009

## **7. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM**

**Commissioned:** 14 April 2008

**Released to Public:** 13 March 2009

**Current Status:** Implementation continuing over the next four years

**Cost:** \$850,000

**Government Response:** 21 August 2009

## **8. DEFENCE BUDGET AUDIT 2008 (PAPPAS REVIEW)**

**Commissioned:** May 2008

**Submission to Government:** 3 April 2009

**Cost:** \$5,434,337

**Government Response:** The Defence Budget Audit is being responded to as part of the Strategic Reform Program.

## **9. THE REVIEW OF CANDIDATE REFERRAL PROGRAM**

**Submission to Government:** Was not provided to Government as it was an internal review conducted by Defence Force Recruiting

**Cost:** \$30, 519

**Government response:** Government will not respond as a decision from Government was not sought.

## **10. THE DUNT REVIEW MENTAL HEALTH CARE IN THE ADF AND TRANSITION THROUGH DISCHARGE**

**Submission to Government:** 4 February 2009.

**Cost:** \$208, 303 including staff wages, travel, consultancies and associated costs.

**Government Response:** There were 52 recommendations for the improvement of services and programs. Defence agreed to 49 of the 52 recommendations and partially agreed to three recommendations. Funding of \$83 million was allocated over FY 2009-10 to FY 2012-13 to start a major program of reform that will address the gaps identified, including improving mental health governance, improving mental health policy, enhancing the mental health workforce, improving mental health training, enhancing prevention strategies, increasing research and surveillance, enhancing mental health in rehabilitation, enhancing mental health in transition to discharge, exploring options for greater family involvement in Defence programs and facilities improvement. For example, to enhance the mental health workforce, Defence will have increased the number of mental health professionals by 61 by the end of 2010.

## **11. REVIEW INTO THE AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE CADETS (ADFC) SCHEME**

**Submission to Government:** November 2008. The Defence response was passed to the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Support on 6 April 2009 and was accepted on 4 May 2009.

**Cost:** \$352,217

**Government Response:** The Defence response was accepted and released publically on 4 May 2009.

## **12. REVIEW OF THE RESERVE SERVICE (PROTECTION) ACT 2001**

**Submission to Government:** Has not yet been submitted. The report was completed in September 2009. Head Defence Legal recommended some additional consultation with other Government departments prior to its submission to Government. This consultation has been

completed and the report is to be considered by the Chiefs of Service Committee later this year before being provided to Government.

**Cost:** \$71,464.

**Government Response:** The Government will respond when the recommendations of the Review have been considered.

### **13. FORCE PROTECTION REVIEW**

**Submission to Government:** March 2010

**Cost:** \$100,000

**Government Response:** National Security Council accepted the recommendations of the Force Protection Review in March 2010.

### **14. SUBMARINE SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW (SSR)**

**Submission to Government:** Date of Public Release of the SSR was 8 April 2009.

**Cost:** \$6107.45

**Government Response:** As this was an internal review, a Government response was not required.

### **15. ASPI REVIEW OF DEFENCE CAPABILITY PLANNING**

**Submission to Government:** 24 December 2009

**Cost:** \$161,000

**Government Response:** June 2010.

(c) Four Reviews are ongoing:

- **REVIEW OF RETENTION AND RECRUITMENT (R2) PROGRAM**
- **REVIEW INTO THE AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE CADETS (ADFC) SCHEME**  
Review is complete, however the implementations of agreed recommendations is ongoing.
- **BISHOP REPORT 3 - THE ADF CADETS, THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE ADF**
- **DEFENCE CLOTHING PROCUREMENT (LEWINCAMP REVIEW)**  
Stage 2 of the review was commissioned in June 2010 to complete further analysis stemming from Stage 1 of the review.

(d) No further reviews have been completed since additional estimates.

(e) Five further reviews are planned:

#### **1. REVIEW OF THE REPORTING OF DEFECTS (RODUMS) WITH AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE (ADF) PERSONAL EQUIPMENT AND COMBAT CLOTHING**

**Commissioned:** 9 June 2010

Internal Defence Review

**Current Status:** Due to be completed by late September 2010.

#### **2. BRADY REVIEW INTO DEFENCE EXPORT CONTROL OFFICE DECISION MAKING PROCESSES (Working title)**

**Commissioned:** 7 June 2010

**Current Status:** Due to be completed by 20 August 2010

**3. REVIEW INTO THE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ACT (PREVENTION OF PROLIFERATION) 1995**, is intended to be commissioned and planned for next financial year 2011-12.

**4. REVIEW INTO THE MILITARY CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE** in the second half of 2010, it has not yet commenced.

**5. DEFENCE HOUSING AUSTRALIA REVIEW** has yet to commence and is to be completed as part of the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget Statements.

