



**Australian Government**  
**Department of Defence**

**Karen Creet**  
Assistant Secretary  
Ministerial and Executive Support  
R1-5-A019  
Department of Defence  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Tel: 02 6265 4414  
Fax: 02 6265 2923

ASMES/OUT/2012/106

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Committee Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write concerning corrections to the Hansard record for the Budget Estimates hearings into the Defence portfolio on 28 and 29 May 2012.

Please find enclosed nine letters correcting the factual evidence provided by individual officers as outlined below:

- (a) General David Hurley, AC, DSC, Chief of the Defence Force, concerning the detainee management process in Afghanistan and the DLA Piper Review;
- (b) Vice Admiral Ray Griggs, AO, CSC, Chief of Navy, concerning the Navy Jet Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats;
- (c) Air Marshal Geoff Brown, Chief of Air Force, concerning performance differences between the Alenia C-27J 'Spartan' Battlefield Airlifter aircraft and the Military Airbus C-295 aircraft;
- (d) Mr Brendan Sargeant, Deputy Secretary Strategy, concerning Overseas Development Aid (ODA) eligible expenditure;
- (e) Rear Admiral Robyn Walker, AM, Commander Joint Health, concerning the Simpson Assist Program;
- (f) Rear Admiral Peter Marshall, AM, Head Maritime Systems, concerning the length of Navy's Jet Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats;
- (g) Air Vice-Marshal Collin Thorne, Head Aerospace Systems Division, concerning the acquisition of the C-27J aircraft; and
- (h) Two letters from Mr Mark Jenkin, Acting Deputy Secretary Defence Support, concerning the cost of providing bottled water at RAAF Base Pearce, and construction costs for huts at Cultana Barracks, South Australia.

Yours sincerely

Karen Creet  
Assistant Secretary  
Ministerial and Executive Support  
3 August 2012



R1-5B-CDF Suite  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE  
PO Box 7900  
CANBERRA BC ACT 2610

CDF/OUT/2012/605

13 July 2012

**Dr Kathleen Dermody**  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody,

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Senate Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning detainee management processes in Afghanistan and the DLA Piper Review.

In answer to a question from Senator Ludlam (page 70 of Proof Hansard 29 May 2012), regarding how long people can stay at the ADF Initial Screening Area (ISA), I stated that *it varies, normally it is for 96 hours, and there are possibilities of extensions for another 96 hours and then another 96 hours.*

This information was incorrect as the extension time periods vary depending on the circumstances.

Following capture the majority of detainees remain in Australian custody in the ISA for up to 96 hours. This is in accordance with International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) detention guidance. During this time, detainees undergo a screening process, which involves asking questions to verify a detainee's identity, completing a basic health screen, recording their biometric details and examining any physical items on their possession.

In certain cases, where more time is needed for comprehensive screening, extensions beyond 96 hours may be authorised for an additional 72 hours, with a possible further extension of 72 hours (a maximum of ten days in total). Comprehensive screening determines whether an individual should be released or transferred, or if a detainee has knowledge which could assist in the force protection of ADF, ISAF and Afghan partners. This additional time period allows for the continuation of questioning, interrogation, exploitation, and the development of evidence packages to support potential prosecutions through the Afghan justice system.

Extension to the 96 hours can also be granted for medical or logistics purposes. Medical extensions are used to ensure a detainee has received the necessary medical attention to allow them to be questioned at the ISA, transferred for prosecution or released. The length of time of a medical extension depends on the individual medical circumstances of the detainee. Depending on the severity of the detainee's medical condition, they may be held in a Coalition medical facility or in the ADF ISA.

Logistics extensions are used for situations where safe transfer or movement of the detainee is not feasible due to the prevailing security situation, delays in the transfer of a detainee, temporary unavailability of a facility to receive or accommodate a detainee, unavailability of transport or adverse weather conditions.

In a follow up question from Senator Ludlam (page 70 of Proof Hansard 29 May 2012) regarding whether detainees are automatically transferred to the Detention Facility in Parwan, Bagram, or released, I stated that *“they will not be automatically transferred to Bagram unless there is a purpose to do so – one that has been identified in that process. Otherwise they are released.”*

To clarify that statement, where there is sufficient evidence to justify ongoing detention, detainees may be transferred to either the Afghan National Directorate of Security in Tarin Kot or the Detention Facility in Parwan, Bagram, for potential prosecution through the Afghan justice system. Where there is insufficient evidence to justify their ongoing detention or to support prosecution, detainees are released.

In answer to a question from Senator Johnston (page 34 of Proof Hansard 28 May 2012), regarding the DLA Piper Review, I stated *“We had to have a mechanism by which we would understand what was contained in them and how to build up a process to deal with them”*. This should more correctly state *“We had to have a mechanism by which the Government would understand what was contained in them and how to build up a process to deal with them”*.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely,

**D.J. HURLEY, AC, DSC**  
General  
Chief of the Defence Force



# ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVY

Chief of Navy

RI-4-C001, Russell Offices, Canberra. ACT. 2600

---

CN/OUT/2012/506

**Dr Kathleen Dermody**

Secretary

Senate Standing Committee on

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Parliament House

CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to clarify evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 29 May 12 concerning Royal Australian Navy (RAN) Jet Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats (RHIB).

In addition to my response to Senator Johnston's question on modifications to RHIBs (page six of Hansard), the following information is provided to clarify the difference between the two types of RHIBs in service with the RAN:

There are two types of Jet RHIBs in service in the RAN – the Armidale Class Patrol Boat (ACPB) RHIB and the J3 RHIB, which is in service in most Major Fleet Units (MFUs). The J3 variant developed as a result of a requirement for a RHIB with greater endurance and speed for longer ocean/sea passages and was introduced into service in 2008.