**W17**

**Consultancies**

**Senator Barnett**

**(a) How many consultancies have been undertaken or are underway since November 2007?**

**Please identify:**

- (i) the name of the consultant;**
- (ii) the subject matter of the consultancy;**
- (iii) the duration and cost of the contract; and**
- (iv) the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc).**

**(b) Please also include total value for all consultancies since November 2007, including a breakdown on these figures for FY 2008/09 and 2009/10 FYTD. Please include figures for:**

- (i) total spending on consultancies; and**
- (ii) value of contracts awarded.**
- (iii) Provide total figures since November 2007 and a breakdown on these figures for FY 2008/09 and 2009/10 FYTD.**

**(c) Is the Department/agency up to date with its reporting requirements on the Government's tenders and contracts website? Are the figures available on that site correct?**

**(d) How many consultancies are planned for this calendar year? Have these been published in your Annual Procurement Plan (APP) on the AusTender website and if not why not?**

**(e) For each consultancy, please identify:**

- (i) the subject matter;**
- (ii) duration;**
- (iii) projected cost;**
- (iv) method of procurement; and**
- (v) the name of the consultant if known.**

**All answers should be current at the time the answer is submitted.**

**Response:**

(a) A listing of Defence and the DMO consultancies with a contract value in excess of \$10,000 (GST inclusive) is reported in the online version of the Defence Annual Report on the Defence website at <http://www.defence.gov.au/annualreports/>. Information is also available on the AusTender website at [www.tenders.gov.au](http://www.tenders.gov.au).

(b) The cost and method of procurement is listed in the online version of the Defence Annual Report on the Defence website referenced above. Information is also available on the AusTender website at [www.tenders.gov.au](http://www.tenders.gov.au).

(c) Defence maintains its contract records on the AusTender website. The department is currently reviewing these records to ensure correctness.

(d) A summary of consultancy contracts is provided in the Defence Annual Report. On completion of the financial year, details of current consultancies at 30 June will be collated and included in the online version of the Defence Annual Report on the Defence website referenced above. Information on these and the Defence Annual Procurement Plan are also available on the AusTender website at [www.tenders.gov.au](http://www.tenders.gov.au).

(e) A listing of consultancies is available on the online version of the Defence Annual Report. On completion of the financial year, details of current consultancies at 30 June will be collated and included in the online version of the Defence Annual Report. Information is also available on the AusTender website at [www.tenders.gov.au](http://www.tenders.gov.au).

## **W18**

### **Government payment of accounts**

#### **Senator Barnett**

- (a) **Has the portfolio/agency paid its accounts to contractors/consultants etc in accordance with Government policy in terms of time for payment (ie. within 30 days)?**
- (i) **If not, why not, and what has been the timeframe for payment of accounts?**
  - (ii) **Please provide a breakdown, average statistics etc as appropriate to give insight into how this issue is being approached.)**
- (b) **For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts?**
- (i) **If so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency for the current financial year; and**
  - (ii) **the previous financial year?**
- (c) **Where interest is being paid:**
- (i) **What rate of interest is being paid; and**
  - (ii) **How is this rate determined?**

#### **Response:**

(a) Separate figures for on time payments for contractors/consultants are not available, however the Department of Defence (excluding DMO) in 2009-10, achieved 97.7% of payments within 30 days. Additionally, 94.5% of DMO's payments were made on time. This demonstrates achievement of the Commonwealth's 90% on time payment target.

- (i) & (ii) On a monthly basis, Defence and DMO monitors and where necessary acts to ensure achievement of the payment target.

(b) Defence paid no interest for the 2009/2010 financial year. DMO paid the following interest amounts to small business:

- (iii) 1 Jul 09 to 31 May 10 - \$0.009 million, and
- (iv) 1 Jul 08 to 30 Jun 09 - Nil

(c) Interest is paid in accordance with the rate and methodology advised in the Department of Finance and Deregulation Finance Circular No. 2008/10.

## **W19**

### **Energy efficiency of Defence buildings**

#### **Senator Birmingham**

**For every building occupied by the Department, please list the following:**

- (a) **Has an energy efficiency audit been undertaken?**
- (b) **If so, what rating was achieved?**

**(c) What action has been taken to improve energy efficiency as a result of any audit undertaken?**

**Response:**

(a) Providing a response for every building occupied by the Department would require departmental officials to review the over 20,000 buildings that are occupied by Defence personnel. This would be an unreasonable diversion of government resources.

Defence owns approximately 20,000 built assets varying in size and function across all Australian States and Territories. With such a large portfolio, Defence does not conduct energy audits on every building it owns or occupies and applies a strategic approach to driving energy efficiency through Energy Action Plans and the submetering of high energy use buildings.

Defence continues to implement the requirements of the Government's *Energy Efficiency in Government Operations Policy 2006* (EEGO) for energy efficiency in Defence owned and leased buildings. Defence monitors and reports its performance against EEGO each year to the Australian Government through the *Government Greenhouse and Energy Report*.

Through Defence's *Energy Management Strategy 2007*, each region has developed an Energy Action Plan that targets energy efficiency improvements in high energy use buildings and equipment using a priority based approach. Opportunities for improvements can be identified without audits, however Defence does conduct energy audits in accordance with the Australian Standard AS/NZ 3598:2000 depending on the priority and nature of the building. For example, this year energy audits have been undertaken for Defence buildings at Russell Offices, Campbell Park Offices, the Australian Defence Force Academy, the Royal Military College in Duntroon, and a range of Defence logistics warehouses and workshops around the country.

(b) Audits conducted according to the Australian Standard did not determine a rating of each building but identified a range of opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of buildings.

(c) Significant energy conservation works and initiatives have been undertaken as a result of Defence Energy Action Plans and associated energy audits. Energy efficiency initiatives currently being applied at Defence facilities include:

- Rationalisation of lighting in office environments;
- Remote powering down of desktops overnight and at weekends/holiday periods;
- Installation of motion and photo-electric sensors to automatically control lighting;
- Adjustment of the automatic air-conditioning and lighting operation hours to reflect building occupancy;
- Revision of air-conditioning and heating temperature settings through the Building Management System (BMS) to better match ambient temperatures;
- Installation of dedicated air-conditioning units in server rooms to reduce wastage of chillers operating for the whole building;
- Encouraging the use of revolving door access to reduce the requirement for heating and cooling;
- Installation of electrical sub-metering on high energy use buildings to measure consumption and track where efficiencies can be achieved;
- Replacement of equipment, such as dishwashers in messes, with more energy and water efficient models;
- Communication and education awareness materials to remind personnel of their responsibilities to reduce energy.

**W20 – Question transferred to Dept of Resources, Energy and Tourism at their request on 23 June 2010.**



Nuclear test compensation

Senator Ludlam

- (a) *Some years ago a payment of \$13.5 million was made by the Australian government for rehabilitation of the Maralinga site. Have efforts been undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the clean up measures, and at what intervals and using what methodology is ongoing monitoring being undertaken into the safety of the area?*
- (b) *Were efforts made to undertake a clean up of the Emu Fields site and the Montebello Islands? If not, why has such a measure not been undertaken?*
- (c) *What justification is there for providing compensation to veterans and other personnel affected by the testing, but failing to provide compensation to the Aboriginals impacted by the same tests?*
- (d) *What options are open for compensation models to Aboriginal peoples affected by the testing?*
- (e) *What financial assistance if any, is being considered to assist the Aboriginal victims of the British Nuclear tests to pursue their legal rights through the British courts? If not, why not?*
- (f) *Has there been any consideration of a model for lump sum compensation for personnel impacted by the tests?*
- (g) *What are the reasons for rejecting such a model?*

**W 21**

Programmes

Senator Trood

- (a) **Can you please provide, in spreadsheet form, a list of all programmes administered by your Department and portfolio agencies?**
- (b) **Can that list please show for each listed programme:**
  - i. **The name of the programme.**
  - ii. **Full administered expenses for each financial year of the forward estimates period starting from 2010-11.**
  - iii. **Full departmental expenses for each financial year of the forward estimates period starting from 2010-11**
  - iv. **Allocated Average Staffing Level (ASL) for the programme in 2010-11.**
- (c) **If that list cannot be provided, can you please advise the reason why simple full-expenditure financial information is not readily available for the public's information?**

**Response:**

- (a) and (b)(i)(ii)and (iii) Information on Programmes administered by **Defence** can be found in:  
**Outcome 1** - Table 19 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11 on Page 36.  
**Outcome 2** - Table 35 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11 on Page 88.  
**Outcome 3** - Table 36 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11 on Page 92.

Information on Programmes administered by the **Defence Materiel Organisation** can be found in Table 66 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11 on Page 154.

Information on Programmes administered by **Defence Housing Australia** can be found in Table 85 of the Defence Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11 on Page 207.

- (b)(iv) The Allocated Average Staffing Level (ASL) is summarised in the table below. Programmes 1.14 - 1.18 have no allocated civilian and contractors as these are Administered Programs.

**Table 1: ASL**

	2010-11 Budget Estimate
Program 1.1 Office of the Secretary and CDF	543
Program 1.2 Navy Capabilities	831
Program 1.3 Army Capabilities	1,139
Program 1.4 Air Force Capabilities	936
Program 1.5 Intelligence Capabilities	2,574
Program 1.6 Defence Support	3,838
Program 1.7 Defence Science and Technology	2,793
Program 1.8 Chief Information Officer	1,207
Program 1.9 Vice Chief of the Defence Force	1,602
Program 1.10 Joint Operations Command	84
Program 1.11 Capability Development	160
Program 1.12 Chief Finance Officer	213
Program 1.13 People Strategies and Policy	460
Program 1.14 Defence Force Superannuation Benefits and 1.15 Defence Force Superannuation-Nominal Interest	
Program 1.16 Housing Assistance	
Net costs of 1.17 Kings Highway Upgrade	
Net costs of 1.18 Other Administered	
ASL not allocated to a specific Program	410
<b>Total ASL (Civilian and Contractors)</b>	<b>16,790</b>