The J3 modifications over the ACPB RHIB included improved engine power, speed, endurance and seating. To increase the durability of the ACPB Jet RHIBs, in 2010 a 'heavy duty collar' was developed and installed to provide a thicker protective skin to those areas of the RHIB that were prone to excess friction when alongside another vessel. This heavy duty collar has always been part of the J3 RHIB.

No further modifications have been made although some additional tactical support equipment has been temporarily installed in MFU RHIBs for the duration of deployed Operations.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

**R.J. GRIGGS, AM, CSC**

Vice Admiral, Royal Australian Navy

Chief of Navy

↑ June 2012



ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AIR FORCE  
AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

---

Department of Defence, R1-6-C001, CANBERRA ACT 2600, AUSTRALIA

OCAF/OUT/2012/AB8305822

June 2012

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 29 May 2012 concerning the performance differences between the Alenia C-27J 'Spartan' Battlefield Airlifter aircraft and the Military Airbus C-295 aircraft.

In answer to a question from the Chair (page 26 of *Proof Hansard* 29 May 12), I stated '*The overall volumetric capacity of the C27 is 15 percent more*'.

This information was incorrect. The correct statement is '*the useable cargo compartment volume of the C-27J is 15 per cent more*'.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

G.C. BROWN  
Ajr Marshal  
Chief of Air Force



**Australian Government**  
**Department of Defence**

Brendan Sargeant  
Deputy Secretary Strategy  
R1-5-B001

Tel: 02 6265 2848  
Fax: 02 6265 1599

DEPSEC S/OUT/2012/36

12 June 2012

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to clarify evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning ODA eligible expenditure.

In answering a question from Senator Rhiannon, page 75 of *Proof Hansard* Tuesday 29 May 2012, I stated that we would identify elements of activities in Afghanistan that meet ODA criterion. This was stated incorrectly. Clarifying that activities undertaken by Defence *could* be categorized as ODA eligible and that the Government *could* count them as part of the overall aid expenditure; is more accurate. In this light, we will identify *if* any of the elements of activities in Afghanistan currently meet that criterion.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

**Brendan Sargeant**  
Deputy Secretary Strategy



JOINT HEALTH COMMAND

---

CP2-5-032, PO Box 7911, Campbell Park Offices, Campbell ACT 2610

CJHLTH/OUT/2012/R11596944

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning the Simpson Assist Program (SAP).

In answer to a question from Senator Fawcett, page 51 of *Proof Hansard 28 May 2012*, I stated that 'for the upcoming financial year we have \$8.119 million budgeted for Simpson Assist. That was additional funding. Then for the following year it is \$7.9 million. It also came with 10 FTE positions for that program.

This information was incorrect because it did not provide an accurate figure for the FTE. The correction is, 'the SAP budget for FY12/13, inclusive of FTE and contractor expenses, is \$8.119 million and an additional \$7.9 million for FY 13/14. There is an additional 21 FTE for FY 12/13 and FY 13/14'.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours Sincerely,

R.M. WALKER, AM  
Rear Admiral, RAN  
Commander Joint Health

6 June 2012





Australian Government  
Department of Defence  
Defence Materiel Organisation

**MINUTE**

Office of Head Maritime Systems  
R2-5-C001  
PO Box 7904  
CANBERRA BC ACT 2610

OHMS/OUT/2012/319  
AB9602085

21 June 2012

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning the length of the Navy's Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats (RHIB).

In answer to a question from Senator Johnston (page 96 of *Proof Hansard* Monday 28 May 2012), I stated that "I think they are 7.4 meter Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats". This information was incorrect because the Rigid Hull Inflatable Boats are 7.2 meters long.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

**P.J. MARSHALL AM**  
RADM, RAN  
HMS



**Australian Government**  
**Department of Defence**  
**Defence Materiel Organisation**

Aerospace Systems Division  
R2-5-C015  
PO Box 7904  
**CANBERRA BC**  
**ACT 2610**

13 June 2012

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning the acquisition of the C-27J aircraft.

In answer to a question from Senator Johnston (page 22 of Proof Hansard 29 May 12), I stated that I had signed the Source Evaluation Report (for the Air Force Battlefield Airlifter) but thought that a delegate from Capability Development Group may have also co-signed the report. I undertook to check this fact. I can now confirm that I was the sole signatory to the Source Evaluation Report.

Further, in response to the same question I referred to a 'Tender Evaluation Board'. This team should be more appropriately referred to as the 'Tender Evaluation Working Group'.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

COLIN THORNE  
Air Vice-Marshal  
Head Aerospace Systems Division  
Defence Materiel Organisation



**Australian Government**

**Department of Defence  
Defence Support Group**

AF11116998

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning the cost of providing bottled water at Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) Pearce, Western Australia.

In answer to a question from Senator MacDonald (page 76 of *Proof Hansard* 29 May 2012), I stated that the cost of providing bottled water at RAAF Pearce in the last financial year, 2010-11, was \$130,000. This information was incorrect and the correct figure is \$113,000.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

Mark Jenkin  
Acting Deputy Secretary  
Defence Support  
2/ June 2012



**Australian Government**

**Department of Defence**  
**Defence Support Group**

AF11116992

Dr Kathleen Dermody  
Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on  
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Dermody

I write to correct evidence that I gave at the Budget Estimates hearing held on 28 and 29 May 2012 concerning construction costs for huts at Cultana Barracks, South Australia.

In answer to a question from Senator Fawcett (page 40 of *Proof Hansard* 29 May 2012), I stated that construction costs at Cultana were \$3,113,044. This information was incorrect and the correct figure is \$2,852,466.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

Mark Jenkin  
Acting Deputy Secretary  
Defence Support  
27 June 2012