**W22**

**Defence Civilian Researchers**

**Senator Trood**

- (a) How many Defence civilian researchers does the Defence Department employ/contract to carry out research on community attitudes similar to the research undertaken on Timor Leste in February 2010?**
- (b) Where do they conduct their research?**
- (c) What is the purpose of this research? How is the information gathered reported back to the Defence Department?**
- (d) Why did the Defence civilian researcher program in East Timor cease on 18 March 2010?**
- (e) Does the Defence Department plan to reinstate this program in the future?**
- (f) Can the Defence Department provide a copy of the survey/questionnaire used at the community forum at Suco of Lore village on 23 February 2010?**

**Response:**

- (a) Over the three-year period of the study DSTO tasked one of its civilian researchers to carry out research on community attitudes in Timor-Leste on an ongoing basis. However, small study teams were raised periodically in order to gather direct source data from Timor-Leste. Eleven Defence civilian researchers have been involved in the studies over the past three years.
- (b) Research on open source reporting is conducted from DSTO's Edinburgh Laboratories. However, periodically, small teams visited Timor-Leste to identify key concerns directly from communities across the country.
- (c) The research was developed at the request of Commander JTF631 following the outbreak of widespread violence and instability in May 2006. The aim of the study was to improve Defence's understanding of the key concerns held by local communities in Timor-Leste and how these may or may not be changing over time. Understanding the community's security concerns and responding appropriately is key to operational success. The information was gathered by sending a small team of civilian and military analysts into country for a few weeks every six months to conduct community-level focus groups in a range of locations. The findings of the research were briefed to the JTF631 Commander at the end of each study visit. A full report of the findings was subsequently provided and dissemination beyond Commander JTF631 and HQJOC is at their discretion.
- (d) A local NGO complained that in the February 2010 study researchers had asked villagers questions about their personal political preferences. The allegations were investigated and it was found that there was no basis to the claims. As a result of the sensitivities surrounding the allegation, it was decided that continuing the study was not operationally essential and the decision to cease the study was the most appropriate course of action.
- (e) The Defence Department has no current plans to reinstate the program. However, Defence is reviewing the approach taken during the February 2010 study. The review will investigate the feasibility for a more transparent study, in consultation with the Government of Timor-Leste and other Australian Government agencies, should Defence require information on community attitudes in the future.
- (f) No survey or questionnaire was used at Suco Lore 1 or any other location during the February study. Rather, the study relied on the conduct of small focus groups among community members. The focus groups were facilitated by locally hired interpreters who were trained by DSTO analysts. The focus group method relied on groups raising important issues themselves. Accordingly, facilitators avoided asking specific targeted questions. The advantage of using open questions rather than leading questions is that it tends to generate more intra-group discussion and renders explicit communities actual concerns rather than the preconceived views of the study team. The guidelines for facilitators are provided below:
- Do not attempt to control the discussion. Guiding questions are only to prompt participation, or suggest possible topics for discussion.
  - Encourage participants to give examples of their experience. If someone shares how they feel about something, ask for an example of something that has happened to make them feel that way.
  - Allow time for participants to think and respond. Be comfortable with silence from the group while they consider responses.
  - Follow up on points of interest. We are not just interested in what is happening, but also what caused these things to happen how people feel about them.
  - Feelings of past experiences are just as important as what is happening today. When participants share experiences from the past, it can be useful to ask whether things have changed today (better or worse), or whether they still feel the same way today?

- Show respect for all participants. Value the thoughts and opinions of all participants regardless of age, education, gender, or wealth.

## **W23**

### **Defence Base Consolidation**

#### **Senator Trood**

- (a) Has the Defence base consolidation process been completed? Is there a timeline for completion?**
- (b) Has this process produced any preliminary conclusions? What are those conclusions?**
- (c) Does the Department intend to take environmental considerations into account when deciding on defence base consolidation and the selling off of defence bases and land?**
- (d) Will community consultation occur prior to the consolidation of defence bases and or the sale of defence land?**

#### **Response:**

- (a) No. The timeline for completion is within the 12-18 month period as indicated by the Minister for Defence on 17 November 2009.
- (b) No decisions have been made on the future of individual bases at this stage.
- (c) No decision has yet been made on any base consolidation. In the event that any bases are disposed of, all relevant Commonwealth Environment legislation and Defence Policy will be adhered to.
- (d) No decision has yet been made on base consolidation. In the event that any bases are identified for closure, community consultation will occur in accordance with standard Defence practice.

## **W24**

### **Greenbank Military Training Area**

#### **Senator Trood**

- (a) What is the current land size of the Greenbank Military Training Area in Brisbane?**
- (b) What is the role/function of the Greenbank Military Training Area?**
- (c) Has the Department decreased the funding and function of this military training area in recent years?**
- (d) Is the Department aware of any distinctive or unique elements of the biodiversity of the site of the Greenbank Military Training Area? What are those elements?**
- (e) Does the Department have any plans to sell the Greenbank Military Training Area?**
- (f) Has the Department been approached by any property developers expressing an interest to purchase the land?**

#### **Response:**

- (a) Greenbank Training Area (GBTA) comprises approximately 46 square kilometers (4,600 hectares). The landscape is predominantly grassland and forest.
- (b) GBTA was gazetted as a military training area in September 1951 and has been used for military training purposes ever since. GBTA is now predominantly used as a small arms range complex to allow military units in Southern Queensland and Northern NSW to meet their weapon proficiency requirements. Individual and small team dry (without live ammunition) training activities up to platoon level are also conducted at GBTA. There is a requirement to provide these functions to military units either at their home base or within one hour's travelling time to facilitate same-day deployment and redeployment. Greenbank meets this criteria for the units based in Brisbane. In 2010, GBTA has averaged 6,400 range users per month.

Under the Enhanced Land Force Project (ELF) a Safe Driver Training Facility will be built at GBTA to allow range users to conduct driver training on the Defence vehicle fleet, a requirement identified through recent operations in the Middle East. ELF will also see GBTA become the depot for 25/49 RAR.

Activities may be conducted in GBTA by any of the three Services of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) operating either singly or jointly, and by invitation, troops from the Defence Forces of other nations. At times, other suitably accredited civilian state or local government organisations e.g. Police, Customs, or Protective Services etc, may conduct activities in the area when authorised to do so. The Queensland Police Service currently leases a range on the training area to conduct their live fire weapon practices, which they operate on a regular basis.

(c) No. Defence has invested additional funding to support the ELF Project.

(d) GBTA is an important environmental area and is entered on the Commonwealth Heritage List for its natural values. It has been listed for the conservation of old growth forest in South East Queensland, and contains suitable habitat for a number of threatened animal species, including Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999) listed species. Areas of Essential Habitat for the Koala and Wallum Froglet are mapped as occurring within GBTA, which are species classed as 'Vulnerable' under the Queensland Nature Conservation Act 1992. GBTA is an important habitat for other species that are threatened, uncommon, or restricted in the Brisbane area, and contains Endangered and Of Concern Regional Ecosystems, as listed in the Queensland Vegetation Management Act 1999.

GBTA is an important element of the Flinders Peak to Greenbank/Karawatha Fauna Corridor, and is also entered into the Directory of Important Wetlands, Australia (Section 3.8.2.4), indicating it is a nationally important wetland. Under the Queensland *Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 2009*, GBTA is identified as an area containing high ecological value freshwaters.

(e) The Greenbank Military Training Area is not scheduled for disposal.

(f) Defence is approached on a regular basis both informally and formally by developers. Most informal approaches are through phone enquiries or questions of staff at meetings. Most queries are directed to various staff in Defence Support, but usually to Range Control, Environmental Officers, and the Base Support Manager - Brisbane. Formal approaches from King and Co, Staines Memorial College and the Springfield Land Corporation Pty Ltd have been received in the past five years.

Defence is currently in discussions with the Queensland Government regarding Commonwealth land beside the Greenbank Training Area. The land is currently licensed to the QLD State Government for environmental study purposes. The QLD Government require a small portion of the land to build a car park beside the Greenbank State School to alleviate traffic congestion at drop off and collection times.

## **W25**

### **China-Peoples Liberation Army (PLA)**

#### **Senator Trood**

**(a) What are Australia's current links/ties with the Chinese military?**

**(b) What joint training occurs?**

- (c) **Does Australia have an exchange agreement with the PLA? What does that agreement entail?**
- (d) **Are there plans afoot to change/upgrade these links and forge closer ties? If so, what are these plans?**
- (e) **According to an article published in *The Australian* on 8 February 2009, Lieutenant General Gillespie wrote a report on 24 March 2008 calling for a 'deeper' military relationship with the PLA. Are you able to table this report?**
- (f) **Who commissioned the report?**
- (g) **Why was this report commissioned?**
- (h) **What were General Gillespie's recommendations in the report?**
- (i) **Have these recommendations been implemented by the Department?**

**Response:**

- (a) The Australian Defence Force (ADF) and People's Liberation Army (PLA) currently engage in an expanding program of defence cooperation activities, including through senior dialogue and visits, education and professional exchanges, and practical exercises in areas of shared interest, such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR).
- (b) No joint training occurs between the ADF and the PLA, although ad hoc joint activities occur in areas of shared interest. For example, in October 2007 the navies of Australia, New Zealand and China carried out a practical maritime Search and Rescue exercise, while in April 2010 Australia and China conducted a desktop exercise on HADR.
- (c) No formal exchange agreement between the ADF and PLA currently exists. However, a range of agreed educational exchanges and placements occur each year. These include annual positions for PLA officers at the Australian Command and Staff College and Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies, and a placement at the Royal Military College Duntroon (yet to be taken up), while the Australian Department of Defence receives annual placements at the PLA University of Foreign Languages, and a short-term cadet exchange occurs twice per year between the Australian Defence Force Academy and the PLA University of Technology.
- (d) Australia and China have both agreed to build on these existing areas of defence dialogue and cooperation to further deepen our bilateral defence ties by:
  - (i) expanding the program of senior defence visits, including through the planned visits to China by the Secretary of Defence and the Chief of Defence Force in December 2010, and the Minister for Defence in early 2011;
  - (ii) cooperating further on areas of shared interest such as HADR and maritime security, including through the conduct of a joint maritime exercise;
  - (iii) enhancing educational and professional exchanges between our two militaries; and
  - (iv) consulting further on ways to increase transparency in defence policy between our two nations in recognition of the importance of mutual trust in the defence relationship.
- (e), (f) and (g) The report was a Post Visit Report following LTGEN Gillespie's visit to China from 15-21 March 2009, and was not commissioned. Such reports are standard following senior visits of this nature. The Department of Defence is able to table a redacted version of this report (an unredacted version can be provided in confidence to the honourable Senators upon request).
- (h) The recommendations made in this report were;
  - (i) the issuing of formal invites to certain senior PLA leaders to visit Australia as part of a regular program of senior visits;
  - (ii) to examine participation on Chinese language training courses in China to develop a larger pool of Mandarin speakers within the ADF;
  - (iii) the ADF should send a student to the PLA National Defence University; and

(iv) Army should investigate sending a student to the PLA Command College in Nanjing.

(i) To date, a number of the recommendations included in this report have been implemented by the Department of Defence. Invitations have been issued to certain of the senior PLA figures identified in the report. Defence participates in Chinese language training courses at the PLA University of Foreign Languages. The ADF sends a student to the PLA National Defence University's month-long International Symposium on an annual basis. Further enhancing educational exchanges between our two militaries also remains a key area for developing our bilateral defence engagement.

## W26

### Security Review at Defence Bases

#### Senator Trood

- (a) **Last year, the Rudd Government ordered a comprehensive review into defence base security following the foiled terrorist attack on the Holsworthy army base in Sydney. Have all the recommendations from that review been implemented in all defence bases throughout Australia?**
- (b) **Is a security review currently underway to 'clarify the status' of defence force personnel in the event of an attack on a military facility in the country?**
- (c) **Why is there the necessity for such a review?**
- (d) **When was the review initiated?**
- (e) **Who initiated the review?**
- (f) **When is the review likely to be completed?**
- (g) **Do defence personnel currently have the right to mount an armed response if attacked on a defence base? Could they face legal action if they used force to defend themselves?**
- (h) **What measures are currently in place for Defence personnel to defend themselves in the likelihood of an attack?**

#### Response:

(a) The review of Defence protective security arrangements, completed in August 2009, made 33 recommendations. Of the 33 recommendations, 15 have been completed. These include strengthening security policy relating to base access control and incident response, further improving contracting arrangements for the provision of guarding services and, at a number of priority sites, implementing further physical security measures such as improved perimeter fencing, security lighting, alarm systems and increased security patrols. The remaining 18 recommendations are all in progress and have been consolidated into a base security improvement work program, with associated funding identified across the forward estimates from within the Defence budget.

In total, Defence has identified 88 bases or sites that are to receive enhanced security measures. Treatment packages have been developed for all these bases.

(b) No. Following the review of Defence protective security arrangements, completed in August 2009, the Government directed Defence to clarify and strengthen protections to ADF members using reasonable and necessary force in responding to an attack on a Defence base. The *Defence Legislation Amendment (Security of Defence Premises Bill) 2010*, which was developed by Defence in consultation with other Commonwealth agencies responds directly to this recommendation. The Bill, which was previously introduced in the Senate on 24 June 2010, lapsed with the proroguing of Parliament on 19 July 2010, necessitating its reintroduction in the House of Representatives on 29 September 2010. The Bill seeks to provide explicit authority for authorised Defence Force members to use force to defend themselves or others from death or serious injury in the event of an attack on Defence premises. The Bill's provisions also clarifies that the common law right of all individuals to defend themselves continues to apply; as will the

various Commonwealth, State and Territory legislative provisions that provide a defence of self-defence.

The Bill was referred to the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee for inquiry on 30 September 2010, with a reporting date of 16 November 2010.

- (c) There are currently no further security reviews, either underway or planned, to clarify the status of Defence Force personnel in the event of an attack on a Defence base or facility within Australia.
- (d) Refer to the response provided at (c) above.
- (e) Refer to the response provided at (c) above.
- (f) Refer to the response provided at (c) above.
- (g) In Australia, all individuals are able to defend themselves or others from death or serious injury under the common law and various Commonwealth, State and Territory legislative provisions that provide a defence of self-defence. Currently, where a Defence Force member takes action in self-defence, or defence of another, it would be a matter for the relevant prosecuting authority to consider whether the circumstances would merit the prosecution of any criminal offence.
- (h) Defence works in conjunction with intelligence agencies and law enforcement authorities to identify any potential threats to Defence bases. When a threat to a Defence base is identified, Defence initiates appropriate protective security measures such as limiting access to a base and increasing the frequency of vehicle and bag searches on entry. Each Defence base has a security plan detailing the measures to be taken should the threat level increase. In Australia, all individuals are able to defend themselves or others from death or serious injury under the common law and various Commonwealth, State and Territory legislative provisions that provide a defence of self-defence.

**W27**

**Mining Deals**

**Senator Trood**

- (a) Are companies seeking to undertake mining projects in Australia required to seek an assessment from the Defence Department before applying to the Foreign Investment Review Board for approval for these projects? Alternatively, is an assessment required only when defence land may be included?**
- (b) How long has the policy of assessment involving Defence land been in place?**
- (c) How many mining applications were made to mining on/near Defence land in 2008-09 and in 2009-10? How many were approved or rejected? What reasons were given?**

**Response:**

(a) When a mining proposal is subject to the *Foreign Acquisitions and Takeovers Act 1975*, the Foreign Investment Review Board (FIRB) is required to consider the proposal. The FIRB will seek contributions from Commonwealth government departments and agencies, including the Department of Defence, on whether the proposal raises any national interest concerns. When a potential investment requiring a decision by FIRB impacts the Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA), the prospective applicant is requested to resolve access issues with the Department of Defence before formalising its application and submitting it to the FIRB.



(b) It is long standing Australian Government practice to assess the impact of mining proposals on Commonwealth land.

(c) New applications to mine on or near Defence land\* during the financial years requested occurred as per the table below:

Category	Financial Year 2008-09	Financial Year 2009-10
Mining applications on Defence land received	1	3
Mining applications on Defence land rejected	1	0
Adjacent applications affecting Defence land received	0	3
Adjacent applications affecting Defence land rejected	0	0

The unsuccessful application in FY 2008-09 was declined on the grounds that it would have impacted unacceptably on Defence's use of the land and presented unacceptable safety risks.

\* Also including the Woomera Prohibited Area.

## W28

### Training Incident

#### Senator Trood

- (a) A media release issued by the Defence Department on the 14 April 2010 stated an Air Force PC9 aircraft incident occurred over a training area at East Sale. What occurred?
- (b) Was an investigation conducted?
- (c) What were the findings of that investigation?
- (d) Did parts of the aircraft fall off during flight? Were those parts located? Were they located by the Defence Department or by a member of the public?
- (e) Were all PC9 aircraft suspended from flying after this incident? Are they now operational?
- (f) Has this type of incident occurred previously in this aircraft?
- (g) What measures have been implemented to ensure an incident of this nature does not occur again?

#### Response:

- (a) During a routine mission on 14 April 2010, an Air Force PC-9 training aircraft from Royal Australian Air Force Base East Sale had two landing gear doors separate from the aircraft during flight.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) The findings of the investigation concluded that the most likely causal factors of this incident are:
- The right hand side main landing gear 'gear up' micro-switch was out of tolerance due to wear on the mating surface of the leg towing hook;
  - The inboard main landing gear doors opened slightly allowing airflow into the wheel well.
  - Both outboard main landing gear doors and right hand side hinge failed catastrophically due to air loads induced by the air speeds required for that sortie; and

- The right hand side outboard main landing gear door was subsequently exposed to the airstream, eventually causing failure of the forward hinge by torsional overload.

(d) Yes, the main landing gear outboard doors separated from the aircraft in flight. The Left Main Landing Gear Outboard Door was recovered in full at 4:35pm on 21 April 2010. The item was recovered in farmland (S38 05.062 E146 41.614) with the outer skin (red) visible. Part of the Right Main Landing Gear Outboard Door was recovered at 2:44 pm on 22 April 2010. The item was recovered in farmland adjacent to a private refuse dump (S38 04.961 E146 42.480). The red outer skin (approx 1 mm thick aluminium layer) was missing from the door panel and was also minus approximately 12 cm of the upper door panel, including the forward hinge assembly.

Both items were located by Defence personnel utilising the Air Force contracted CHC Search and Rescue helicopter located at East Sale.

(e) No, the PC-9 aircraft were not suspended from flying following this incident. The aircraft have remained operational and flying operations continued.

(f) Similar incidents have occurred on Air Force PC-9 aircraft where misaligned or worn microswitches may have caused the landing gear doors to open uncommanded in flight. However, in these previous incidents, due to the lower speed at which these incidents occurred, the doors did not separate from the aircraft.

(g) The Defence Materiel Organisation through Training Aircraft System Project Office released Special Technical Instruction-PC9-0527—*MLG Outboard Door and microswitch check* on 20 April 2010 detailing maintenance inspections and actions to be carried out by 23 April 2010. All Air Force PC-9 aircraft released for flying operations have now undergone the inspections as detailed in this Special Technical Instruction. Aircraft that have not undergone the inspection are still undergoing other maintenance action and will require the Special Technical Instruction to be conducted before being cleared to fly. Any damaged or worn microswitches or towing hooks have been realigned or repaired. Inspection of these components is part of the ongoing R2 aircraft servicing zonal inspection which occurs every 300 flight hours or 12 months, whichever occurs first. Training Aircraft System Project Office are currently developing a revised undercarriage rigging check to prevent recurrence.

## W29

### Clothing Contracts

**Senator Eggleston** (*QoN transferred from Dept of Innovation, Industry, Science & Research on 22 June*)

- Is it true that an Australian TCF company, in conjunction with a European company, has developed a world first innovative fabric that has a special flame retardant wool blend?**
- Is it also correct that an interim initial garment order was placed in 2009 where the garments were made in Australia using Australian made fabric?**
- Is it also true that, in January this year, the DMO awarded two contracts for the supply of this special flame retardant Australian developed fabric, and that the specifications of this fabric were included in the tender document?**
- Did an Australian company take the technological know how provided to it by the Australian developer of this flame retardant technology to China? And is it now the case that the deliveries of garments from China are late and are unlikely to meet with the Australian performance standards?**

**(e) Is the Department concerned about the export of Australian innovation and know how to China in this way? If it is, what steps have your (and/or the Government) taken to ensure Australian know how isn't exploited by other nations?**

**Response:**

- (a) DMO is unaware that wool/flame resistant viscose fabric is a world first Australian innovation. The DMO is aware that an Australian TCF company, Bruck Textiles/Melba Tex, is a provider of a wool/flame resistant knitted fabric, specifically a wool/Lenzing FR flame resistant viscose fabric. The European company referred to is believed to be Lenzing AG (Lenzing) who are owners of the Lenzing FR(R), a fire retardant viscose fibre. DMO has made contact with Lenzing AG and has been advised that Lenzing do not operate a "licensee system" unlike some other fibre suppliers and brand managers. This means that downstream yarn and fabric manufacturers, such as Bruck in Australia or overseas suppliers are not licensed or otherwise solely authorised to use and process the branded Lenzing FR(R) viscose fibre and yarn. Lenzing also advised DMO that the company works with a range of spinners, knitters, weavers and other textile processors across the world and that they provide technical assistance to processors of Lenzing fibres. An initial review of open source material (via web search) revealed that a Norwegian company had used a 50/50 wool/Lenzing FR viscose in 2004 for underwear. This does not support the case that it is a world first Australian innovation.
- (b) Interim garments were procured in 2009 from an Australian company. The garments were made in Australia from 100% Australian wool.
- (c) The DMO released a Request for Tender (RFT) for cold weather and extreme cold weather undergarments in January 2009. The RFT included the requirement for thermal drawers and skivvies. A specification, DEF (AUST) 8196 Undergarments Extreme Cold Weather, was released as part of the RFT. An essential requirement of the specification was that where wool was to be used that the mean fibre diameter of the wool content of the fabric be 19.5 microns maximum, as tested in accordance with AS 2001.2.1 – 1088 'Methods of test for textiles – Physical tests – Determination of mean fibre diameter of textile fibres by measurement of projected images'. Other essential requirements for the fabric were the weight range for the fabric, the "melt stick" flammability behaviour of the fabric, shrinkage and thermal resistance (warmth) range characteristics of the fabric. The specification did not nominate fibre content; nor did it list or require the use of branded textile fibres. The specification was open enough to allow for any appropriate fibre composition so long as it met essential requirements.
- (d) DMO is unaware whether this is the case, however it is not clear what technological know-how might be relevant. The technology to make the yarn, spin the yarn into fabric and to cut, make and trim thermal underwear is all readily available overseas. The deliveries are being undertaken in accordance with the schedule for deliveries as agreed between the Commonwealth and the supplier. DMO is undertaking testing to confirm that the delivered product is compliant with the specification - this is routine.
- (e) DMO is not aware of the export of Australian innovation. DMO has been advised by Lenzing in Europe that it works with companies across the world to incorporate its branded fibres in yarns, fabrics and clothing provided by those companies. DMO is not involved in these commercial arrangements. DMO required the provision of clothing that met a specification. The specification did not detail any 'know how', nor did it specify fibre composition.

Attachments to Defence Organisation answers to questions on notice

- Attachment to question 3(a): Australian Defence apparel—contract. *[182 pages]*
- Attachment to question 7(g): Harding-Treloar report 2006—Department of Defence minute regarding audit investigation final report. *[7 pages]*
- Attachment to question 8(a): Availability of reviews and reports—Inspector-General Group, Audit investigation into procurement of combat fleece jacket, 22Dec05. *[69 pages]*
- Attachment to question 8(c): Availability of reviews and reports—pack frames ... a preliminary report. *[11 pages]*
- Attachment to question 8(d-1): Availability of reviews and reports—DMO Independent review of the in-service ADF combat boot: technical report by Booz Allen Hamilton, 19Mar08. *[104 pages]*
- Attachment to question 8(d-2): Availability of reviews and reports—DMO Comparative assessment of the ADF in-service combat boot with boots used by allied forces, 16Mar08. *[70 pages]*